

## 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**

Source	Study area	Landowner types identified
Bieling (2004)	Germany	Economically interested Conceptually interested Uninterested
Boon et al. (2004)	Denmark	Classic Hobby Indifferent
Butler et al. (2007)	United States	Woodland retreat Working the land Supplemental income Ready to sell
Fischer (2012)	Oregon	Commodity managers Amenity managers Recreational managers Passive managers
Finley and Kittredge (2006)	Massachusetts	John Muir Henry David Thoreau Jane Doe

**Table 1. Summary of recent landowner typology research, *continued***

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

---

## Literature cited

- Bieling, C. 2004. Non-industrial private-forest owners: possibilities for increasing adoption of close-to-nature forest management. *European Journal of Forest Research* 123 (4):293–303.
- Boon, T. E., H. Meilby, and B. J. Thorsen. 2004. An empirically based typology of private forest owners in Denmark: Improving communication between authorities and owners. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 19:45–55.
- Butler, B. J., M. Tyrrell, G. Feinberg, S. VanManen, L. Wiseman, and S. Wallinger. 2007. Understanding and reaching family forest owners: Lessons from social marketing research. *Journal of Forestry* 105 (7):348–357.
- Finley, A. O. and D. B. Kittredge. 2006. Thoreau, Muir, and Jane Doe: Different types of private forest owners need different kinds of forest management. *Northern Journal of Applied Forestry* 23 (1):27–34.
- Fischer, A. P. 2012. Identifying policy target groups with qualitative and quantitative methods: The case of wildfire risk on nonindustrial private forest lands. *Forest Policy and Economics* 25 (0):62–71.
- Hujala, T., J. Tikkanen, H. Hanninen, and O. Virkkula. 2009. Family forest owners' perception of decision support. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 24 (5): 448–460.
- Kendra, A. and R. B. Hull. 2005. Motivations and behaviors of new forest owners in Virginia. *Forest Science* 51 (2):142–154.
- Kluender, R. A. and T. L. Walkingstick. 2000. Rethinking how nonindustrial landowners view their lands. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry* 24 (3):150–158.
- Korhonen, K., T. Hujala, and M. Kurttila. 2012. Reaching forest owners through their social networks in timber sales. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 27 (1):88–99.
- Kurtz, W. B. and B. J. Lewis. 1981. Decision-making Framework for Nonindustrial Private Forest Owners: An Application in the Missouri Ozarks. *Journal of Forestry* 79 (5): 285–288.
- Majumdar, I., L. Teeter, and B. Butler. 2008. Characterizing family forest owners: A cluster analysis approach. *Forest Science* 54 (2):176–184.
- Ross-Davis, A. and S. Broussard. 2007. A typology of family forest owners in north central Indiana. *Northern Journal of Applied Forestry* 24 (4):282–289.
- Salmon, O., M. Brunson, and M. Kuhns. 2006. Benefit-based audience segmentation: A tool for identifying nonindustrial private forest (NIPF) owner education needs. *Journal of Forestry* 104 (8):419–425.
- Surendra, G. C., S. Mehmood, and J. Schelhas. 2009. Segmenting Landowners Based on Their Information-Seeking Behavior: A Look at Landowner Education on the Red Oak Borer. *Journal of Forestry* 107 (6):313–319.