THE ARKLETON TRUST

PART-TIME FARMING ***IN*** *THE RURAL* ***DEVELOPMENT*** *OF INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES*

Report of a seminar held in Scotland from 16 to 21 October 1983

PART-TIME FARMING IN THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES

Report of a seminar held in Scotland from ***16*** *to 21 October* ***1983***

THE ARKLETON TRUST

THE ARKLETON TRUST uses its resources for the study of new approaches to rural development with emphasis on education and training. It aims to promote dialogue between politicians, administrators and practitioners at all levels on the problems of Europe and the Third World.

The Trust's activities include the holding of high level seminars on specialised subjects of immediate relevance to Europe and/or the Third World and the collection and collation of relevant experience for its publications programme.

The Trust is not a grant making body and it supplements its limited resources in collaboration with other bodies which share its objectives. It is recognised as a charity by the United Kingdom Charity Commissioners.

Further information about the work of the Trust and copies of this report may be obtained from: The Arkleton Trust, Langholm, Dumfriesshire DG13 OHL, Scotland, UK.

The copyright in this report is vested in the Arkleton Trust. It may, however, be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission from the copyright holder provided that acknowledgement is made to 'The Arkleton Trust' and a copy of the publication is provided to the Trust.

Q 1985 The Arkleton Trust

Dedicated to the memory
of
David Moore
1942-83

CONTENTS

PaSe

PREFACE (vii) **I** INTRODUCTION 1 II **PAST STUDIES** OF PART-TIME FARMING **3** I GROWING IMPORTANCE OF PART-TIME FARMING **5** Centrally-planned economies 7 IV **MAIN** CHARACTERISTICS **8** Time aspects and motivation **8** Location **9** Nature of off-farm work **10** Agricultural characteristics **13** Relative income **16 V CONCEPTS AND** DEFINITIONS **18** VI **CHANGING NATURE AND FUNCTIONS** 20 VII FARM **UNITS 23 VIII** FARM **FAMILIES** 25 Longer-term changes **26** IX **FUTURE** OF PART-TIME FARMING **29 X** PROS **AND CONS** OF PART-TIME FARMING **31** Attitudes of specific groups **33** XI **GOVERNMENT** POLICIES **36** Past policies **36** Future requirements 40 **XII** RESEARCH **NEEDS** 46 XIII SUMMARY **AND CONCLUSIONS** 48 **NOTES AND REFERENCES 56 APPENDIX** 1 List of seminar participants **61 APPENDIX** 2 Part-time and full-time farmers or **63** farm households in **OECD** countries

PREFACE

This report is based on the discussions of a seminar held by the Arkleton Trust at the MacRobert Conference Centre, Douneside House, Tarland, Aboyne, Aberdeenshire, Scotland, from 16 to 21 October **1983.**

The seminar, the fifth in a series begun in 1978, was once againthe occasion for lively and intensive discussions **by** a group of people with wide experience of rural development in many different countries. Its subject was Part-time Farming -a Positive Factor in Rural Development. The Chairman of the seminar was Patrick Commins, and the participants (all of whom attended in their personal rather than official capacities) are listed in Appendix 1.

During the seminar the fifth Arkleton Lecture was given **by** James Shaw Grant, CBE, formerly Chairman of the Crofters Commission, on *The Part-Time Holding -an Island Experience.* His lecture, which greatly enriched the seminar discussions, may **be** obtained from the Trust as a separate publication.

The Arkleton Trust gratefully acknowledges the excellent facilities for its seminar provided for the second time **by** the MacRobert Trusts. For financial assistance for the seminar and related activities it is again grateful to the Edward Cadbury,
Ernest Cook, Walter Higgs and MacRobert Trusts and to the Highlands and Islands Development Board. Thanks are also due to the several farmers who received the seminar participants during a field trip.

The report of the seminar has been prepared by Keith Abercrombie, in consultation with the participants and with the approval of the Chairman of the seminar. As with the reports of previous Arkleton Seminars, it is not intended to represent views agreed by the participants, although it is hoped that it does this as far as possible. In addition to the seminar discussions, it draws on material not directly discussed there, in order to provide a full report on the subject.

The seminar took place a few weeks after the death of David Moore, one ofthe founders ofthe Arkleton Trust. He had been at all the earlier seminars and was expected at this one as well. He took leave of absence from FAO to work as the Trust's first Programme Director fram 1978 to 1980, and was Secretary to the Trustees until his death. David was particularly responsible

for the unusually informal but extremely hard-working style that has characterized the Arkleton Seminars and has contributed so greatly to their success. His inspiration will always be with us in our work on the causes to which he was deeply committed, and this report is dedicated to his memory.

John Higgs
Chairman The
Arkleton Trust

INTRODUCTION

Many people, although accepting that rural development is a valid policy aim in the developing world, continue to doubt its relevance to predominantly urban societies. Yet rural development is steadily being given more emphasis in industrialized countries. Depopulation (even though it is now diminishing) is seen as a major problem in many of their rural areas, especially the more remote ones. It is increasingly realized that government interventions confined mainly to agriculture and to some physical planning controls have done little to alleviate rural problems. Similarly, regional policies based on the establishment of industrial "growth poles" in rural areas have rarely been a complete success: Interest in the rural areas has also quickened as a result of the growth of urban unemployment.

Large parts ofrural Europe have been designated since 1975 as Less Favoured Areas (LFAs) under EEC Directive 75/268. Additional assistance for these areas was initially limited to the agricultural sector, but from 1982 Integrated Development Programmes (IDPs), drawing finance from the regional and social funds of the EEC as well as its agricultural fund, have been started on an experimental basis for a few of those LFAs whose problems cannot be solved by agricultural policies alone. There are also several recent examples of more integrated approaches to rural development through national measures in individual countries.

Various aspects of rural development in European and other industrialized countries, especially those concerned with education, have been addressed by successive Arkleton Seminars. It was some of the conclusions of the seminar held in 1982, which discussed institutional approaches to rural development in Europe, that led to the choice of part-time farming as the subject of the 1983 seminar.

The 1982 seminar found that the growth of part-time farming was among the most important of the many recent changes in rural Europe to which these institutional approaches would have to adapt. Land must increasingly be seen as providing an economic and social base from which a family could carry out many activities in addition to farming. The increasing flexibility and plurality in rural occupations exemplified by the growing importance ofpart-time farming could even have lessons for society

as a whole, by pointing the way towards the necessary new definitions of what constitutes useful and satisfying employment. However, part-time farming is virtually ignored by public policy'.

There have already been many studies and discussions of part-time farming in industrialized countries, as is briefly described in the next part of this report. Some further explanation may therefore be needed of the reasons justifying yet another.

The main reason is the predominantly exploratory, descriptive and negative nature of so much of the previous work on the subject. For a long period part-time farming was regarded chiefly as a transitory and even aberrant phenomenon, and the main emphasis was on its apparent shortcomings as a type of farming rather than on its role in the wider rural economy. It is only quite recently that its likely permanence and its more positive aspects have come to be recognized. Even now it is still often forgotten that modern part-time farming is to some extent a return to the past, when all farmers were part-time in the sense that they performed many tasks which have since been taken over by specialists off the farm.

Another reason is that the overall economic and social circumstances in which part-time farming is carried out have recently changed very radically. Its recent growth was associated with the rapid expansion of non-farm employment opportunities, especially in manufacturing and services, in or close to rural areas. Its evolution during the lastest phase of economic recession and rapidly rising unemployment has received surprisingly little attention.

Thus there is room for an examination not only of the role of part-time farming in the broad context of rural development, but also of its evolution during the most recent situation. It is also timely to look at the role which part-time farming might play in a future in which attitudes and policies concerning employment may have to be substantially changed, and in which new oppor tunities are opening up for the decentralization of much employ ment that hitherto had to be concentrated in urban areas.

The next three parts of this report aim mainly to summarize the basic background material which the seminar took as its starting-point. Most of the rest of the report is based more fully on the discussions of the seminar itself.

H PAST STUDIES OF PART-TIME FARMING

It appears that the term "part-time farming" was not coined until as late as 1930.[1] Although previous studies had occasionally discussed it, they used different terminology, often even less neutral in tone, such as "farming in the twilight zone", "one-cow farmer", "backyard farmer" and even "amphibian".[2]

The early studies were mainly descriptive and usually took the view that it was an inefficient type of farming and a problem, though fortunately an ephemeral and localized one. There was briefly a somewhat more positive attitude during the economic depression of the 1930s, but in the 1950s and 1960s it was predominantly negative.

A conspicious renewal ofinterest in part-time farming began in the second half of the 1970s. This probably chiefly reflects a growing realization that it is extremely widespread, is here to stay, and has been expanding. Notable landmarks were the symposium held at the University of Guelph, Canada, in June 1975, the workshop in July 1976 and seminar inJuly 1977 at Wye College, England, and the survey made by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1975-77.

The beginnings ofa more positive approach also date from this period. However, it is noteworthy that the organizers of the Guelph Symposium, which contributed greatly to the newer, more positive attitudes, were forced to conclude that "whether part-time farming is a problem or a resource was not resolved at this meeting. It . . . cannot be considered a universally positive or negative element".[3] Similarly, the Wye Seminar, which also took a generally favourable attitude, included in its report a section on "the case against part-time farming".[4] It is particularly in a number of more recent country studies, which will frequently be referred to in the course ofthe present report, that a positive approach has emerged most clearly.

Bibliographies of part-time farming were published in 1966 and 1977.[5] It is already high time for another, but it would by now be a very large undertaking, and certainly too much to be attempted here. The references at the end of this report should, however, constitute at least a skeleton bibliography for the last few years.

Much of the most useful recent material was conveniently brought together in special issues of the periodicals *GeoJournal* in

1982 and *Sociologia Ruralis* in 1983. A recent article also traces in some detail the historical evolution of studies of part-time farming.[6] These three publications represent valuable reviews of the "state of the art" at the time of the seminar.

III GROWING IMPORTANCE OF PART-TIME FARMING

It is only quite recently that part-time farming has been distinguished in national agricultural statistics. In the United States, for example, this was first done in 1930, and in Canada in 1941,1 althoughJapan's Farm Household Economic Survey has done so for much longer. Most of the industrialized countries with market economies now identify part-time farming in some way in their national statistics, following avariety ofdefinitions based on the share or amount of income derived from non-farm occupations or of work-time spent on them. The very smallest holdings are excluded from the agricultural statistics on the basis of various national definitions. In most national statistics only the farm operator is considered, but in a few cases the whole farm family or household is included.

The OECD report distinguishes between full-time farms and two classes of part-time farm.[2] The full-time farms generally include those deriving up to about **10%** of income from or devoting up to this proportion of work-time to non-farm occupations. For Class I part-time farms the proportion is up to **50%,** and for Class **11** more than **50%.** For Class II the cut-off point is what is defined in the national statistics as an agricultural holding. The adequacy of such definitions is discussed below in Part V of this report.

The table in Appendix 2 brings together the OECD figures on the numbers of part-time farmers or households in individual countries, and where possible supplements them with data for more recent years and additional countries. Although the value of the table is obviously limited by the differences in national definitions, it does give a first rough idea of the magnitude of part-time farming.

Adding up the latest data shown in the table, it may be estimated that, in a fairly representative sample of 16 industrialized market economies, more than 9 million farmers (or households), or just over half of the total, were on a part-time basis around the 1970s.

Japan and Norway stand out as the countries where part-time farmers are the largest proportion ofthe total. Injapan they were **87%** in both 1975 and 1980,[3] and in Norway **69%** in 1979. For Spain there are estimates only for Class II, but this class alone was

as much as 48% in 1972. Classes **I**and II together were also more than half the total farmers in Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland in all or most of the years covered in the table, and in the United States in 1969. Although smaller, the proportions were far from negligible in the remaining countries. In absolute terms, apart from Japan, part-time farmers are most numerous in Italy, Spain and the United States.

Because they are generally smaller than full-time farms, part-time farms represent a smaller share of the farming area than of the number of farms. The land occupied by Classes I and **I1** together was 22% of the total in Austria in 1970, **26%** in Germany in 1975, 34% in Norway in 1969, and 74% in Japan in 1975. Since much of their production is consumed by the farm household, their share of total marketed output is still smaller.

Again it is largest in Japan, where in 1970 the contribution of Class IIalone was 23% of total marketed production and 34% of that of rice.[4]

For nine countries the table shows data for more than one year. With very few exceptions, the numbers of farmers, full-time farmers, part-time farmers and Class I part-time farmers have declined. For Class II, however, there are rather more exceptions to the general fall in absolute numbers. Some sample survey data for Ireland that do not appear to be compatible with those in th& table indicate a remarkable increase of more than **70%** in the number of part-time farmers between 1961 and 1978.' Sample survey data for other countries as well are often on a different basis from the census figures discussed here.

In relative terms, the proportion of part-time farming as a whole has risen in several ofthe countries in the table, and that of Class II in nearly all of them. In addition, in Australia primary producers recording wage and salary incomes rose from 23% of the total in 1968/69 to **27%** in 1972/73.6 Thus the incidence of part-time farming (and especially ofClass II), as measured by its share of the total, appears to have increased in most of the countries for which there is information. Very few data are available for the most recent period of recession and unemployment, but its incidence seems to have stayed about the same in France, Germany andJapan, and to have risen in Norway and the United Kingdom.

As might be expected from the generally growing share of Class II in relation to Class I, there is also evidence for several

countries of an increase in the proportion of income derived from non-farm work or of work-time spent on it. In France off-farm work increased throughout the 1970s and reached about 40% of the total income per farm by 1981.[7] In the United States its share rose from 26% in 1945 to 50% in 1975 and 57% in 1977.[8] In Sweden the share of the average farm family's income from outside agriculture increased from 37% in 1966 to **68%** in 1980.' In Canada, although the proportion of farm operators reporting some off-farm work has remained fairly constant at about a third, the amount of such work rose from an average of 75 days a year in 1941 to about 175 in 1966.[10]

Centrally-planned economies

In the centrally-planned economies of eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R., with their collectivized agricultures, the nature of part-time farming is different, but here too its importance appears to be growing.

Production from the private plots of collective farm members and of non-agricultural workers amounted in 1975 to **35%** of gross agricultural production in Hungary, **31%** in Romania, 21% in the U.S.S.R., **16%** in Bulgaria, 15% in Czechoslovakia, and 11% in the German Democratic Republic. In the second half ofthe 1970s its importance declined in the last two countries, but it seems likely to have increased further in the others. It is responsible for a very large share of the output of certain products, for example 68% of eggs in Hungary in 1974, 65% of poultry in Romania, 64% of potatoes in the U.S.S.R., 59% of meat other than poultry in Hungary, 58% of milk in Romania and of fruit in the German Democratic Republic, and 44% of vegetables in Czechoslovakia.[11] Part-time farming is even more important in Poland, where private farms exist side **by** side with the collectives, so that its nature is closer to that in the market economies. Part-time farmers increased from 1.8 million in 1960 to 2.6 million in 1970. The proportion of heads of peasant families with full-time jobs outside the farm grew from 23 to 30%, and ofthe total employed family members with such jobs from 28 to **35%.**[2] Family farms with mixed sources of income rose from 45% of the total in 1962 to 54% in 1970.[13]

IV MAIN CHARACTERISTICS

As a further part of the background material that the seminar took as its starting-point, it is necessary to summarize some of the main characteristics of part-time farming as they emerge from the past studies of the subject.

