Appendix

Lessons from Woodland Owner Research

The nation’s 10 million or so woodland owners are a diverse group, and one that resists broad characterization. In fact, as some research has suggested, this audience really doesn’t differ much from the general public. While some values like property rights and a preference for solitude are common among woodland owners, they hold few other values or motivations in common.

Recent woodland owner research has focused on developing landowner typologies that can be useful in reducing a massive and diverse group of people into smaller and more uniform subgroups. While imperfect, grouping people by type can help you focus limited resources on one or two of the groups you most want to reach. You might choose to offer events or develop communications that are more likely to resonate strongly with these groups. This approach may be more effective than trying to be everything to everybody, particularly given the highly diverse nature of landowner populations. For example, using the Butler et al. (2007) framework (see Table 1), you might decide that for your women’s network, the Woodland Retreat group is most likely to come out and get involved. (For details and definitions, you will need to consult the research directly. Table 1 serves primarily as a guide to orient you to some available research.)

Many typologies are based on statistical analysis of landowner responses to self-administered surveys. They tend to produce three to four landowner segments. The results of a few such studies are presented in Table 1, along with references at the end of this Appendix for those interested in digging deeper into definitions of each of these landowner types and other details of the studies.

Table 1. Summary of recent landowner typology research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Study area</th>
<th>Landowner types identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bieling (2004)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Economically interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptually interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninterested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boon et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Classic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler et al. (2007)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Woodland retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ready to sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer (2012)</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Commodity managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry David Thoreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Summary of recent landowner typology research, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors and Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Landowner Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hujala et al. (2009) | Finland | Trusting realizers  
Active learners  
Independent managers (20%) |
| Kendra and Hull (2005) | New forest owners in Virginia | Absentee investors  
Professionals  
Preservationists  
Young families  
Forest planners  
Farmers |
| Kluender and Walkingstick (2000) | Arkansas | Timber managers  
Resident conservationists  
Affluent weekenders  
Poor rural residents |
| Korhonen et al. (2012) | Finland | Non-committed Forest Management Association (FMA) members  
Independent timber traders  
Relationship builders  
FMA partners |
| Kurtz and Lewis (1981) | Missouri | Timber agriculturalist  
Timber conservationist  
Forest environmentalist  
Range pragmatist |
| Majumdar et al. (2008) | Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina | Multiple-objective  
Nontimber  
Timber |
| Ross-Davis and Broussard (2007) | North-central Indiana | Forest managers  
New forest owners  
Passive forest owners |
| Salmon et al. (2006) | Utah | Amenity  
Multiple-benefit  
Passive |
| Surendra et al. (2009) | Arkansas | Amenity focused rural  
Amenity focused urban  
Passive rural  
Passive urban |
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