

Interim Report

Investment into Land: Key Motivators and Behaviours of Scottish Landowners



Authors: Lorna Pate, Ian Merrell, James Glendinning, Ana Vuin, Steven Thomson, Bryony Nelson

April, 2024

This work was supported by the Scottish Government
[Strategic Research Program 2022- 2027](#)



Context

The Scottish Government Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services (RESAS) division funds the [Strategic Research Programme 2022 to 2027](#) to advance the evidence base in the development of rural affairs, food and environment policies.

One of the themes (Theme E) of the [Strategic Research Programme 2022 to 2027](#) is on Rural Futures. This theme has 3 research topics: rural communities, rural economy and land reform. There are 2 projects within each topic, led by Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) and James Hutton Institute (JHI). This publication sits within a series of publications as part of this theme.

Within the land reform topic, the two projects are

- 1) Impacts of Land-Based Financial Support Mechanisms on Land Values, Landownership Diversification and Land Use Outcomes
- 2) Scotland's Land Reform Futures

This current research on land markets and land use change aims to understand whether recent land transactions are leading to (and fuelled by) land use change, for example, towards achieving net zero. Relatedly, it aims to explore the influence of financial support mechanisms on land values, particularly the recent interest in carbon schemes.

It will provide an evidence base for understanding the effects increased land values are having on Scottish Government land reform goals to further improve transparency of land ownership, help ensure large scale land holdings deliver in the public interest, and empower communities by providing more opportunities to own land and have more say in how land in their area is used.

This Research Briefing sits within a workpackage concerned with decision-making around investment into land. Previous reports in this workpackage include:

[Rural Land Values, Sales and Investment Trends](#)

[A Rapid Evidence Assessment of Investment Decision-Making for Land](#)

[Assessing land use change: International evidence review](#)

Other previous publications in this project are:

[Rural Land Values and Land Diversification](#)

Contents

Context	2
Highlights	i
Executive Summary	ii
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Methodology	2
3 Key Findings	3
3.1 Part 1: Land management structures	3
3.1.1 Individual/family decision-making	3
3.1.2 Group decision-making.....	3
3.1.3 Examples of group decision-making	4
3.1.4 Contracted managers	5
3.2 Part 2: Land manager motivations and behaviours	6
3.2.1 Group 1: Financial Gain through Development/Land Use Change	6
3.2.2 Group 2: Self-Serving Motivations	7
3.2.3 Group 3: Food Producers	8
3.2.4 Group 4: Public (Environmental) Goals.....	9
3.2.5 Group 5: Locally Defined Goals	9
Conclusion and Next Steps.....	10
Cited Sources.....	10

Highlights

What were we trying to find out?

We are interested in the decision-making processes, behaviours and motivations of landowners or land managers, particularly around their future land use decisions and investment strategies into their land.

What did we do?

We interviewed landowners and land managers in four case study areas across Scotland (River catchment of Spey and Tweed, Shetland Islands and Galloway and South Ayrshire Biosphere Reserve). We asked them about the land they manage and explored decision-making and motivations at various stages of their ownership/management. We also looked to the future and asked what they were planning, and if funds were required to reach their future land use goals.

What did we learn?

The results in this report are our first analysis of the data, with further reports due in later years of the project. From this initial analysis we sought to identify the key decision-making structures (primarily individual or group decision-making processes) We then created a set of personas, identifying key motivations or behaviours of each group.

What do we recommend and what happens next?

We aimed to interview the widest range of different landowners as possible to reflect the diverse nature of landownership in Scotland, including individual private owners, tenants, crofters, public organisations, community-owned land, businesses, institutions and natural capital investors. However, drawing generalisations amongst and between these groups was still difficult.

The personas are a useful tool for policy-makers to understand the different dynamics within the landowners of Scotland. However, it is important to acknowledge that these generalisations should not entirely overshadow the nuance and diversity of behaviours and motivations at a granular/individual level, largely determined by the land itself or the personal beliefs/values/opinions of an individual.

Executive Summary

- This is the first-stage analysis of 45 interviews conducting with a range of different landowners/managers across Scotland. They were asked questions about their land management decision-making processes and investment strategies into their land, particularly around receiving financial incentives (grants, subsidies, natural capital payments).
- A typology of different landowners/managers was developed which will be turned into a set of personas through further analysis. Firstly, the decision-making processes were seen to be either individual (sometimes as a family unit) or as a group. Within group decision-making multiple different ownership groups were identified, including companies, institutions, and private trusts, the public sector, third sector organisations and charitable trusts, community owned land and elements of crofting (common grazings). The role of contracted land managers were included into the typology and included two groups: Land managers managing multiple sites and experts/specialists.
- Following this the interviewees were split into 5 categories according to the main motivations and behaviours.
- Group 1: Financial Gain through Development/Land Use Change. This group were primarily motivated by maximising the income their land could generate and included the following subgroups: Natural capital buyers, commercially focussed estates, developers, energy producers/storers, commercial foresters, investors.
- Group 2: Self-Serving Motivations. This group were less motivated with maximising income streams and instead had diverse reasons for owning land, but primarily to serve a purpose personal to their own interests, for example: Philanthropic environmentalists, family run estates (custodians), private amenity/leisure ownership, crofting as an identity/culture.
- Group 3: Food Producers. This group of farmers are motivated to maintain the main activity of their business, which is producing food (and sometimes other goods). This is a broad group with many different behaviours.
- Group 4: Public (Environmental) Goals. This is land that is managed primarily to produce public goods (not-for-profit), whether this be nature conservation, clear air, flood defences etc. The two sub-groups identified were: Managed for Conservation or Scientific Purposes, Public Amenity.
- Group 5: Locally Defined Goals. There was also a set of owners/managers who were mainly motivated by local level factors and included a lot of community owned land. Two sub-groups are: Land for Social Gains and Maintaining Community.