Time aspects and motivation

Most of the early studies of part-time farming emphasized its transitional nature, as a stage in the movement of people into or (more often) out of agriculture. The flexibility and mobility it affords are undoubtedly of great value in helping people to experiment with and adjust to changing patterns of work. The more recent studies, however,-have increasingly revealed that much ofit is ofa stable or at least persistent nature. It is an end in itselfas well as a means to an end, in some cases because aspiring full-time farmers have come to accept it as a permanent compromise.' Indeed it is a long established and widespread way of life. Nevertheless, while recognizing the persistence of part-time farming, it is desirable not to lose sight of its dynamic nature. The actors and their roles change frequently, particularly in line with the family life-cycle.

A combination of "push-factors", related to limited opportunities in farming, and of "pull-factors", related to the availability of off-farm employment opportunities, has long been regarded as explaining the main motivation for part-time farming.[2] Yet this is hardly the whole story. A sample survey of part-time farmers in England and Wales in 1981/82 found that "living in the countryside" ranked first among their objectives, "doing enjoyable work" second, "making a living out of farming" only third, and "holding capital in the form of land" fourth.

Many people, especially those brought up-in urban areas, perceive a great variety of attractions in rural living and the possession of a small farm: a secure house, often of a higher standard than could be afforded in a town; lower living costs, including the possibility of producing part of one's own food (and also fuel); a safety net against unemployment; the chance to escape from congested urban areas and bring up children in a healthy environment; and the direct responsibilities involved in farm work. Similarly, off-farm work is not sought by farm

families solely because of the income it brings. Other factors include the widening of interests and social contacts provided by a non-farm job, especially an urban one.

In general, however, the main motivation for part-time farming is certainly the desire to combine the security and other advantages afforded by the possession of a farm with the chance to participate in the increasing prosperity of the rest of the economy. For a long time its growth was encouraged and made possible by the rapid expansion of non-farm employment opportunities in or close to many rural areas. Improved transport and communications facilitated not only the decentralization of industry but also commuting to work. More recently, as will be discussed later, the picture has altered as a result of industrial recession and rapidly rising unemployment.

A number of typologies of part-time farming have been proposed in an attempt to capture some of the temporal and motivational characteristics discussed above. The simplest proposes three groups: "traditional", "stable" and "privileged".[4] A study of the agricultural hinterland of an urbanizing area in Ontario, Canada, identifies six different situations that may be more generally applicable: "small-scale hobby and miscellaneous", "aspiring element", "persistence", "sporadic", "prosperous large-scale hobby", and "unique".[5] Other typologies, again to be discussed later in Part VI of this report, take account of the changes that have occurred recently. Related conceptual and definitional problems are dealt with in Part V.

Location

Typological studies of part-time farming have also paid much attention to its geographical location within a country. Four types of area have been identified in the Canadian context that should also have wider application.[6] In Canada "areas of symbiotic relationship" are characterized by a long-standing association between farming and some other primary activity like forestry, fishing or mining in areas that are marginal for agriculture. Here there is a high incidence of part-time farming, mostly of a persistent nature. "Areas of low economic opportunity" are both marginal for agriculture and offer low potential for off-farm employment, so that there is a need to augment incomes by off-farm work but little opportun

ity to do so. Here too part-time farming is persistent, farmers are mostly elderly and agriculture is declining. "Rural-urban fringe areas" have the highest intensity of off-farm work in Canada. Most part-time farmers here are of the persistent type or hobby farmers. The least part-time farming is found in "areas of high agricultural potential", where it is mostly used as a way into full-time farming or is sporadic.

In the Federal Republic of Germany there is little part-time farming in the rural-urban fringe, and its main incidence is in the peripheral mountainous regions. In some industrial areas of the country a stable association has developed between industry and part-time farming.[7] In Norway there has long been a symbiotic relationship between agriculture and forestry or fishing, especially in mountainous areas, although it has recently declined. In England and Wales there is least part-time farming in the areas that are most rural, and the supply of non-farmjobs appears to be more important than the demand for them in determining its geographical distribution.[9]

Despite such differences, the geographical distribution of part-time farming within a country appears mainly to reflect the interplay of the often wide disparities between regions in the income potential from agricultural and non-agricultural occupations. Most part-time farming is found where farm incomes are low. Favourable conditions for farming lead almost everywhere to the predominance of full-time farming, even near to urban industrial centres. It is in areas that both have unfavourable conditions for farming and are remote from such centres that the greatest problems arise. There is little non-farm work except in services for the farm community itself, and this has often become too small to attract some of the most basic of such services and amenities.[10]

Nature of off-farm work

The nature of the off-farm work done **by** part-time farmers and their families strikingly illustrates their very great diversity. The different categories of off-farm or non-farm work (neither term satisfactorily covers the whole field) they engage in are extremely varied and include every conceivable occupation. Non-farm work may be carried out on the farm and farm work offthe farm.

There are many traditional types ofsuch work, especially on a seasonal basis. During the period of rapid economic growth that lasted almost without interruption from the recovery after the second world war until the early 1970s, many new forms of non-agricultural employment increasingly became available, especially in manufacturing industry and tourism and other services. There is a large amount of full-time off-farm work, but more often both the work on the farm and off it are part-time.

Reference has already been made to the traditional relations, often mainly seasonal, between agriculture and forestry, fishing, mining and quarrying in some areas. Work as hired labour on other (usually larger) farms is also traditional, particularly in the south of Italy" and in Spain.[2] Sometimes such work involves seasonal migration, as with the small farmers from the west of Ireland who formerly went to England for the potato and beet harvests.

It is traditional too for farmers to engage in self-employed service activities (often for the farming community) such as transport, or contract work with farm machinery. Especially in Scandinavia, many rural school-teachers are part-time farmers. The home production of textiles and some other products has a long history in many areas.

Like farming itself, work of these traditional kinds usually requires some special skills. Many of the newer types of off-farm employment, especially in building and construction and in manufacturing, are unskilled. At the same time, however, rising levels of education have made many types of non-farm work possible for the present generation that were not open to their parents, who were often restricted to poorly paid and sometimes casual unskilled work. Indeed, in the United States part-time farmers tend to be better educated than their full-time counterparts. " Better-educated farmers are more competitive in the non-farm labour market, and their importance is increasing through the entry into agriculture of people who have already held non-farm jobs.[4]

Among examples of the changes that have occurred, in Finland seasonal off-farm employment in primary occupations has rapidly given way to more regular employment in service industries.'[5] In Japan, with the decentralization of industry and transport improvements, the variety of off-farm jobs has widened con

siderably, and there has been a shift from casual to permanent or long-term employment, which rose from 33% of the total in 1941 to **39%** in 1955 and 55% in 1975.16

In Austria, Finland and Germany 70 to 85% of part-time farmers commuted to their off-farm work in the mid-1970s, 10% of them returning to their farms only at weekends.'[7] In Ireland the average distance travelled to work by part-time farmers who are wage workers is 10.4 km.[18] In England and Wales there is a close relationship between the costs of travelling and the rewards obtained. Some 40% of those with professional non-farm occupations but only 6% of manual workers travel 32 km or more, and the distances are also greater for main rather than subsidiary jobs.[19]

There are, however, many opportunites for earning additional income without leaving the farm. In addition to traditional handicrafts, farm buildings are increasingly used for such purposes as light industry, machinery repair and tourist facilities. Farmers also combine the roles of producer and retailer in a number of ways.

Tourism is now an important source of income for many farmers in areas ofspecial scenic beauty or historical significance or with winter sports facilities. In many such areas they have traditionally found seasonal employment in hotels and restaurants or as ski-instructors and maintenance workers. Farmers are increasingly providing tourist facilities, such as meals, accommodation and camping and caravan sites, on the farm itself. A sample survey of farm holdings in the LFAs of England and Wales in 1981 found that 20% were involved in tourism[20]

An important feature of part-time farming that has been surprisingly neglected is that it frequently involves an unusually high proportion of self-employment in off-farm or non-farm enterprises. One ofthe least noticed of the papers at the Guelph Symposium inJune 1975 already indicated that in a small area of eastern Ontario, Canada, more than 70% of the non-farm jobs held locally were self-employed or on a franchise basis.[2'] The OECD report also provided some data on self-employment in the off-farm work of part-time farmers, but it failed to draw any conclusions or even to include the information in the general part of the report. InJapan 20% was self-employment, with a higher proportion in Class II; in Germany a sample of Class II farms of above average size indicated about 15% of self-employment; in

Austria a limited survey found 18 to 22% ofself-employment for Class II and 6 to **19%** for Class I; and in France 28% of farmers and **11%** of members of farm families were self-employed in their off-farm occupations.[2]
More recent data indicate 3**0%** of self-employment (includingsub-contracted manufacturing work on the farm) in the Shiga Province of Japan in **1976.'** Ix Ireland self-employment predominates in the larger farm sizes, and was 32% of the total off-farm employment of part-time farmers in 1978, in comparison with the average of 10% in all non-agricultural employment.[24] In England and Wales a surprising 65% of part-time farm operators are self-employed in their off-farm occupations?2[5] In Spain, although only 15% ofpart-time farmers are self-employed in their off-farmjobs, the proportion isas high as 23% for those who began them after 1975.26 Self-employmentin the second job has been found to be a marked feature of multiple jobholding in all countries of the EEC.[27]

Agricultural characteristics

Although part-time farms are by no means always small, their average size is generally much less than full-time ones, and theytend to weigh heaviest in the smaller size groups. In Austria in 1970 the average size of Class II part-time farms was 8.3 ha (compared with 25.7 ha for full-time farms), in Germany in 1975 5.0 ha (22.4 ha), in Norway in 1969 3.4 ha (10.4 ha) and injapanin 1975 0.7 ha (2.1 ha) -in each case one third or less. In Italy**73%** of Class II had less than 2 ha in 1970. In the United States many medium-sized mechanized farms are part-time; nevertheless Class II made up 62% of all farms in the smallest size group(with sales of less than $2,500 a year) in 1969, and there are some very small part-time farms, mostly in the south.[2]

Part-time farming leads to different farm production patternsfrom full-time farming, and has considerable effects on the number, size and type of farm enterprises. In general there is more emphasis on enterprises requiring less labour and managerial attention. Thus there has been a rapid expansion in highlymechanized rice production on part-time farms injapan. Cereals are also important on part-time farms in Germany, Norway and the United States. In such countries as Austria, Germany and Norway potatoes are frequently grown, chiefly for home con

sumption, although they require more labour than cereals. Speciality products like flowers, honey, silk and rabbits, which require high labour inputs for only limited periods, are also commonly produced by part-time farmers.[29] Many part-time farmers, especially in southern Europe, are viticulturists. In Yugoslavia, for example, there are some areas where holdings producing grapes, other fruits and vegetables can be fully utilized throughout the year with less than 50 days work from the family.[30]

Because of the high labour requirements of small dairy herds, part-time farmers have generally reduced their milk production, although in some mountainous areas there are few remunerative alternatives. Thus in Ireland, beef cattle and sheep are the predominant enterprises on part-time farms (on 69% in 1981, as compared with 49% offull-time farms), while only 23% of them had dairying as a major enterprise, in comparison with 39% of full-time farms.[3]' Pig fattening is a common part-time enterprise in Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland, and sheep raising in Norway and Switzerland.

A large part of the production of part-time farms is used for home consumption. In Italy, for example, 45% of the production of part-time farms in Friuli is for home consumption,[32] and in Marche **35 %** on farms up to 3 ha and **18 %** on those over 10 ha.[33] In Yugoslavia, however, part-time farmers marketed more of their livestock production (52%) in 1977 than full-time farmers (48%).'

Seasonal off-farm work in the winter obviously has hardly any effect on the availability of labour on part-time farms. There is little field work at that time, and the livestock work can usually be done by the wife. There is also often severe underemployment on small farms with several family members of working age. At the other extreme, however, a small isolated farm may virtually have to cease production for sale if the farmer takes a full-time commuting job. In between these two extremes, the farm family may be expected to adjust in various ways.

In addition to the shift to less labour-intensive enterprises already discussed, on-farm adjustments include working harder or longer, obtaining help from other family members, seeking outside help, or using labour-saving technology. Off-farm adjustments include the selection of a flexibile **job** (such as self-employment), using paid holiday periods and working

irregular shifts. Adjustments may also be needed to cope with the changing labour supply during the family life-cycle.[35] In evaluating their dual employment, 5% of farm operators in Wisconsin, United States, saw strong conflict and 42% some conflict, but 28% saw their jobs as independent and 25% as complementary. More conflict was seen by the younger age group. In Shiga, Japan, where there are fewer alternatives to part-time farming, the corresponding figures were 26, **50, 11** and 14%.[36] In England and Wales 14% of part-time farmers felt that their farming benefited from their other job and 31% that it suffered, while 41% felt that their other job benefited from farming and 17% that it suffered.[37]

These evaluations probably depend greatly on the extent to which such adjustments as those discussed above have been successfully made. Where the adjustments have been insufficient, there must be considerable strain from overworking. In England and Wales a large proportion of the farmers sampled who averaged over 40 hours a week on the farm also put in from 10 to 30 hours on anotherjob.[31] In the Irish sample the average working week of part-time farmers was 50 hours.[39]

There is no doubt that in some circumstances part-time farming imposes severe constraints on time allocation, curtailing leisure and recreation and other family activities. The burden on wives providing tourist accommodation is particularly heavy during the season. In Yugoslavia women are responsible for more than half of agricultural production, and some manage all the farm work as well as the household and family.' In Spain, especially on livestock farms, the women are strongly against part-time farming and resent the long hours of work it entails.[41]

Contrary to earlier belief, there appear to be no significant differences in crop yields on part-time and full-time farms, although stocking rates and livestock yields are sometimes slightly lower on the former. Part-time farmers generally use less fertilizers and pesticides per hectare, but this usually results from their choice of less intensive enterprises rather than less readiness to adopt improved technology. In Ireland, for instance, there is no difference in their economic efficiency in the use of purchased feed, fertilizer and seed,[42] and in general farm management practices the smaller part-time farmers have better scores than the smaller full-time farmers.[43]

Productivity per hectare may be lower on part-time farms, but

this again generally reflects the choice of enterprise rather than lower efficiency. Many part-time farmers are able to make investments on their farms from non-farm earnings, sometimes in order to develop them into viable full-time ones. Althoughthis may sometimes lead to over-capitalization in terms of the farm unit, it may also bejustifiable as a substitute for labour in a deliberate attempt to lighten the burden of farm work for someone with another remunerative job.

