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Disposition

• The cob-web model on social practices in family forestry

• “The forest farm as a project that spans generations”

• Women as “transitive element” in the transfer of property

• 3 data sources – triangulation

• A typology on women’s different positions in family forestry
The Cob-web model - a conceptual model for understanding social practices in family forestry

Source: Lidestav & Nordfjell, 2005
The forest property should be regarded as an arena with a strong social, cultural and economical meaning, surrounded by cornerstones of livelihood, work, residence and valuations. All together, such a property constitutes a project that spans generations. The ownership itself and its assignment of accumulated capital and work are linked to a transfer of knowledge, experience of practical work, ability to manage the property, as well as the transfer of a lifestyle.

Törnqvist (1995)
Gender
Inheritance
Property rights
Work
Marriage
Tradition/Practices
Taxation

To clarify women’s function in the transfer of family farms Irene Flygare have introduced the concept **transitive element**;

Inheritance positions are established in everyday work, and the ownership is justified by the work invested in farming, particularly in the field work. As long as women’s contribution to the farm consists mainly of other tasks than fieldwork, they can never compete with a man regarding property acquisition. A woman’s chance of inheriting a farm depends on either being born in a family with no sons, marrying a farmer, or becoming the widow of a farmer

Flygare, 1999
Aim: to examine the extent of women’s ownership, and by which conditions female heirs can compete with a brother or other male relative.

The specific research question: concerns the impact of gender on
* the take over as such and the conditions of forest property transfer
* the ownership constellation, i.e. single or jointly owned
* the size of the property
Triangulation of data sources and methods

I) Forest data register 1994, all For. Own. 18-80 yr, > 5 ha

II) Inquiry 97/98, n=980

III) 116 Narratives, 1999
Table 1. Proportion of female forest owners in different ownership categories, %.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single owned</th>
<th>Owned together with one or more persons of same sex</th>
<th>Owns together with one or more persons of different sex</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – 49 ha</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 399 ha</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 ha -</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Proportion of male and female owners on forest properties acquired via their own parents/relatives by ownership constellation (n= 980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Type</th>
<th>Men, column percent</th>
<th>Women, column percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own alone</td>
<td>38a</td>
<td>24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own together with spouce</td>
<td>24a</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own together with siblings/relatives</td>
<td>34a</td>
<td>50b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereof with same sex</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td>16b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereof with different sex</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>33b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own together with non-relatives or other combination</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Descriptive accounts of owners and forest estates that have been acquired via parents/relatives (Source: Lidestav 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean size, ha</td>
<td>58.2a</td>
<td>49.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age, yr</td>
<td>53.0a</td>
<td>52.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion with spouse, %</td>
<td>79.9a</td>
<td>82.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion resident at the estate, %</td>
<td>51.0a</td>
<td>31.3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion running agriculture on the estate, %</td>
<td>34.2a</td>
<td>15.8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of owners on the estate, mean</td>
<td>1.47a</td>
<td>1.89b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking over by inheritance/gift/last will, %</td>
<td>41.5a</td>
<td>60.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking over by purchase from relatives, %</td>
<td>58.5a</td>
<td>39.1b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By results from I and II we can state that gender has an impact on:

- Whether an heir has taken over the family forest farm or not
- Whether the forest estate is single or jointly owned
- The size of the property
- The conditions of the transfer i.e. by inheritance/gift/last will or purchase.
The individual women and her relation to the forest holding (n=30) was analyzed

- Kind of ownership
- Size of the property
- Age
- Civil status
- Children
- Residential
- Farming
- Administrative work
- Practical work
- Reasons for becoming the owner
Reasons for becoming the owner

• A1 – Being the one that has demonstrated more or at least as much interest/commitment in the forest farm, or the lack of interest/commitment of the brother.

  A2 – Being the one who live nearest to the forest farm, the one who was prepared to settle and maintain the farm and/or support the parent's residence.

• A3 – Being married to a “handy man”.

• B1 - Fiscal reasons.

• B2 – A solution to the equity problem; giving all children the same economical conditions if other means of compensation are regarded as less convenient or impossible due to the high market value of the property, or the brother had already acquired another forest farm.

• B3 – Being the one who happened to be at hand when the transfer was settled due to sudden decease of the father/parents, a very young or sick brother.
A traditional/pre-modern view on property rights

A modern view on property rights

Figure 1. Suggested typology on female forest owners who have acquired a forest property from their parents/relatives in competition with a brother.
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