Thus there may be some negativerelations between part-timefarming and the use of land and capital. In their flexible use of family labour resources, however, there is little doubt that part-time farms are highly efficient. Especially in Japan, theymake particularly effective use of female and elderly labour, whose opportunity costs are otherwise very low.

Relative income

The lower labour intensity of most part-time farms usually means lower gross and net output than on comparable full-time farms ofsimilar size. However, output is often higher per unit of labour. Thus the part-time farmer is able to obtain not only a higher income per working day on the farm, but also a still higher income for the time he spends on off-farm or non-farm work.

This frequently brings the total income of part-time farmers up to that obtained by full-time farmers whose farm businesses are several times larger than would be possible on the part-time farmers' holdings. In Norway part-time farmers had higher total incomes than full-time farmers in the mid-i 970s, and injapan the incomes of full-time farm households were only about two thirds of those of both Class I and Class II part-time households. "

In Japan the non-farm component of farm household income exceeded the farm component for the first time in 1963, and subsequently rose to 68% in 1975. The total disposable income per head of the farm population exceeded that of the non-farm population for the first time in 1972, and by 1975 the difference was 13%. In 1973 the same thing occurred for the first time in the United States, partly because of favourable farm price relationships but also because of the growth of part-time farming.

In Hungary part-time farming has contributed greatly to the'

levelling ofrural and urban incomes.[47] In Yugoslavia the regions with ahigh proportion ofmixed households are among the most prosperous.[48]

V CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

Part-time farming has gradually come to be recognized as a highly complex and varied phenomenon. Discussion still continues on the most suitable concepts and definitions for its analysis.

The terms "part-time farming" and "part-time farmer" are themselves now widely regarded as unsatisfactory. They define the phenomenon too narrowly as a type of farming. Their unfortunate connotations of a lack of specialization, inefficiency, amateurism and backyard activities doubtless contributed to the negative attitude of so many of the earlier studies.

The seminar preferred the term "multiple-jobholding farm household" (or family) as being much more appropriate in the broader context of rural development. It recognized, however, that this is cumbersome, that the traditional terms have already gained wide currency, and that they will probably have to continue to be used as a convenient shorthand. Most of this report (including its title) therefore uses the conventional terminology. As already noted, most national statistics distinguish part-time farming on the basis of the sources of income or the work-time of the farm operator alone. Such statistics are obviously necessary for many purposes. However, for a full understanding of part-time farming (and especially of its likely future) it is essential to have data that cover the whole farm household or family. Governments should therefore be encouraged to publish national data on this basis as well, and all specific surveys of part-time farming should cover farm households or families.

It has been pointed out that this approach may lead to anomalous results, such as a full-time farm becoming a part-time one on a child's leaving school and joining the work-force in a non-farm job, and then reverting to full-time status on his or her marrying or otherwise leaving the farm household.' At the national level such anomalies probably roughly cancel one another out. In any case they are less important than the need to capture the full diversity and the dynamics of part-time farming, and in particu changes that occur during the family life-cycle. The household or family approach may also lead (as in Japan) to almost all farms being classified as part-time, but this too could be a true reflection of reality.

There is a continuum from full-time farm households to full-time non-farm households. In between these two extremes the universe of multiple-jobholding farm households is very large and varied, embracing all those actively exploiting agricultural land and buildings which also derive income from off-farm or non-farm activities. While all of this universe should be taken into account in studying part-time farming, it must obviously be more narrowly defined for specific policy purposes through a cut-off point for the size of holding or the exclusion of such categories as large-scale hobby farms, urban allotment holders, or people who would otherwise be classified as full-time farmers but have non-farm income from investments or pensions. Specific policy measures must also take account ofregional or other locational differences.

The OECD classification of full-time farmers and Class I and Class **11** part-time farmers,[2] discussed earlier, is based on arbitrary cut-off points in the continuum that are not necessarily the most appropriate for such measures. However, it does provide a useful first indication of the broad dimensions of the phenomenon, as well as ,a suitable basis for international comparisons. This kind of general definition is still necessary in order to draw the attention of policy-makers to the importance of part-time farming, provided it is subsequently refined for the determination and implementation of specific policies.

The concept of "standard man-days" (SMDs) has sometimes been proposed as a means of identifying part-time farms. However, as is discussed further in Part VII, this only defines the potential labour-absorption capacity of a farm and says nothing about the available labour and the way in which it is actually used.

VI CHANGING NATURE AND FUNCTIONS

Since studies first began to be made of part-time farming there has been a succession of major changes in the overall economic and social circumstances in which it has been carried out. In response there have been some changes in its nature and functions.

During the depression of the 1930s it provided a lifeline that helped many people to avoid extreme poverty. Subsequently, as discussed above, it was for a long time regarded as a transitional stage, mainly for people entering or (more often) leaving farming. More recently its very widespread occurrence and enduringnature have come to be recognized, and this may well reflect a change in the real situation as well as in the perception of it. In Canada, for example, it has become a major way into farmingrather than out of it.' Thus, even though much part-time farming is now ofan enduring character, the mobility and flexibility it affords are still of the greatest importance.

With the rapid postwar growth and decentralization of employment opportunities in industry and services, traditional (often seasonal) types of off-farm and non-farm employmentincreasingly gave way to more modern and permanent types of employment. At the same time, consciousness of the growingnon-farm options increased greatly, rising aspirations raised the threshold of economic viability for individual farms, and technological changes released labour from farming tasks. In some countries the growth of part-time farming continued to be necessitated by the subdivision of holdings on inheritance.

What has happened in the most recent phase of economic recession and rising unemployment, and how part-time farminghas reacted to these changes, is much less well documented, although the broad national statistics presented earlier indicate that in most of the few countries for which there are recent data part-time farms appear to have maintained their position or increased as a proportion of the total. It is in particular for this most recent phase that the seminar was able to bring to bear some valuable new information and insights.

In many rural areas depopulation has now come to a halt, in some' cases facilitated by improvements in rural services and infrastructure. There are, however, many differences between countries and between the regions within them. In the Federal

Republic of Germany rural depopulation continues, although it has always been slower than elsewhere because of strong rural development policies. In Switzerland too there has been no back-migration to rural or mountainous areas. In many other European countries and in North America, on the other hand, rural populations have begun to increase again. However, this has rarely meant a return to agriculture, although the reduction ofthe farm population has generally slowed down. There is little room for such a return in countries like the United Kingdom, where (apart from the crofting areas, where tenure is frozen) there has been extensive restructuring of farms.

In such southern European countries as Italy and Spain the migration of workers, mainly abroad to northern countries, stopped some time ago. Large numbers of emigrants have now been obliged to return to their home countries. Many of them have resettled in rural areas as part-time farmers, bringing with them some capital and new skills.

The changes described above appear in most cases to have begun already before the onset of industrial recession and unemployment in the early 1970s. They have, however, speeded up subsequently.

The clearest picture of some of the ways in which part-time farming has reacted to these changes is provided by some recent studies of northern Italy.[2] These distinguish between "old" and "new" types of part-time farming. The first is where the family used the farm for residential and subsistence purposes while its head was away as an emigrant worker. Together with the remittances of the emigrants, this was a major factor in keeping people in rural areas during the emigration phase. Most of these early migrants have now retired to their holdings as pensioners, and this type of part-time farming is dying out. From about the mid-1960s it has tended to be replaced by the second type, which represents a more deliberate attempt to make the most of the farm holding to produce for the market and at the same time to adapt it to enterprises more suited to combination with off-farm or non-farm work. Thus dairy cows have frequently been eliminated and the land planted with cereals, apart from a small plot for subsistence production. With the declining importance of subsistence production, the house property has in some cases become the most important constituent of the part-time farm, and most of the land has been rented to full-time farmers.

It is significant that the recent flowering of part-time farming in Italy has been much greater where there has been a spontaneous, unorganized diffusion ofsmall industry and business in rural areas, rather than where industrial activity has been "implanted" from outside. Thus, in central Italy, there are marked differences between neighbouring areas depending on whether or not they fall within the orbit of the *Cassaper il Mezzogiorno,*which offers generous grants for industrial projects. It seems that planned job creation in rural areas does not lead directly to entrepreneurship, and that the fostering of local skills gets better results than simply introducing new employment possibilities.

More generally, the role of women in the off-farm or nonfarm employment of multiple-jobholding farm families has increased in line with the tendency in the economy as a whole.[3] Attention has already been drawn to the unusually high proportion of self-employment in the off-farm or non-farm jobs of the present generation of part-time farm families. Particularly in North America, the "disappearing middle" of medium-size farms has made the large full-time farms increasingly dependent for many specialized services on part-time farmers with small holdings.

Side by side with these predominately economic or social factors, what may be called "ideological" or "non-materialistic" influences have also reinforced the turn-around in rural depopulation and the endurance or expansion of part-time farming.These include a growing dissatisfaction with urban life, resistance to the conventional wisdom about the future of industrial societies, the rise of the conservation ethic, and increasing interest in small-scale activities and organically produced food.

Thus, although the detailed evidence is still very much more scanty than would be desirable, it does appear that in generalpart-time farming has not only survived the recent changes but has also assisted in adjusting to them in various ways.

Questions about part-time farming were hitherto asked mainly in terms ofagricultural production and productivity, especially at the time of the "Mansholt Plan" for the rationalization of production in the EEC. With the economic crisis, the emphasis has changed towards its broader social role. In this context, it is desirable to look for justification of part-time farming not in terms ofthe performance ofindividual farm units but in terms of its total contribution at the "meso-economic" or regional level.

VII FARM UNITS

Although the family or household is the most appropriate unit for the study of part-time farming, the farm unit obviously also continues to be relevant. While multiple-jobholding farm families react in ways such as those described above to outside economic and other forces and opportunities, they have to make their decisions within the framework provided **by** their farm holdings as the basic business unit. In addition, such government assistance as they may expect to get is likely to come mainly on a sectoral basis from agricultural departments, which are obliged to tailor their schemes of assistance to the sizes of farm units.

As has repeatedly been emphasized in this report, past studies of part-time farming have concentrated unduly on the purely agricultural characteristics of the farm units involved, and have tended to neglect its wider functions and contributions in rural society. While it was previously believed that part-time farming was agriculturally inefficient, it has more recently come to be recognized that, even ifits land productivity may be lower than that of full-time farming and it sometimes appears to be over-capitalized, this is mainly because of the adjustments that have been made in farm enterprises to accommodate the requirements of a second job. This could hardly be justified in a situation of food shortages, but is presumably more acceptable in the present surplus situation in European and North American agriculture, especially in view of the much higher total incomes obtained by part-time farmers than full-time farmers with comparable farm units.

Although the average size of part-time farms is much smaller than that of full-time farms, it is misleading to equate part-time farms with small farms, or with the "small-farm problem", as has sometimes been done in the past. Many part-time farms are quite large. Size is of course an extremely important factor, but other relevant aspects of the farm unit include its location, the quality of the land, its buildings and other capitalization, the tenurial and inheritance systems under which it is held, and the availability of additional land for rent or purchase in the neighbourhood. The range offarm sizes and its degree of polarization in a particular area is also important. Where land or its ownership are highly fragmented, it is more likely to be used for house construction than for part-time farming.

In the EEC the theoretical concept of standard man-days (SMDs) has gained wide currency as a way of describing farm units. For the application of EEC measures, farms with a potential of 2,200 hours of employment per year are regarded as providing full-time work for one person. In 1975 only **57%** of the farms in the EEC qualified as full-time on this basis. '

However, this describes only part of the reality of part-time farming. Farms can suddenly be reclassified as a result of technological changes, irrespective of whether they have actually been introduced on the farm in question. Many farms whose potential is more than this minimum number of SMDs are in fact worked on a part-time basis (as long as other job opportunities are available). Similarly, many people are forced (mainly by the lack of other job opportunities) to work virtually full-time on farm units that cannot provide an adequate income on this basis. At the same time the adequacy of a particular farm unit is changing as the threshold ofeconomic viability rises in line with higher aspirations. Thus many farm units distributed under land reforms (for example in Italy and Japan) have in the course of time become too small for full-time farming.

Although the characteristics of the farm unit are always the starting-point, it is necessary to look much further for a full explanation of part-time farming. The most important question is how a family or household actually makes use of its farm unit, including the changes that occur during the family life-cycle, and how it reacts to changes in the wider economic and social context within which it must operate.

VIII FARM FAMILIES

Much more needs to be known about the motivation, decision-making and other behaviour of multiple-jobholding farm families and households. It has become increasingly clear that, in contrast to the farm, farmer and agricultural aspects that were the main emphasis of so many of the past studies of part-time farming, the farm family or household is the most useful unit of analysis.[1] It is not the farmer alone but the family or household[2] that decides on the use of common resources. This is the social and economic unit that allocates changing labour and other resources between farm and non-farm activities in response to perceived pressures and opportunities at home and externally. It may be seen as the interface between the farm and the non-farm environment, filtering energies, resources and ideas between them.

The internal workings of the farm family and the interdependence (or lack of it) between family members in reaching decisions are extremely complex matters, and very little is known about them so far. Moreover, substantial changes are taking place, not only in the composition ofthe family labour-force but also in the attitudes, aspirations and roles of its individual members. Some of these changes are of a short-term nature during the course of the family and farm life-cycles. Superimposed on them, however, are longer-term changes that may substantially affect the future of part-time farming.

During the family life-cycle children obviously enter and leave the farm labour force, and older people retire or play less active roles than before. Some new entrants to farming are reluctant to abandon their non-farmjobs until they are properly established.[3] Others see such jobs as a temporary help in getting through certain stages in the family or farm life-cycle. They can provide a more reliable and regular income than farming, which may be particularly valuable at times of high family expenditures, or funds to pay back debts for land purchase or to finance farm or household investments and sometimes the eventual purchase ofa full-time farm.[4]

It is only a few of the most recent country studies that have begun to pay much attention to the crucial family aspects of part-time farming. In particular, one of the most important and

detailed of them makes some interesting comparisons of the United States and Japan.[5]

Some information on the family aspects of part-time farmingis also available in recent studies ofEngland and Wales,[6] Ireland/ Italy,' and Spain.[9] While there is some scope for the comparativeanalysis ofthe data, it would be a large undertaking in view ofthe different methodological approaches and is therefore not attempted here.

Longer-term changes

These country studies are generally based on one-time surveys,and cannot therefore throw much light on the longer-termchanges that are taking place in the attitudes and roles of the individual members of multiple-jobholding farm families. Anyexamination of these changes must therefore at present be confined to a few general impressions.

Family structures and relationships are clearly in a transitional stage in all the industrialized countries. The changes that are occurring appear to be particularly rapid in formerly backward rural areas and in countries, such as those in southern Europe,where educational improvement and industrial developmenthave come more recently. Attitudes to work and leisure are changing, especially those of women and young people. In most countries women have now achieved educational equality with men, and their growing experience of off-farm work has also been a major influence.

Some of the traditional family relationships (most notablythose between generations) are giving way to newer ones. Sometimes, however, some of the former remain and help to reinforce the latter. Thus, although the urban type of nuclear family is everywhere (except in Japan) replacing the extended family that is more characteristic of rural areas, the extended family appears still to be surviving in many places as a looser but nevertheless important network of solidarity in such more modem matters as the interfarm exchange of machinery and services.

Patriarchal and other authoritarian approaches to family decision-making, the prescriptive allocation of roles to individual family members and the pooling of resources and incomes are everywhere being eroded. The unquestioning assumption of duties and obligations by the younger generation is being re

placed by more democratic arrangements, either informal or negotiated and sometimes contractual. It is thus particularly necessary to investigate the ways in which work responsibilities are now determined.

Information is, not unexpectedly, especially hard to find on the extent to which the total incomes of multiple-jobholding farm families were or are pooled or amalgamated. Certainly there is a great variety of different situations. In general it seems that all or most of off-farm income is now left at the disposal of the family member who earns it (although in some areas a large part was formerly handed over to the parents), while work on the farm is usually recompensed by bed and board. Especially when the son is expected to leave the farm on marriage, he is allowed to accumulate savings for his future life. However, where off-farm income is closely related to the farm itself (for instance, a milk round or contract services using the farm's machinery), it has more often been ploughed back into the farm. The same is usually true when the son is expected to take over the farm.

There are many cases of formal partnership agreements between fathers and sons for the running of the farm. On a more limited scale, a son may sometimes assume full financial and other responsibility for a particular branch of the farm's activities, such as machinery operation or a livestock unit.

Better-educated young people are becoming more individualistic and attach greater value to their social independence and mobility. They increasingly seek a recognized professional status on the farm, instead of simply a place as a dependent member ofthe family labour-force. In some cases this desire has been met by arrangements such as thosejust described. In Italy, especially on medium-sized farms, a type of "professional" part-time farming is emerging, where at least one family member works full-time on the farm.

The traditional work ethic is also changing. Many young people feel that their parents and grandparents had to work much too hard and cannot relate to their life-style. The data quoted in Part IV of this report indicate the long hours of work that may be involved in part-time farming and the consequent curtailment of leisure. The burden on the wife is often extremely heavy, especially ifhousework is added to gainful employment, and this is much less likely to be tolerated in the future, particularly by women who have already experienced non-farm work. With the

tendency for women to complete the child-rearing phase earlier than formerly, they now have more freedon to work outside the home.

An important influence on family (and particularly inter-generational) relationships is the legal possibility or not of building a second house on the farm holding. This has generally been resisted in the United Kingdom, but a recent change in the legislation for the crofting areas of Scotland has facilitated the new tendency for educated young people to remain or return there. In North America the younger generation is frequently no longer ready or able to keep the older people in the house, and they now increasingly move from the farm into specialized institutions for their care that are multiplying rapidly in rural areas.

IX **FUTURE** OF PART-TIME FARMING

The future of part-time farming depends above all on the continued functioning of the multiple-jobholding farm family as a socio-economic unit. That many new tensions are likely to have to be faced in this regard is apparent from the above account, and its continuity cannot be automatically assumed. However, the highly flexible and adaptable approach to the use of family labour that it has exhibited in the past, together with its income-earning capacity, suggests that some forms of part-time farming will certainly endure.

A basic aspect is of course the extent to which the coming generations will continue to want to live and work in rural areas. Some recent developments like the return of the migrant workers in southern Europe can hardly be repeated. But most of the other recent developments that have brought a reversal of rural depopulation in many areas seem unlikely to prove temporary. These include in particular the desire to escape from urban congestion and pollution, to grow part ofone's own food and to engage in small-scale activities.

In most cases the on-farm and off-farm adjustments that reduce the work burden of multiple jobholding can still **be** carried much further. Moreover, there are wide variations in the desires and aspirations of individuals, even within the same family, so that there should be no shortage of young people wishing to be part-time farmers.

There are, however, some other threats to the future of part-time farming. The higher-grade jobs (mainly in services) that have increasingly replaced unskilled and often insecure off-farm work may offer a livelihood that is attractive enough without the need to do farm work as well. Especially in urban-fringe areas, continued urbanization could greatly reduce the availability of farmland.[2] Nevertheless the majority of the farm families in the Wisconsin and Shiga surveys expected to continue their dual jobholding into the foreseeable future.[3] Similarly, in central Italy almost all the male children working in part-time farming intend to continue this way of life when they inherit the family farm.[4]

Two basic alternative scenarios may be envisaged for the external economic environment into which part-time farming will have to insert itself in the future. In the first, manufacturing

industries would continue their decline in the older industrialized countries and their shift to third world countries. In the second, there would be some recovery from the recession in these industries in the industrialized countries. However, this would probably be based mainly on a substantiil injection of high technology in order to reduce labour costs. Thus in neither case would there be much recovery in employment in these industries. At the same time, the continued development of computer-based technologies should make possible the further decentralization to rural areas (and to homes as well as specialized premises) of many activities, especially in the services sector, that formerly had to be concentrated in towns.

Combined with the increasingly perceived non-economic attractions of living and working in rural areas, these likely developments should continue to encourage people to engage in part-time farming. Indeed, people with access to some farmland and its buildings, and thus having the possibility of part-time farming, may well come to be regarded as a privileged class. They are already so regarded in some communities.

It is now generally recognized that the future will require radically different approaches to employment and leisure and to the provision of essential services. Part-time farming is certainly not a panacea in this regard. Although it predominates in the farm labour force of the industrialized countries, this is only a very small proportion of the labour force as a whole.[5] However, the flexible and adaptable type ofoccupational plurality demonstrated by part-time farming is likely to be an important part of future employment patterns and could possibly help to point the way for the rest of society as well. Especially in small and remote rural communities, it could also play an important role in the future provision of many essential services, from which some governments are increasingly inclined to withdraw.

This role may finally lead to some increased interest by government policy-makers, which could be an important new influence in the future. Even agricultural policy may eventually begin to recognize the importance of part-time farming, because ofthe need to reduce the cost offarm support and the surpluses of many products. The statement of the then EEC Agricultural Commissioner after the announcement ofthe measures to reduce milk production from 1984, that in future the typical farming family could not expect to live exclusively by agriculture[6] may have a-much wider significance than he appeared to intend.

X PROS AND CONS OF PART-TIME FARMING

Before discussing the basic question of policy approaches, it is useful to return briefly to the background information which the seminar took as its starting-point and examine some of the attitudes to the pros and cons ofpart-time farming that have been taken in the past. These have in many cases been influential in determining policies or (more often) the lack of them.

The negative view of many of the early studies has been repeatedly mentioned. They generally regarded it as an inefficient type of farming, inherently inferior to full-time farming and a sign of failure. The more recent studies have tended to dispel this image and to find that (taking account of production patterns) it is not inherently less efficient than full-time farming. They have also identified many benefits from part-time farming in the wider context of rural development.

One of the most controversial areas that remains concerns agricultural land. As already noted, land use appears generally to **be** less intensive under part-time farming. In addition it is believed to reduce the mobility of land and inflate land values because of the ability of part-time farmers to hold on to small pieces of land and (where the demand is strong) bid up prices in competition with full-time farmers wishing to enlarge their holdings. It has therefore been seen as an obstacle to structural reform. While the position differs from area to area, there is, however, little evidence that this is so, or that in places where part-time farming is common structural reforms would necessarily be beneficial,' especially in view of the tendency towards surplus production. Moreover, large-scale full-time farming can also reduce mobility in the land market and lead to very rigid structures. Large-scale hobby farmers are probably the part-time farmers who have most effect on the land market.

It is sometimes argued that the random mixture of farming and industry characteristic of part-time farming in some rural-urban fringe areas is environmentally undesirable.[2] Intensive livestock production units have particularly come under fire in this re spect, although there seems to be no reason to associate them with part-time any more than full-time farming.

Political economists have long claimed that part-time farming leads to the "proletariatization" ofthe rural population and to the availability of a docile labour force that accepts low wages, is not

unionized and can readily be dismissed. The recent findings concerning the relative incomes of part-time farmers, their educational levels in the United States, and the extent to which they are self-employed in their off-farm occupations run strongly counter to this argument. Several ofthe recent studies emphasize their entrepreneurship, self-reliance and innovativeness in areas where the old "subsistence mentality" has now largely disappeared, and one of them refers to a "positive selection of creativity".3

Part-time farming might be more correctly viewed as preventing "proletariatization" and leading, on the contrary, to "embourgeoisement". In the United States, for example, its persistence and growth have slowed the concentration and centralization ofcapital in agriculture, attenuated the polarization of the agricultural class structure and reversed the trend for small farms to disappear.[4]

It is now widely recognized that it plays a positive role in lessening income and employment problems, improving income distribution and helping farm investment. The problem of low incomes in farming would be far worse without multiple jobholding, which provides an alternative to structural reform. Multiplejobholding farm families achieve a highly flexible and adaptable use of all their labour resources in relation to all available employment opportunities. The farm is a cushion against non-farm employment, and non-farm work in turn against the uncertain business results of farming. Multiple

jobholding helps to avoid abrupt social changes and hardship, especially by providing a smoother way into and out offarming, and the possibility of adjustment within the family as an alternative to leaving the land altogether. By slowing down rural-urban migration it also reduces the cost of urban social infrastructure and prevents the redundancy of past rural investments such as schools.

Its wider contributions to rural development are particularly important in remote, mountainous and other disadvantaged rural areas. It enables far more people to make a living in these areas than full-time farming, so that it is possible to retain the critical minimum population required for a viable infrastructure of essential services, some of which are performed by the multiple-jobholding farm families themselves. The large amount of self-employment in their off-farmjobs brings entrepreneurship

and leadership to such areas and helps to diversify their economies. Even those who commute to wage employment have a strong indirect impact in maintaining their commercial economy and local autonomy.

The danger is sometimes mentioned that part-time farming introduces heterogeneity and conflicts, and loosens traditional community ties. However, it is already along-established way of life in most areas, and (partly as a result of the modernization and commercialization of agriculture) the communities concerned have mostly changed considerably from the very homogeneous ones that existed in the past. It is possible, on the other hand, that the differences between part-time and full-time farming may be becoming more marked than before, although this may mainly reflect the differences between larger and smaller farms.

Attitudes of specific groups

In addition to the attitudes to the pros and cons of part-time farming taken in the many studies ofthe subject, it is also possible to look at the views of some specific groups. 'These include full-time farmers and their unions, agricultural extension workers, the part-time farmers themselves, and their non-farm employers. The attitudes of governments are discussed separately in Part XI below.

Full-time farmers tend above all to regard part-time farmers as people who have failed to make a proper living from farming. They also resent their effect on the land market, and see their ability to retain or gain control of land as a threat. They believe that they are weak sellers, often dealing outside normal channels and undercutting them, though it seems unlikely that prices could be much affected by their generally small market share. They also take the view that the existence of part-time farming weakens the case for the parity of farm incomes with those in other occupations. The problem of low incomes in farming would indeed be much worse without the off-farm and non-farm earnings of multiple-jobholding farm families, and in theory taking into consideration the earnings of these families from all sources would make it possible to define the problem more precisely and also make it easier and cheaper to solve. However, it seems most unlikely that any government would risk taking on the still powerful farm lobbies over this issue.

Full-time farmers of course make some distinction between the different types ofpart-time farmer. They are generally more sympathetic to small farmers seeking extra income in difficult circumstances than to well-paid professionals for whom farming is not an inherited career.

Part-time farmers are also sometimes accused ofbeing unwilling to join cooperatives and other producers' organizations, although several recent studies suggest that this is not so. Certainly farmers' organizations predominantly represent full-time farmers, but this seems to be at least partly their own fault. Part-time farmers tend to be ignored in membership drives, and meetings are rarely held at times convenient to them. They are often regarded as part of the "urban enemy" against which farmers see themselves as fighting.

Farmers' unions in Canada seem readier to accept some typesof off-farm employment, such as those connected with agriculture, than others.lPart-time farmers appear to be more fullyrepresented in farmers' organizations in Finland, although here too there is afeeling that they do not contribute sufficiently to the battle for appropriate prices and have divided loyalties.[6] In France the farmers' unions accept that low-income farmers should seek additional sources of income, but they resent rich people and hobby farmers taking over farms and employingothers to work them.[7] In both Ireland and Norway there are separate organizations for large and small-scale farmers, and the latter not unexpectedly take a more sympathetic view ofmultiplejobholding. In Sweden the farmers' union has recognized the need to know more about part-time farming;' in general it believes that it should be promoted, but not at the expense of full-time farming.[9]

Extension workers tend to take the same view of part-timefarmers as do full-time farmers. Moreover, all over the world they concentrate on the larger farmers, who include few multiplejobholders. While the latter are accused of taking insufficient interest in advisory services, the fault would seem to lie mainly with these services themselves. Some of the England and Wales sample claimed that they had asked for help but the advisor never came."° A recent survey of central Italy indicates the extremelylimited access of small farmers to advisory services."

As discussed earlier, many part-time farmers see no conflict between their dual occupations. In addition, the limited available

evidence suggests that most of them are satisfied with their status. In Ireland 65% of the sample said they intended to continue with their farm and off-farmjobs, making no change in either, and more than 85% that they were satisfied or verysatisfied with this.[12] In England and Wales 49% said they would prefer to farm full-time, and 30% that they would rather combine farming with another occupation.[3] On the other hand, in Spain only 20% of part-time farmers expected their children would continue in part-time farming and 7% in full-time farming.[14]

The attitude of industrial employers to part-time farmers as employees is also of interest. The OECD report found that in Austria and Switzerland farmers are considered good workers but that there is a problem in their having to present themselves on time every day. In the United States employers do not discriminate against them and indeed favour them for responsible positions. They make every effort to give them holidays at times of peak farm labour requirements, although insisting that the firm must come first in any conflict over the use of time." There is evidence from Austria, Ireland, Italy and the United States that part-time farmers are regarded as reliable workers and that absenteeism is not a significant problem.16

In Yugoslavia it is recognized that part-time farmers introduce the traditional values of hard-working farmers to their off-farm work, and that there is less absenteeism among them."[7] In the southern Vosges in France employers are not only generally in favour of dual activity and lenient about absences for such things as haymaking, but have even sometimes purchased farms to let to part-time farmers.[18] More generally, however, at times of scarce employment there may be some opposition to farmers who are competing with non-farmers for non-farm jobs.'[9]

XI GOVERNMENT POLICIES

One of the most striking features ofpart-time farming is that it is very largely a spontaneous development. In very few countries has its growth been deliberately stimulated by government policies, and in some these policies have directly or indirectly discriminated against it. In general there is still a policy vacuum, and this is partly explained by the lengthy (and for a long time rather one-sided) debate about the pros and cons of part-time farming. Another problem is that; as with all aspects of rural development, a very large number of different sectors and thus government departments would have to be involved in policy formulation. Nevertheless, so large a group as the multiple-jobholding farm families now constitute in the agricultural and rural populations of all the industrialized countries clearly merits more serious policy attention than it has received in the past.

Past policies

Especially in the EEC countries, government agricultural policies have been aimed mainly at the achievement and maintenance of economically efficient farm structures for specialized commercial production. Financial and other resources have been largely concentrated on those farms where they were expected to be most cost-effective in terms of production.

Thus, even though there is no explicit EEC policy to discourage part-time farming (or indeed any overall policy about it), in practice many part-time farmers have been excluded from specific assistance measures by criteria based on farm size and the proportion of income derived from farming. The initial almost exclusive emphasis of EEC policies on price support as a means of raising farm incomes applied equally to all farmers, but the main benefits inevitably went to those with a large volume of sales, who are mostly full-time farmers. Following the 1968 "Mansholt Plan" for structural reform, the structural directives introduced in 1972 ruled out assistance for most part-time farmers by stipulating that no more than 20% of the income of those assisted could come from non-agricultural activities. Although Directive 72/161, on the provision of socio-economic guidance for and the acquisition of occupational skills by persons engaged in agriculture, may be said to include them, this is only to assist them to leave agriculture.

Directive 75/268, which in 1975 introduced additional assistance for mountain and hill farming and farming in certain less favoured areas (LFAs), is the first and so far the only **EEC** measure to recognize the importance of part-time farming. For these areas it raises the maximum proportion of income that may be earned from non-agricultural activities to qualify for assistance from 20 to **50%,** and also provides assistance for tourism and craft industries on farms.

In fact the LFAs directive reflects a more general tendency in the industrialized countries with market economies. The few of them that take any measures in favour of part-time farming appear to do so mainly as an instrument in furthering other, largely non-agricultural policy objectives. These include most notably their policies for agriculturally marginal, mountainous and other disadvantaged areas, where it is desired to maintain population for tourism and environmental reasons and to ensure the critical minimum level of settlement for the provision (often by the multiple-jobholding farm families themselves) of essential services.

At the national level the range of situations and options varies quite widely and at least partly explains some differences in government policy attitudes and approaches. The North American countries are in the fortunate position of having both good agricultural structures and abundant land resources. Thus the United States has been able to maintain a benevolent neutrality about part-time farming. Canada, however, has taken a somewhat unfavourable attitude, ' although there is no explicit discrimination against part-time farmers and they benefit from a number of special local programmes.

Other countries (including Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom) also have good structures but are short of agricultural land. These countries have mostly taken unfavourable attitudes to part-time farming, mainly in defence of their highly-.prized farm structures. Land is especially short in the Netherlands, where the aim is its maximum utilization for a highly efficient, export-oriented agriculture.[2]

In the United Kingdom some investments are discouraged on what are regarded as unviable holdings, but grants are paid for such land improvements as drainage, which are of value even if the holding is amalgamated.[3] There is a long history of various land settlement and statutory smallholding schemes, which have

established a number of small farms, many of which, with rising economic aspirations, have become part-time. This country also has the only fully institutionalized system ofpart-time farming in the Scottish crofts. These have had complete legal protection since the first legislation in 1886, and are eligible for many types of special assistance.[4]

Japan, where part-time farming is even more prevalent than elsewhere, represents a special case. It too is very short of land. Especially since the postwar land reform, it has had a good agricultural structure, but only in the sense of the equitable distribution of the land. The highly conservative attitude of Japanese farmers is an obstacle to further structural reform, and the government has been obliged for social reasons to facilitate part-time farming.

The countries ofsouthern Europe still have highly fragmented agricultural structures. They face the difficult problem of trying to improve these structures at the same time as keeping as many people as possible on the land. They therefore generally take a favourable attitude to part-time farming, although this is rarely explicit. In Italy the first specific favourable mention of multiple jobholding in a policy document was in the national development programme announced in 1982, but since agriculture is a regional responsibility there has been little effect so far. The solution in these countries is not always seen in terms of conventional family farming, and in southern Italy, for example, where agricultural structures are extremely fragmented, a number of cooperative farms and other rural production cooperatives have been established, recognizing that they cannot necessarily provide full-time employment for their members.

Such countries as Austria, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland are somewhat special cases. They have difficult agricultural conditions, including long hard winters during which little farm work is possible. They wish to increase their self-sufficiency in food and to keep the largest economically justifiable number of workers on the land. They also need a sufficient density of population in difficult mountainous areas to maintain the countryside for tourism. Part-time farmers have therefore generally (although not always, as will be seen below) been helped in the same ways as full-time farmers. In Austria they also receive investment grants for tourist accommodation and are the subject of special extension programmes.[6]

In several countries there have recently been shifts in government policy attitudes. This is partly because it is no longer considered appropriate during an industrial recession to encourage structural improvements at the expense of employment opportunities. Thus the EEC countries have accepted in principle a major reorientation ofstructural measures to favour smaller family farms as against large-scale agri-business. One result is likely to be the general application of the provision, hitherto available only in LFAs, enabling aid to be granted to farmers deriving up to 50% of their income from non-agricultural activities.

This change in attitude has already been reflected in the policies of some individual countries. France now takes a more favour-able attitude than before, in particular for part-time farmers in mountainous regions. But the biggest change has been in the Federal Republic of Germany. Already since 1968 the aim has been to serve the interests of all who work in rural areas, including the creation of non-farm jobs to facilitate the conversion of farmers to part-time farming or to non-farm work. Grants are available for the conversion and rationalization of part-time farms, and the extension services study solutions specially adapted to their situations.[7] From the beginning of1984 the Federal Government has eased the conditions under which assistance and advice are available to Class II part-time farms. Although the actual implementation differs from region to region because of the federal political structure, all regions now take what may be regarded as a benevolent attitude to part-time farming.

In Norway policies have fluctuated with changes in government. In 1974 the new government introduced a revised policy which included grants and other assistance to part-time farmers with more than 0.5 ha, especially in the northern and mountainous regions, with the aim of building a stable basis for part-time farming. However, with the change of government again in 1981 investment grants were reduced and confined to those working more than half-time in agriculture. In Sweden government loans and grants for part-time farms were stopped in 1967.8 More recently, however, official attitudes have again become more favourable, especially under the new rural policy introduced in 1982.[8]

In eastern Europe part-time farming of the type described in

Part **III** of this report was not encouraged after the initial collectivization of agriculture, although it was tolerated as a temporary phenomenon. More recently Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and the U.S.S.R. have begun to stimulate it in various ways. In Hungary the second collectivitization in 1961 accepted the importance of part-time farming, and in 1967 the restrictions were lifted on the number oflivestock that could be held on household plots and on the marketing of their produce. In 1975 a government decree defined guidelines for the long-term development of part-time farming.' On the other hand, it appears that in Poland, at least until recently, government policy still aimed to transform all part-time farmers into either full-time farmers or non-farm workers.[1]

The above account of government policies is unfortunately far from complete or fully up to date. It is confined to agricultural policies, since the available information on the many other policy areas relevant to part-time farming is even more piecemeal. Where possible some information on these areas is introduced for illustrative purposes in the following discussion of future policy requirements.

Future requirements

A first question in discussing future policy requirements for part-time farming is whether any specific policy measures are required at all. It has been forcibily argued that the best strategy is one of "benign neglect", taking action neither for it not against it.[1]" A closely related view is that neither part-time nor full-time farming should be a public policy issue, and that specific policy objectives should be pursued regardless of whether the farmers concerned are full-time or part-time.[3] Such an approach would at least remove any discrimination against part-time farming. However, it would also tend to perpetuate the general failure of governments to recognize its contribution to rural development as well as any special needs it may have for assistance to enable it to make these contributions. Moreover, it is an inescapable fact that many different government measures in a wide variety of sectors substantially affect part-time farming, whether intentionally or not. Even so, benign neglect should probably be retained as a policy option in certain cases. For example, the recent diffused

development ofsmall-scale industry in the rural areas ofnorthern Italy was entirely spontaneous, and for some years the authorities were even unaware of it. Too much institutional intervention, however well-intentioned, could end up by stifling it.

More generally, an important problem is that part-time farmers straddle two worlds, so that policies concerning them would involve not only agricultural ministries but others as well. For proper account to be taken of their needs and potential, a main requirement is therefore much greater coordination than exists at present between the relevant government departments.As was stressed by the 1982 Arkleton Seminar, it is now time for the governments of industrialized countries (and the EEC) to follow the example of many third world countries and draw up rural development policies, and possibly even establish separate departments for rural affairs.[4]

As has been emphasized throughout this report, not only the situation but also the political and other perspectives in which part-time farming is viewed are changing in a number of important ways. The reversal ofrural out-migration in many areas and the probable long-term nature of the decline in conventional employment in industry are radical and unprecedented changes that cannot escape recognition in government policies. Food surpluses in most industrialized countries and the need for adjustments in their agricultural production patterns in favour of increased export opportunities for developing countries are other important factors.

Although it has not yet led to many changes, the need is increasingly seen in industrialized countries for wider rural development policies, based on indigenous development rather than the largely discredited growth pole approach, and focussed on people instead of purely production considerations. In this type of development multiple-jobholding farm families could play a major role, in such ways as enabling more people to live in rural areas, injecting entrepreneurship and thus helping to diversify the rural economy, and avoiding the marginalization of certain population groups. Such contributions would be more readily apparent to policy-makers if appropriate methods of social cost-benefit accounting could be developed for use at the regional and other "meso" levels.

Nevertheless, it is unlikely to be found either necessary or desirable for governments to adopt policies for the deliberate

stimulation of part-time farming. What is most badly needed is for them to stop virtually ignoring the very large segments ofthe farm and rural populations represented by multiple-jobholding farm families, and at least to assess the likely effects on them of existing or new policy measures. Whether or not they require special measures of assistance is a separate issue, which has to be considered on its merits in relation to specific circumstances and policy objectives.

In general part-time farming (as well as rural development as a whole) would benefit from national and regional policies that allow greater autonomy and flexibility at local levels, rather than mainly reflecting the convenience of centralized bureaucracies. Policies in a large number of areas may need to be made more flexible and less restrictive if there is to be greater freedom of opportunity. Some more specific suggestions are discussed below, again starting with agricultural policies but also including some reference to other relevant policy areas.

Most of the industrialized countries with market economies now seek to maintain or increase farm production and incomes through a combination ofprice supports and structural improvements focussed on full-time farmers. They justify the exclusion of farms below a certain size from many specific assistance programmes on the grounds of the need for structural improvement and for the most cost-effective use of limited resources. However, the frequent exclusion of farmers deriving less than a certain proportion of income from farming smacks of, if not a definite prejudice against part-time farming, at least an out-dated view of the composition of the farm population. The current review of the EEC's structural measures provides a convenient opportunity for some changes in this regard.

The negative attitude of some agricultural ministries to part-time farming is sometimesjustified by the argument that it is less responsive than full-time farming to government policy objectives. This is clearly true injapan, where part-time farmers have concentrated on rice monoculture and cut out the less profitable winter cereal crop, while full-time farmers have increased their production oflivestock products and fruits and vegetables more in line with the government's selective expansion programme.'S Elsewhere, however (except for some products in eastern Europe), part-time farmers have much less influence on marketed output and the national production pattern. Their tenden

cy to move out of milk production should also help to reduce unwanted surpluses.

Land tenure legislation obviously has substantial effects on the farming pattern and especially on the prospects for entering or leaving agriculture. In some industrialized countries legislationmainly designed to improve the protection of tenants has also had the adverse effect of discouraging owners from letting land because of the difficulty of getting it back if required. This has reduced the opportunities for new entrants, whether prospective part-time or full-time farmers. But it has also reduced flexibilityin another way by causing some people to remain in part-time farming who would not otherwise do so. While they still prizethe security derived from the possession of agricultural land, they would give up agricultural production altogether if rental legislation were more flexible.

Such people are particularly numerous in Japan, where it has recently been proposed that the legislation should be changed so that land could be rented out with the guarantee of being able to reclaim it.[6] Part-time farmers not wishing to continue farmingcould rent most of their land to full-time farmers and keep onlytheir house and garden. This would help not only to retain peoplein rural areas but also to achieve a production pattern more in line with government objectives.

A similar approach could also be useful elsewhere, providedthat part-time as well as full-time farmers were eligible to rent the land thus released. In France the *Socits d'Aminagement Foncieret d'Etablissement Rural* (SAFERs) are empowered to promotetenancies as well as amalgamations, but the local boards are mainly in the hands of full-time farmers and this has been done in only a few areas.

Another field where unnecessary restrictions need to be re moved concerns the legal status of women. In some countries they are still not recognized as heads of family or farm operators,although the legislation has recently been improved in several cases. Even more important, their unpaid work as members of farm families is rarely recognized as a proper occupation with pension and other social security rights apart from those derived through their husbands.

Similarly, part-time farmers, even if male, often have bureaucratic difficulties over taxation and social security entitle- ments as a result of working in two sectors of the economy or

being wage-workers and self-employed at the same time. In France attempts have been made to resolve the social security problem by establishing single boards at the village level.[17]

Physical planning controls have often been a major obstacle to part-time farming, although in some cases they have recently been relaxed. The United Kingdom restrictions on building a second house on the farm holding have already been mentioned. In the same country controls on the use of farm buildings for non-agricultural purposes have only recently been liberalized. More generally, physical planning has often failed to come up with adequate answers to the increasingly overt conflicts about land use, and many industrial projects have been sited on good agricultural land, often simply for building convenience. Many part-time farmers are in the middle of such conflicts, and an increasing recognition oftheir importance and role might help to resolve them.

The privatization of state-owned forests is a recent policy move in several countries that could help to provide additional employment for multiple-jobholding farm families. Following the Swedish model, such countries as Canada, France and the United Kingdom now envisage the fuller involvement of far mers in forest management.

Part-time farmers do not appear to have any greater difficulty than full-time farmers in obtaining credit. Their land can be pledged as collateral for non-agricultural as well as agricultural loans. Those with regular wage employment are generally well placed for obtaining credit.

An important influence on the future of part-time farming is that of the very broad area comprising education, training and extension. How to adapt them to meet the needs of today has been a predominant theme at previous Arkleton Seminars, in cluding that in 1982.[18] Agricultural education and training pay little, if any, attention to the option of multiple jobholding. If primary and secondary education in rural areas were more fully based on the situation and possibilities of the local economy, this would clearly better equip school-leavers for part-time farming or other rural occupations. However, in many rural areas parents (and teachers too) still expect children to be educated almost exclusively for white-collar jobs in towns. In view of the great importance of women in part-time farming, it is essential that extension and training should be provided for them as well as for men.[19]

Agricultural extension and advisory services have also made little attempt to assist with the special problems of multiplejobholding farm families, although recent programmes in Austria and Germany are exceptions and possible solutions are being studied in Switzerland as well. Some in-service training on part-time farming is also available for extension workers in Spain. Possibly the recruitment of some former part-timefarmers as field-workers would be useful in this regard, as well as the encouragement of informal discussion groups for the exchange of experience.[2]

In spite of the poor reputation of agricultural extension services, especially among part-time farmers, in many countries they are nevertheless still the envy of small businessmen in rural areas. Where, as in the United Kingdom for instance, there are substantial advisory services for small rural businesses, there appears to be no discrimination against part-time farmers. However, the general problem remains that, neither on the agricultural nor the non-agricultural side, can they obtain much advice on how best to combine two occupations. Much more needs to be known about how to foster rural entrepreneurshipand small-scale rural industry, and about the role of multiple-jobholding farm families in this essential process. Whereas agri-cultural training and advice is fairly accessible to farmers, this is not particularly so for other skills and information.

The above brief account of some of the ways in which government policies might be improved for the benefit of part-time farming is admittedly incomplete. It should be sufficient, however, to indicate the very large number ofbroad policy fields -including social, regional, income, employment, industrial, environmental, housing, tourism, physical planning and educa-tional, as well as agricultural and rural development policies that could usefully give at least some consideration to the role and needs of multiple-jobholding farm families.

XII RESEARCH NEEDS

In spite of the large number of recent studies of part-time farming, there are still many aspects which are incompletely understood and where further research is needed. The research has so far mainly been conducted independently **by** agricultural economists, rural sociologists and geographers, and there is considerable scope for more interdisciplinary research.

Even the general picture still requires much more systematic study than has been possible in this short report, and it is already time for a repeat of the basic OECD survey, which is apparently now envisaged. This could in particular bring up to date the information on the incidence of part-time farming in as internationally consistent a manner as possible, on its changing nature and functions, and on government policies in all relevant fields.

A new bibliography of part-time farming studies is also needed. If this could include developing countries, it could provide a useful starting-point for exchanges of experience between industrialized and third world countries with similar economic and social problems and objectives on an aspect of rural development that is common to both of them. It is under stood that FAO is contemplating a part-time farming project involving the developed countries on the north side of the Mediterranean and the developing countries on the south.

Studies of part-time farming would be facilitated by improve ments in national or other official systems of data collection. These often lack representativeness in coverage or use inadequate categories for collection and analysis. As far as possible data should be collected and published for farm families and house holds as well as for farm operators alone. Time budgets may also often be more useful than conventional occupational classifica tions.

Concepts of the economic and other rationality of the be haviour of multiple-jobholding farm families require investiga tion not only at the farm level but also at the regional and national levels. Part-time farming particularly needs to be evaluated in specific regional economic and social contexts. For this purpose, more appropriate methods of social accounting could be de veloped for use at the regional level which would widen the conventional categories of costs and benefits. This should make it possible to evaluate the potential contributions of part-time

farming more thoroughly and convincingly, and to specify the potential advantages of various policy options.

The multiple-jobholding farm family itself, rather than the farm unit, should become the principal focus ofanalysis in future studies of part-time farming. Thus the seminar's major specific research proposal was for longitudinal studies to examine longer-term changes in family organization, roles, decision-making and adjustment processes, as well as those occurring during the family life-cycle. Several of the participants at the seminar indicated their interest in taking part in such a study under the aegis of the Arkleton Trust. Since the seminar considerable progress has already been made in the preparation of a feasibility study for the project as a basis for seeking the necessary finance.

A better understanding is needed ofthe preconditions for rural entrepreneurship and how best to foster and encourage it. Some of the necessary information could be generated by studies of decision-making in multiple-jobholding farm families such as that proposed above. Much more also needs to be known about the multiplier effects of rural employment. Other important areas for study include the effects of local autonomy versus centralization in rural development, the viability threshold of various rural services, and methods of providing advisory services more suited to the needs of multiple-jobholding farm families.

Case studies and other "softer" techniques should also be used to capture the realities of rural life as experienced by multiplejobholding farm families. If the relevant research methodology could be further refined, such studies would usefully complement the more quantitative or survey type ofinvestigation. Local sources of information, such as schools and other educational projects, could increasingly be used. More studies of a historical and structural nature would be useful in monitoring the longer-term changes in the agricultural and rural economy.

As far as possible, the audience for research on part-time farming should be conceived as government policymakers, rather than limited to fellow professionals. It is therefore essential that the results should be communicated effectively and clearly and expressed in policy terms.

XIII SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report has attempted to draw attention to the contributions to society of a large but often neglected part of the farm population ofthe industrialized countries. Its principal conclusion is that multiple jobholding farm families are an important positive factor in many aspects of the rural development of these countries. This is in contrast to the predominantly negative conclusions of many ofthe earlier studies of part-time farming, which regarded it as a transitory and inefficient type of farming and also neglected its wider contributions in the then largely ignored sphere of rural development.

The more recent studies have clearly revealed that it is a long-established, widespread and varied way of life and an enduring feature of the rural economy. Although it is a very dynamic phenomenon, with the actors and their roles frequently changing (especially in line with the different stages in the familylife-cycle), there is now no doubt that much ofit is ofa stable or at least persistent nature.

. The available national statistics are incomplete and use varying definitions of part-time farming, but they are sufficient for a first rough indication of its overall importance. Totalling them produces the striking result thatjust over half the farmers (or in some cases farm households) in the industrialized countries with market economies are part-time. The incidence of part-time farming, as measured by its share of the total, has increased or stayed about the same in recent years in most of the few countries for which there are data. There is also evidence of an increase in several countries in the proportion of income derived from off-farm or non-farm work or of work-time spent on it.

The term "part-time farmer" is now widely regarded as unsatisfactory, and the seminar preferred "multiple jobholding farm household" (or family). However, the traditional terminology has gained wide currency and will probably have to continue to be used as a convenient shorthand.

With very few exceptions, the national statistics distinguish part-time farming on the basis of the sources of income or the work-time of the farm operator alone. For the adequate study of part-time farming, it is essential to have data that cover the whole family or household as well.

The farm unit ofcourse also continues to be relevant. Multiple

jobholding farm families have to make their decisions within the framework it sets as the basic business unit. Government assist ance is tailored to farm units. But many farms classified as capable of providing full-time employment are in fact worked part-time, while many others are worked full-time even though they could never bring an adequate income on this basis.

Thus, although the characteristics of the farm unit remain the starting-point, the decision-making of the farm family or house hold is the most useful focus of analysis. The principal research recommendation of the seminar was therefore for longitudinal studies to examine longer-term changes in family organization, roles, decision-making and adjustment processes, as well as those occurring during the family life-cycle.

There is a continuum from full-time farm families or house holds right through to full-time non-farm ones. In between, the universe of multiple jobholding farm families and households is very large and varied, embracing all those actively exploiting agricultural land and buildings which also derive income from off-farm or non-farm activities. Although all of this wide uni verse should be taken into account in studying part-time farm ing, it must obviously be more narrowly defined for specific policy purposes. Policy measures must also take account of regional and other differences in the characteristics and motiva tion of part-time farming.

Although its persistence is now recognized, it is also still important as a transitional stage in the movement into or (more often) out of agriculture. This is of great value in helping people to experiment with and adjust to changing patterns of work. More generally, however, the main motivation for part-time farming is the desire to combine the security and other advan tages afforded by the possession of a farm with the chance to participate in the prosperity of the rest ofthe economy. This goes further than the conventional explanation based on a combina tion of "push-factors", related to limited opportunities in farm ing, and "pull-factors", related to off-farm employment oppor tunities. Many attractions are increasingly perceived, especially by those brought up in urban areas, in rural living and the possession of a small farm.

The geographical location of part-time farming within a coun try appears mainly to reflect the interplay of the often wide disparities between regions in the income potential from agri

cultural and non-agricultural occupations. Most part-time farming is found where farm incomes are low, and favourable farming conditions lead almost everywhere to the predominance of full-time farming, even close to urban industrial centres.
The different categories of off-farm and non-farm work (neither term satisfactorily covers the whole field) engaged in by multiple jobholding farm families are extiremely varied. Nonfarm work may be carried out on the farm and farm work offit. There are many traditional types of such work, especially on a seasonal basis. During the long period ofrapid economic growth that lasted until the early 1970s, new forms of non-agricultural employment increasingly became available in or close to rural areas, particularly in manufacturing industry and tourism and other services. Rising levels of education have made many types of non-farm work possible for the present generation that were not open to their parents. Indeed, in the United States part-time farmers have been found to be better educated than their full-time counterparts. In many countries there is now an unusually high proportion of self-employment in the off-farm and nonfarm work of multiple jobholding farm families.

As regards the agricultural characteristics of part-time farms, their average size is usually much less than full-time ones, although they are by no means always small. Generally some adjustments have been made in the pattern ofproduction so as to emphasize enterprises requiring less labour and managerial attention. Where productivity per hectare is lower on part-time farms, this mainly reflects such adjustments rather than the inefficiency assumed in some of the earlier studies. Many part-time farmers are able to make farm investments from their non-farm earnings. Although this may sometimes lead to overcapitalization in conventional terms, it is often a rational adjustment to lighten the burden of farm work for someone with another remunerative job. When sufficient adjustments of this kind have not been made in farm or off-farm work, there may be considerable strain from overworking.

Although there may be some negative relations between part-time farming and the use of land and capital, it is certainly very efficient in its flexible use of family labour resources. Output per unit of labour is often higher on part-time farms. Thus the part-time farmer is able to obtain not only a larger income per working day on the farm but also a still larger one for

the time spent on other work. In several countries part-time farmers have higher total incomes than full-time farmers, and in some cases this has even caused the total disposable income per head of the farm population to exceed that of the non-farm population.

These trends are mainly associated with the earlier phase of rapid economic growth and increasing non-agricultural employ ment opportunities. Much less is known about how part-time farming has reacted in the most recent phase of economic recession and rising unemployment. In many rural areas de-population has come to a halt, although this has rarely meant a return to agriculture. The emigration of workers from southern Europe has stopped and large numbers have been obliged to return. Many have resettled in rural areas as part-time farmers, bringing with them some capital and new skills. In northern Italy, for example, a more modern type of part-time farming has developed, more oriented to production for the market and better adapted to the combination of farm and non-farm work, and there has been a spontaneous diffusion of small industry and business in rural areas. Most of these changes appear to have begun already before the onset ofindustrial recession and unemployment but to have speeded up subsequently.

More generally, the role of women in the off-farm or nonfarm employment of multiple jobholding farm families has increased in line with the tendency in the economy as a whole. The turn-around in rural depopulation and the endurance or expansion of part-time farming have been reinforced by such non-economic factors as a growing dissatisfaction with urban life. Part-time farming seems in general not only to have survived the recent changes but also to have assisted in adjusting to them. Questions about it are now increasingly being asked in terms of its broad social role instead of simply agricultural production and productivity.

Important changes are also taking place in the attitudes and roles of the individual members of multiple jobholding farm families. Family structures and relationships are clearly in a transitional stage in all the industrialized countries. Attitudes to work and leisure are changing, especially those of women and young people. Some of the traditional family relatidnships (most notably those between generations) are giving way to newer ones.

Patriarchal and other authoritarian approaches to family decision-making, the prescriptive allocation of roles to individual members, and the pooling of resources and income are everywhere being eroded. The unquestioning assumption of duties and obligations by the younger generation is being replaced by more democratic arrangements. Better-educated young people are becoming more individualistic and attach greater value to their social independence and mobility. They increasingly seek a recognized professional status on the farm instead of simply a place as a dependent member **of** the family work-force. The traditional work ethic is also changing, and in particular the often heavy burden on the wife in the multiplejobholding farm family is much less likely to be tolerated in the future.

The future of part-time farming depends above all on the continued functioning of these families as socio-economic units. Many new tensions may have to be faced in this regard, and its continuity cannot be automatically assumed.

In general, however, the highly flexible and adaptable use of family labour that part-time farming has exhibited in the past, together with its income-earning capacity, should ensure that some forms ofit will endure in the foreseeable future. In any of the alternative scenarios that can be envisaged for the future economic environment in the industrialized countries, employment in conventional manufacturing industry is likely to decline still further. At the same time, the continued development of computer-based technologies should make possible the further decentralization to rural areas (and to homes as well as specialized premises) of many activities formerly concentrated in towns. Combined with the increasingly perceived non-economic attractions of living and working in rural areas, these likely developments should continue to encourage the adoption of part-time farming as a way oflife. Indeed part-time farmers may well come to be regarded as a privileged class.

The future will require radically different approaches to employment and leisure, and here the flexible use offamily labour in part-time farming may have some lessons for society as a whole. Some governments are also now inclined to withdraw from the provision of some essential services, and here too part-time farming could play a useful role, especially in small and remote rural communities. It enables far more people to live and work in such areas than would full-time farming, thus helping to main

tain the critical minimum population required for the effective provision of services, many of which are in fact provided by the multiple jobholding farm families themselves.

Other important economic and social contributions of part-time farming, not only in remote areas, are also now coming to be recognized. It plays a positive role in lessening income and employment problems, improving income distribution and helping farm investment, and provides an alternative to structural reform as a solution to the problem of low incomes in farming. The large amount of self-employment in the off-farm jobs of multiple jobholding farm families brings entrepreneurship and leadership to rural areas and helps to diversify their economies. These benefits might be more apparent if they were analyzed at the regional or "meso" level.

The increased recognition of such contributions may finallylead to more interest **by** government policy-makers. For one of the most remarkable features of part-time farming is that it is very largely a spontaneous development. In very few countries has it in any way been deliberately stimulated by government policies, and many specific policy measures in fact discriminate against it, either directly or (more often) indirectly.

The general lack of explicit policies is partly explained by the lengthy (and for a long time rather one-sided) debate about the pros and cons of part-time farming. Most of the previous criticisms of it should by now have been dispelled by the evidence of the more recent studies. However, full-time farmers and their organizations, which have a very powerful voice in agricultural policy, are generally still hostile to most forms of part-time farming.

In the EEC, although there is no explicit policy about part-time farming, in practice many (and possibly most) part-timefarmers are excluded from specific agricultural assistance measures by criteria based on farm size and the proportion of income from farming. The income criterion has so far been relaxed slightly only for the additional assistance available since 1975 for the areas designated as LFAs. This in fact reflects a more generaltendency in the industrialized market economies as a whole, where most ofthe few measures in favour of part-time farming appear to be mainly an instrument in furthering other, largely non-agricultural policy objectives. More recently, however, policy attitudes have become somewhat more favourable in

some countries both inside and outside the EEC, partly because it is no longer considered appropriate during an industrial recession to encourage structural improvements at the expense ofemployment opportunities.

A first question about future policy requirements for part-time farming is whether any specific measures are required at all. It appears to have done quite well without them in the past, and the option of "benign neglect" should be retained at least in some cases. This would remove any discrimination but would also, if too generalized, tend to perpetuate the failure of governments to recognize the contributions of part-time farming to rural development and any special assistance needs it may have for their realization. Moreover, it cannot be ignored that many different government measures in a wide variety of sectors substantially affect it, whether intentionally or not.

An important problem is that policies concerning part-time farming would involve not only agricultural ministries but others as well. A main requirement is therefore much greater coordination between them within an overall policy framework for rural development. Although it has not yet led to many changes, the need is increasingly seen in industrialized countries for wider rural development policies, based on indigenous development and focussed on people instead of purely production considerations.

It is unlikely to be found either necessary or desirable for governments to adopt policies for the deliberate stimulation of part-time farming. What is most badly needed is for them to stop virtually ignoring the very large segments of the farm and rural populations involved and at least to assess the likely effects on them of existing or new policy measures. Whether or not they require special measures of assistance is a separate issue, which has to be considered on its merits in relation to specific circumstances and policy objectives.

In general, part-time farming (as well as rural development as a whole) would benefit from national and regional policies that allow greater autonomy and flexibility at local levels. Policies in a large number ofareas may need to be made more flexible and less restrictive if there is to be greater freedom of opportunity. While it may be possible tojustify the exclusion offarms below a certain size from many specific agricultural assistance programmes, the exclusion of farmers deriving less than a certain proportion of

income from farming smacks of, if not a definite prejudice against part-time farming, at least an out-dated view of the composition of the farm population. Other areas where unnecessary restrictions need to be removed include tenancy regulations, the legal status of women, taxation and social security regulations for people with dual occupations, and physical planning controls (especially concerning the building of asecond house on the farm holding and the use of farm buildings for non-agricultural purposes).

Agricultural education, training and extension should pay more attention to the option of multiple jobholding and to the special problems of people with dual occupations. Many extension workers appear to share the prejudices of full-time farmers against part-time farming. Although such advisory services as exist for small rural businesses do not usually discriminate against part-time farmers, they too are rarely in a position to advise on how to combine two occupations.

These are only a few examples of some of the ways in which government policies might be improved to the benefit of part-time farming. It must be concluded, however, that there are very many broad policy fields -including social, regional, income, employment, industrial, environmental, housing, tourism, physical planning and educational, as well as agricultural and rural development policies -that could usefully give at least some consideration to the role and needs of multiplejobholding farm families.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

I INTRODUCTION

1 Arkleton Trust. *Institutional Approaches to Rural Development in Europe,* Report **of** a seminar held in Scotland from 17 to 22 October 1982, Langholm, Dumnfriesshire, 1983, **p. 20-21, 23,** 28.

II PAST STUDIES OF PART-TIME FARMING

1 D. Rozman. *Part-time Farming in Massachusetts,* Massachusetts Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 266, 1930.

2 Julius **A.** Mage. A typology of part-time farming, *in* Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage (eds.). *Part-time Farming: Problem or Resource,* Proceedings of the First Rural Geography Symposium, University **of** Guelph, June **18,** 19 and 20th 1975, **Geo** Abstracts, Norwich, 1976, p. **35**.

3 Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage. Epilogue, in Fuller and Mage (eds.). *Op. cit.* p. 284.

4 Ruth Gasson (ed.). *The Place of Part-time Farming in Rural and Regional Development,* Proceedings of a seminar held at Wye College, 11-14th July **1977,** Centre for European Agricultural Studies, Wye College, Ashford, Kent, Seminar Papers No.3, **1977,** p. 6-7.

5 S.M. Fraundorfer. Part-time farming-a review of world literature, *World Agricultural and Rural Sociology Abstracts 8* (1), 1966; Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage. *A Directory of Part-time Farming Studies,* Vol. 1: North America and W. Europe, Department of Geography, University of Guelph, 1977.

6 Anthony M. Fuller. Part-time farming: the enigmas and the realities, *Research in Rural Sociology and Development* 1 (1), 1983.

III GROWING IMPORTANCE OF PART-TIME FARMING

1 Julius **A.** Mage. ***Op. cit.,*** **p. 6-7.**

2 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Part-time Farming in **OECD** Countries,* Vol.3, General Report, Paris, **1978, p. 36.**

3 One reason why the figures are so much higher **for** Japan than other countries is that they relate to farm households. In addition, the minimum size of holding included in the agricultural statistics is much smaller; while it can be argued that this inflates the number of part-time farm households, it is also a true reflection of the very small average size **of** Japanese farms.

4 *Ibid,* p.11-13.

5 J. Higgins. *A Study of Part-time Farmers in the Republic of Ireland,* Socio-Economic Research Series No.3, Economics and Rural Welfare Research Centre, An Foras Talúntais, Dublin, 1983, p. 13.

6 Wendy Tubman. A note on off-farm income of farm families in Australia, *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 21 **(3),** 1977, p. 209-214.

7 M. Mathisse. Les revenus exterieurs **des** agriculteurs de 1970 **1** 1981, *Cahiers de Statistique Agricole,* May-June 1982.

8 Thomas **A.** Carlin and Linda M. Ghelfi. Off-farm employment and the farm sector, in United States Department of Agriculture. *Structural Issues of American Agriculture,* Washington, D.C., 1979, p. 270-273.

9 Lars Olof Persson. Part-time farming -corner-stone or obstacle in rural development? *Sociologia Ruralis* ***23*** (1) 1983, p.50.

10 J.A. Mage. The geography of part-time farming -a new vista for agricultural geographers, *GeoJournal* 6 (4), 1982, p.302-303.

11 Gy6rgy Enyedi. Part-time farming in Hungary, *GeoJournal* 6 (4), 1982, p. 324.

12 Dyzma Galaj. Part-time farmers in Poland, *in* Fuller and Mage (eds.). ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 258-260.

13 M. Dzierwickla. Dual occupation in Polish agriculture, *in* **J.** Turowski and L.M. Szwengrub (eds.). *Rural Social Change in Poland,* Polish Academy ofScience, Warsaw, 1976.

IV MAIN CHARACTERISTICS

1 Anthony M. Fuller. The problems of part-time farming conceptualised, *in* Fuller and Mage (eds.). ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. , **51**.[48] 2 G.V. Fuguitt. Part-time farming and the push-pull hypothesis, *American Journalof Sociology* 64 (4), 1959, p. 375-379. 3 Ruth Gasson. *Gainful Occupations ofFarm Families,* School of Rural Economics, Wye College, Ashford, Kent, 1983, p. 14 8. 4 Ada Cavazzani and Anthony M. Fuller. International perspectives on part-time farming: a review, *GeoJournal*6 (4), 1982, p. 388.

S Julius A. Mage. A typology of part-time farming, ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 23-29.

6 **J.A.** Mage. The geography of part-time farming, ***Op.*** *cit.,* **p. 309.**

7 **E.** Mrohs. Part-time farming in the Federal Republic of Germany, *GeoJournal*6 (4), 1982, p. 329-330.

8 D.G. Symes. Part-time farming in Norway, *GeoJoumal*6 (4), 1982, p. 351-353.

9 Ruth Gasson, ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 67, 70-71.

10 OECD. ***Op.*** *cit.,* Vol.3, p. 33-40.

11 In Italy as a whole as much as **30%** ofoff-farm work by farm operators in 1970 was in agriculture (**0.** Pieroni. Positive aspects of part-time farming in the development of a professional agriculture: remarks on the Italian situation, *GeoJournal* 6 (4), 1982, **p.332).**

12 **E.** Arnalte. Part-time farming in Spain-a review, *GeoJournal6*(4), 1982, p. 338; for a fuller account see: Eladis Arnalte Alegre. Agricultura a tiempo parcial y transformaciones del campesinado, *Agricultura y Sociedad* **17,** 1980.

13 R.A. Loomis. *A Profile ofPart-timeFarming in the United States,* Agricultural Economics Report No. **15,** Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, **1965.**

14 F.H. Buttel. The political economy of part-time farming, *GeoJournal*6 (4), 1982, p. 294. **15 OECD.** ***Op.*** *cit.,* Vol.3, p. 18. 16 Ryohei Kada. *Pan-time Family Farming: Off-farm Employment and Farm Adjustments in the United States andJapan,* Center for Academic Publications, Tokyo, 1980, p. 46. **17 OECD.** ***Op.*** *cit.,* Vol.3, **p.** 19. 18 J. Higgins. **Op.** *cit.,* p. 42. 19 Ruth Gasson. ***Op.*** *cit.,* **p.83.** 20 University of Exeter, Agricultural Economics Unit. *The Role ofFarm Tourism in the Less FavouredAreas of Englandand Wales 1981* (*A Physicaland Financial Appraisal),* Report No. 218, Exeter, **1983,** p. 3.

21 Michael Bunce. The contribution of the part-time farmer to the rural economy, *in* Fuller and Mage (eds.). ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 252.

22 **OECD.** ***Op.*** *cit.,* Vol.1 (Germany,Japan, Norway, United States), Paris, 1977; Vol.2 (Austria, France and notes on Belgium, Canada, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland), Paris, 1978.

23 Ryohei Kada. ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 84-85.

24 **J.** Higgins. ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 20-26. **25** Rith Gasson. ***Op.*** *cit.,* p. 52. **26** Miren Etxezarreta ***el*** *al.* ***LA Agricultura Insuficiente: Una aproximaci6na [a Agriculturaa Tiempo Parcial en Espaia*** (provisional version), autumn 1984, p.164.

27 Jeremy Alden and Richard Spooner. *An Analysis of Second Jobs in the European Community,* University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology, Department **of** Town Planning, Papers in Planning Research,35, 1981, **p. 98-101.**

28 OECD. *Op. cit.,* Vol.3, **p.10-11.** 29 *Ibid, p. 1-* [1] [12]. **30** Stane Kraovec. Farmers' adjustment to pluriactivity, *Sociologia Ruralis 23* (1), p. **13.**

31 **J.** Higgins. ***Op. cit.,* p. -.** [72,73]
32 Roberto Grandinetti and Elena Saraceno. *Lavoro a part-time nella pianura e nelle colline del Friuli,* **OECD** Intergovernmental Meeting on Rural Entrepreneurial Capacities, Senigallia, Italy, 7-10 june 1983, Background material to the Italian Report, Annex **3,** 1983, p. [12]

33 Ada Cavazzani. *Il Part-time Agricolo: Ristrutturazione Capitalistica e Famiglia Agricola,* Marsilio Editore, Venice, 1979, p. [8] 5.
34 **S.** Popovic and M. Nikolic. Mixed households in less developed areas of Yugoslavia, *International Seminar on Mixed Households; Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, 22-24 June 1981.*
35 Ryohei Kada. *Op. cit.,* p. [22], 102-110, 115-120, 123-125.
36 *Ibid,* **p.11 -,** 121-123. [11]
37 Ruth Gasson. ***Op. cit.,* p.1** [4] [7]
38 *Ibid,* p. [9] [7] . [6] [2]
39 J. Higgins. ***Op.** cit.,* p. .
40 M. Rupena-Osolnik. The role of farm women in rural pluriactivity: experience from Yugoslavia, *Sociologia Ruralis 23* (1), **1983, p. 1.** [9]
41 Miren Etxezarreta ***et** al.* ***Op.** cit.,* p. . [252]
42 **J.** Higgins. *Relative Economic Efficiency on Irish Farms,* Ninth Annual Conference, Economics and Rural Welfare Research Centre, An Foras Talfintais, Dublin, 1982. 43 *Idem.* ***A** Study of Part-time Farmers in the Republic of Ireland,* ***Op.** cit.,* p. [92]. 44 Ryohei Kada. Trends and characteristics of part-time farming in post-war Japan, *GeoJournal* 6 (4), 1982, p. . [371]
45 **OECD.** ***Op.** cit.,* Vol.3, p. -. [23] [24] 46 Ryohei Kada. *Part-time Family Farming,* ***Op.** cit.,* **p. ,** 45-46. [37]
47 György Enyedi. ***Op.** cit.,* **p. .** [325] 48 Stane Kragovec. Part-time farming: implications for income and price, *in* Ruth Gasson (ed.). ***Op.** cit.,* p: [89] .

V CONCEPTS **AND** DEFINITIONS **1** Centre for European Agricultural Studies. *Part-time Farming: its Nature and Implications, a Workshop Report,* Seminar Papers No.2, Wye College, Ashford, Kent, p.1 -. [8] [21] 2 The full classification is as follows:

Main living farms
Full-time farms Part-time main income farms (Class **I** part-time farms) *Supplementary living farms* (Class **11** part-time farms)

VI CHANGING NATURE AND FUNCTIONS

1 Anthony **M.** Fuller. The problems of part-time farming conceptualised, ***Op.** cit.,* p. . [44] 2 Roberto Grandinetti and Elena Saraceno. *Le Aziende Agricole Part-time in Friuli. Venezia Giulia,* Centro Ricerche Economico-Sociali, Udine, **1980, p. -.** [175] [179]
3 For a recent study of the role of women in rural pluriactivity, see European Commission on Agriculture, Working party on Women and the Agricultural Family in Rural Development. *Report of the Technical Consultation on Women in Rural Pluriactivity, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, 13-17 June 1983,* FAO, Rome, 1983.

VII FARM UNITS

1 Walter Frank. Part time farming, underemployment and double activity of farmers in the **EEC,** *Sociologia Ruralis 23* (1), 1983, p. [20] .

VIII FARM FAMILIES 1 See especially B. Delord and Ph. Lacombe. ***La** Multi-activitides Agriculteurs, Conjonctureou Structure?* Colloque National, Association des Ruralistes Franais, La pluriactivit6 des families agricoles est-elle une condition **de** survie pour **le** monde rural? L'Isle d'Abeau, Bourgoin-Jallieu, November 1981. 2 L. Martens. Part-time farming in developed countries, *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **7** (4), p. 378379. **3** Centre for European Agricultural Studies. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.15.** 4 **OECD.** ***Op.** cit.,* Vol.3, **p.1**4**-15. 17**

5 Ryohei Kada. *Pan-timeFamily Farming,* ***Op.** cit.* 6 Ruth Gasson. ***Op.** cit.* **7 J.** Higgins. ***Op.** cit.* 8 Ada Cavazzani. ***Op.** cit.;* Osvaldo Pieroni. *Agricolture a Tempo Parziale,* **INEA, I1**

Molino, Bologna, 1983. 9 Mire, Etxezarreta *et al.* ***Op.** cit.,* 336

10 **0.** Pieroni. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 331**-** ; Osvaldo Pieroni. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 182-188.

IX **FUTURE** OF PART-TIME FARMING **1** Ada Cavazzani and Anthony M. Fuller. ***Op.** cit.,* p. 389. 2 Ryohei Kada. ***Op.** cit.,* p. 213. **3** *Ibid* p. 22 34 Coin Fraser. *Informationand Innovation on Farmsin CentralItaly -astudy in Lazio and Umbria,* Arkleton Trust, Langholm, Dumfriesshire (in the press). **5** This is particularly strikingly revealed **by** astudy of a rural area in Sweden, where the farm work of part-time farmers was found to be less than 4% **of** total employment (Lars Olof Persson. *Op. cit.,* p.59). 6 Pod] Dalsager, as quoted in *The Times,* London, **13** April 1984.

X PROS AND CONS OF PART-TIME FARMING 1 OECD. ***Op.** cit.,* Vol.3, p. 30. 2 Danio Agostini. Part-time farming in the rural-urban fringe in Italy, *in* Ruth Gasson (ed.). ***Op.** cit.,* p. 34. **3** Andre Brun. Case Studies ofpart-time farming in less-favoured areas, *in* Ruth Gasson (ed.) *Op. cit.,* p. 68.

4 F.H. Buttel. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 295**-**297.

5 Richard Wietfeldt. Attitudes towards pan-time farming of farmers' unions, *in* Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage (eds.). ***Op.** cit.,* p.209-210. 6 Patrick Hackman. Attitudes ofthe farmers' union to multiplejobholders in Finland, *in* Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage (eds.). ***Op.** cit.,* p. 215-216. 7 Denis Bergmann **and** Claude Laurent. Research needs and priorities, *in* Ruth Gasson (ed.). ***Op.** cit.,* p. 11. 8 Viltar Safvestad. Part-time farming in Sweden, *in* Fuller and Mage (eds.). ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 228.

9 Lars OlofPersson. ***Op.** cit.,* p.51.

10 Ruth Gasson. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.1**3**.**

11 Colin Fraser. ***Op.** cit.*

12 **J.** Higgins. Op. *cit.,* **p.55**, 61

13 Ruth Gasson. ***Op.** cit.,* p. 333.

14 Miren Etxezarreta *et al.* ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 9**.**

15 OECD. ***Op.** cit.,* Vol.3, **p.18-1**44**.**

16 Ruth Gasson (ed.). ***Op.** cit.,* p. .

17 Ana Barbic. The farmer-worker in Yugoslavia: a bridge between the city and the country, *Sociologia Ruralis* ***23*** (1), 1983, p. 81. 18 Andrd Brun. **Op.** *cit.,* **p.** 6**1.** 19 **J.** Higgins. ***Op.** cit.,* p.100.

XI" GOVERNMENT **POLICIES 1 C.** Laurent. Multiplejobholding farmers in agricultural policy, *GeoJournal6(4),*1982, **p.288;** see also a fuller version of the same study: Les determinants de l'artitude des pouvoirs publics **1** l',gard **de la** pluriactivit6 **des** agricuireurs, in A. Brun, Ph. Lacombe, C. Laurent. ***La** Pluriactivittdes Agriculteurs:Hommes -Espaces-Politiques,*
Institut National de **la** Recherche Agronomique, Srie Economic et Sociologic48 Rurales, May 1982, p. - 1.

2 *Ibid,* p. -. 288 289

3 OECD. *Op. cit.,* Vol.3, **p. .** 29

4 For the legislative and other history ofcrofting, see: lain Fraser Grigor. *Mightierthan a Lord: the Highland Crofiers' Struggle for the Land,* Acair, Stornoway, 1979; James Hunter. *The Making of **the** Croliing Community,* John Donald, Edinburgh. **1976.**

5 Giuliano Cesarini. *RuralProductionCooperativesin Southern Italy,* The Arkleton Trust, Langholm, Dumfriesshire, 1979.

6 C. Laurent. ***Op.** cit.,* p. -0. 289 29

7 ***Ibid,*** p. -292.

8 Vikar Safvestad. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.** 2 2 1.

9 Lars OlofPersson. ***Op.** cit.,* p.51.

10 Gy6rgy Enyedi. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.-.** 323 324 11 Marek Muszynski. The economic costs oftransforming dual occupational people into single occupational, *in* Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. **Mage** (eds.). ***Op.** cit.,* 267 273 p. -. 12 Robert W. Crown. What should be done about part-time farming-implications for policy, *in* Anthony M. Fuller and Julius A. Mage (eds.). ***Op.** cit.,* **p.205.**

13 RID. Bollman. Part-time farming in Canada: issues and non-issues, *GeoJournal*6 (4), 1982, p. 298 .

14 Arkleton Trust. ***Op.** cit.,* **p.-,** 49. 34 35 **15 OECD.** ***Op.** cit.,* Vol.3, p. 2 6 . 16 Yujiro Hayami. *The prospectforstructuraladjustments in Japaneseagriculture,* paper for seminar on Famiglie agricole a reddit misti, Bressanone, Italy, **15-17** September **1983,** **p. -6.** 4

17 A detailed study has been made of the legal position of part-time farmers in France. See: Bernard Dufour. La situation juridique de l'agriculteur **I** temps partiel, *Revue de DroitRural* **98,** September-October 1981, p.419-430; 99, November 1981, p.431-440. This subject is also discussed by Henri **de** Farcy. *Un Million d'Agriculteurs a Temps Partiel?* Editions **di.** Centurion, Paris, 1979, p. -. 102 107

18 Arkleton Trust. ***Op.** cit.,* p.-. 41 47 19 European Commission on Agriculture, Working Party on Women and the Agricultural Family in Rural Development. *Report ofthe 1984 Symposium on Management Trainingfor Women in Farmingand Pluriacivity,Dublin, Ireland, **2-7** July 1984, **FAO,*** Rome, 1984.

20 Tom **Gjelten.** *To Improve Spanish Farmingwithout Hurting Spanish Farmers,*Arkleton Trust, Langholm, Durnfriesshire, 1984, p. 4 3 .

21 For a discussion ofsome of the problems of training for part-time farmers see David Birkbeck, *Effective Trainingfor Family and Part-timeFarmers,* Arkleton Trust, Lang-holm, Dumfriesshire (in the press).

APPENDIX 1

List of seminar participants

Andre Brun

Directeur de Recherches, INRA Orleans,
Economie et sociologie rurales, Ardon, Olivet,
France Head, Department of Rural Sociology,

Patrick Commins
(Chairman) Miren
Etxezarreta

An Foras Talfntais, Dublin, Ireland Professor of
Economic Policy, Universidad Aut6noma de
Barcelona, Facultad de Ciencias Econ6micas y
Empresariales, Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain
Chief, Development Support Communications
Branch, Information Division, FAO, Rome,
Italy Professor, University School of Rural
Planning and Development, University of
Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada Head of
Branch, Land Improvement Division, Ministry
of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London,
United Kingdom

Colin Fraser

Anthony Fuller

John Garnett

Freelance journalist, Washington,
D.C., United States
Research Fellow, Department of
Geography, University of Exeter,
Exeter, United Kingdom
Research Fellow, Research Institute of
Fiscal Science, Ministry of Finance,
Beijing, China Head of Land Development
Division, Highlands and Islands
Development Board, Inverness, United
Kingdom School Inspector, Oksnes,
Norway Professor of Sociology,
Department of Sociology and Political
Science,
University of Calabria, Cosenza,
Calabria, Italy
Director, Centro Ricerche Economico
Sociali, Udine, Italy

Tom Gjelten Anne

Glyn-Jones

Bichang Li Hugh

MacLean Jarle

Meley Osvaldo

Pieroni

Elena Saraceno

Bernhard Walther Zentralstelle ffir regionale Wirtschaftsf6rderung, Bern, Switzerland

1983 Arkleton Lecturer James Shaw Grant Former Chairman, Crofters Commission, United Kingdom

Arkleton Trust John Higgs Chairman of the Trustees Keith Abercrombie Trustee and Senior Consultant

(Rapporteur) John Bryden Programme Director Elizabeth Higgs Domestic Bursar Janet Hutton Administrator

APPENDIX 2

Part-time **and** full-time farmers **or** farm households' in **OECD** countrics

Total Full-time Part-time Farmers Country Year farmers farmers Classes Total Classes Total

1 11 1 I1

Thousands **%** of total farmers

Austria **19602 390 203** 42 145 187 11 **37** 48 **1970s 356** 171 44 141 185 12 40 52 **1973-**334 153 35 146 181 **10** 44 54 Belgium 1970 **180** 102 16 61 78 9 34 43 Canada 1970 359 250 38 72 110 11 20 31 Finland 1969 298 189 60 50 110 20 17 37 France 1970 1588 1229 92 267 359 6 17 23 1980 1262 980 ... ... 282 **... ...** 22

Germany, F.R. 1965 1252 512 323 418 741 26 33 59 1970 1083 466 234 **383** 617 22 **35** 57 1975 905 409 **139 357** 496 **15** 40 55 1980 798 ... **...** 311 **...** 39

Ireland 1972 **175** 136 **... ...** 39 **...** ... 22 Italy 1970 3607 2249 181 1177 1358 5 **33 38** Japan 6 1960 6057 2078 **2036** 1942 3978 34 **32** 66 1970 5342 **832** 1802 2709 4511 34 51 84 1975 4953 616 1259 3078 4337 25 62 87 1980 4661 623 1002 3036 4038 22 65 87 Netherlands 1975 **163** 121 10 **30** 40 **6** 18 25 Norway 1959 198 77 45 76 **120 23 38** 61 1969 154 **51 32** 71 **103** 21 46 67 1972 **128** 44 **27** 56 84 22 44 66 1979 124 **38** 16 70 86 **13 56** 69

Spain 1972 2473 1285 1188 ... ... 48 . Sweden 1961 **233 169** ... ... 64 **... ...** 27 1971 **150** 92 **... ...** 58 **... ...** 39

Switzerland 1965 162 86 14 62 76 9 38 47 1969 149 89 **51** 41 **1975 133 65** 12 **56** 68 9 42 51

1980 125 61 **11 53** 64 9 42 51

United Kingdom 1971 296 228 ... ... 68 **... ...** 23 1979 296 216 ... ... **80 ...** ... 27

United States 1959 3708 2043 556 1109 1665 **15** 30 45 1964 **3158 16%** 448 1014 1462 14 32 46 1969 2730 1248 390 1092 1482 14 40 54 1974 2466 1350 ... ... 1116 ... **...** 45

Source: OECD. *Pat-timefarmingin OECD Countries,* Vol.3, General Report, Paris, 1978, p.8-9, 63, supplemented by national census data for later years and additional countries.

I Farm operators or heads of farm families, unless otherwise specified; see text for definitions of Classes Iand II. 2 Farm family labour force. **3** Farmers and their wives. 4 Farm labour force.
5 Farm operators (work time) and farmers and their wives (income). 6 Farm households.

ARKLETON TRUST PUBLICATIONS

EDUCATING FOR THE YEAR 2000AGRICULTURAL EDUCATIONAND TRAINING IN THE EUROPEANCOMMUNITY
Report of a seminar held in Scotland 1978. A4 40pp price £1.50 U.S. $3.50 including postage.

THE WORK OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS DEVELOPMENT BOARD WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE ROLE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING The Arkleton Lecture 1978 by Prof. Sir Kenneth Alexander A4 28pp price £1.50 U.S. $3.50 including postage.

DISADVANTAGED RURAL EUROPEDEVELOPMENT ISSUES AND APPROACHES
Report of a seminar held in Scotland 1979. A4 **48pp** price £1.50 U.S. $3.50 including postage. French edition also available.

THE AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL OFMARGINAL AREAS
The Arkleton Lecture 1979 by Prof. J.M.M. Cunningham. A4 24 pp price £1.50 U.S. $3.50 including postage.

RURAL PRODUCTIONCOOPERATIVES IN SOUTHERN ITALY
by Giuliano Cesarimi. A4 **80pp** including five colour plates price £4.50 U.S. $10.00 including postage.

SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL IN EDUCATION TOO The Arkleton Lecture 1980 by J.G. Morris. A4 24pp price £2.00 U.S. $4.50 including postage.

RURAL DECLINE IN THE UNITED KINGDOM -A THIRD WORLD VIEW
A report by a Third World Group on three rural development programmes in the U.K. **AS** 32pp price £2.00 U.S. $4.50 including postage.

CAN EDUCATION CHANGE RURAL FORTUNES?
Report of an international seminar held in Scotland in 1980. A5 44 pp price £2.00 U.S. $4.50 including postage.

OUR OWN RESOURCES -COOPERATIVES AND COMMUNITY ECONOMICDEVELOPMENT IN RURAL CANADA
Report of a study tour by Roger Clarke.
A5 84pp price £2.50 Can. $5.75 including postage.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN LEWIS AND HARRIS THE WESTERN ISLES OF SCOTLAND
A commentary by Keith Abercrombie on a seminar held in Scotland in 1980 by the international advisory committee of the Arkleton Trust. **A5** 32 pp price £2.00 U.S. $4.50 including postage.

SCHEMES OFASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN LESS FAVOURED AREAS OF THE EEC
Background paper for the 1982 Arkleton Seminar on institutional approaches to rural development in Europe. A4 72pp price £2.75 including postage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE
The Bibliography of abstracts includes approximately 1,700 references classified by subject. The period covered is 1978 to 1981. Published material from both East and West Europe is included. A4 258pp price £4.75 including postage.

PEOPLEAND POLICIES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT -INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES IN THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
The Arkleton Lecture 1982 by Michael Tracy. **A5** 56 pp price £2.75 including postage.

SER VOL AND ITS EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, WEST INDIES: AN OBSERVATION
Report of a study tour by Angela Morrison A5
80pp £2.75 including postage.

INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE
Report of a seminar held in Scotland from 17-22 October 1982. **A5** 60pp £2.75 including postage.

DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS AND APPROACHES IN THREE RURAL AREAS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Report of the 1982 Study Tour of Mid-Wales, the Western Isles, and the Grampian Region of Scotland by a Third World Group. **A5**
1O4pp £3.75 including postage.

THE PAR T-TIME HOLDING -AN ISLAND EXPERIENCE
The Arkleton Lecture 1983 by James Shaw Grant CBE. **A5**
28pp £2.00 including postage.

EDUCATION, TRAINING AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
Summary Report on a Collaborative Programme between Rural Areas in Italy, Ireland and Scotland, 1982-83 byJ. Bryden, P. Commins and E. Saraceno.
A5 40pp £2.50 including postage.

INFORMATION AND INNOVATION ON FARMS IN CENTRAL ITALY
A study on Lazio and Umbria by Colin Fraser **A5**
126pp £4.50 including postage.

TO IMPROVE SPANISH FARMING WITHOUT HURTING SPANISH FARMERS
A report on Agricultural Development Strategies in Spain by Tom Gjelten
A5 52pp £3.50 including postage.

EFFECTIVE TRAINING FOR FAMILY AND PART TIME FARMERS
Fellowship report of a study in the UK, Norway, Germany and France by David Birkbeck **A5** pp £2.50 including postage.

Ref: 85/2/E Price £3.00 (including postage)

Published by the Arkleton Trust, Langholm, Dumfriesshire DlG13
OHL, Scotland, UK Printed by John G. Eccles Printers Ltd, Inverness