1 Introduction

Landowners and land managers are a key group who help achieve multiple (and sometimes conflicting) public goals. They have direct roles in food production, public goods (such as clean air, flood mitigation), energy production, recreation and access to land. In recent years there has been increased policy attention on how Scotland's land managers can help achieve Net Zero, primarily through Nature Based Solutions for carbon sequestration (tree planting and peatland restoration) and biodiversity improvements. Currently landowners are incentivised to undertake these activities through subsidies, grants or natural capital payments (acquiring carbon credits to sell or use), however, uptake to date has been slower than expected.

Understanding the decision-making structures and processes, objectives, motivations, investment strategies and behaviours of landowners and managers is important to plan future incentives or policy nudges.

The aim of this paper is to categorise Scotland's Land Managers into a set of personas, based on their decision-making processes and investment strategies. In this paper the term Land Manager encompasses those who manage land including owners, renters, consultants and contractors. Understanding land manager decisions and what drives them is of interest to a wide variety of groups including policy makers, governmental bodies/organisations, and the general public.

Developing and using personas is a useful exercise. It has been widely adopted in marketing to segment market participants based on key characteristics. This is a commonly used technique in tourism and destination management (Dolničar, 2004, Tkaczynski et al., 2009). There are three main ways of creating personas; either quantitatively, qualitatively or using a mixed methods approach (Jansen et al., 2022). Using quantitative data, cluster analysis is normally used to group participants based on their responses to different survey questions (Tu et al., 2010). For qualitative design (like this research), thematic analysis is used to group participants, based on verbal responses to structured or semi-structured questions.

Despite there not being any work previously conducted on investment strategies and behaviours linked to these around land use change, there are still multiple behavioural typologies which have been produced for landowners and/or farmers.

One area that has received attention is the uptake of tree planting on farms. Natural England have recently reviewed this literature and produced a comprehensive and critical analysis of this literature (Staddon et al., 2021). Eves et al. (2015) conducted a large cluster analysis focusing on English farmers. Hopkins et al. (2017) also categorised farmers based on their intentions towards tree planting in Scotland.

Another theme is farmers (or other land managers) behaviours around adopting environmental stewardship schemes (Schwarz et al., 2009, Urquhart, 2008, Graymore et al., 2015). Glenk *et al* (2022) develop vignettes (short textual

descriptions) of farmers in order to assess public perceptions of the acceptability of agricultural support payments. Previous studies had focussed on the efficiency of payments in delivering public goods. The use of vignettes allowed them to extend this and further investigate public acceptance of payments in relation to the characteristics of the farmer as a person, and the farm as a business unit.

A good example of a mixed method approach is Sutherland et al. (2011) who also looked at Scottish land managers. They grouped landowners into the following categories: Ecological land stewards, economic land stewards, multi-functionalists, community stewards and 'others'.

Barnes *et al.* (2022) applied latent class analysis to a cross- European survey of farmer attitudes to develop a typology of ecological practice adoption, based on farmer self- identities. Employing a similar approach, Barnes *et al.* (2011) sought to understand the behaviours of farmers in Nitrate Vulnerable Zones, while Barnes *et al.* (2013) developed a typology of climate change risk perceptions among dairy farmers in Scotland.

More generally, Bartkowski *et al.* (2022) reviewed empirically derived European farmer typologies, identifying 36 empirical studies. While no two typologies are exactly the same they find similar 'recurring' types between studies, which they label: *Productivist, Innovator, Diversifier, Traditionalist, Environmentalist, and Pragmatist*. Interestingly, although they find clear systematic patterns in the names applied to define typologies, looking closer at the specific descriptions they find considerable variability in how they are described. Further themes between studies included typologies based on occupational status, or adoption of specific technologies such as biogas production.

2 Methodology

Our typology has been determined with a behavioural focus based on the COM-B model (Michie et al., 2011). Where at the basic level capability, opportunity and motivation are required to exhibit a behaviour.

Interviews were conducted with 45 landowners and/or land managers in Scotland between 2023-24. These interviews were focussed on 4 key geographical areas: the catchment of the river Tweed, the Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere Reserve, Shetland and Speyside. Interviewees were recruited purposively. A sampling framework was created using available geographic land use data which provided a breakdown of the main land uses in each of the case study areas. This was then turned into four individual sampling frameworks. As an example, the high levels of estates in Speyside warranted interviewing more estate owners than in Shetland, where more smallholders and crofters were approached. Interviewees were recruited through various means, including using SAC local consultants, online platforms or through the team advertising the research at a range of different industry events.

The interviews used a semi-structured interview guide to ensure key topics were covered. These lasted between 20 minutes to 2.5 hours depending on how complex their investment strategies and intentions towards future land use change were. Using anonymised transcripts and detailed notes taken during interviews key features of land managers were identified and categorised into land manager typologies. The first step was to identify the means in which landowners/managers made decisions (either individually or as a group) and then to categorise them based on their motivations, land use objectives and behaviours.

3 Key Findings

3.1 Part 1: Land management structures

Our initial analysis was to determine the underlying decision-making processes of different landowners/managers (often with different land use objectives to one another). Landowner decision-making processes are split into three key groups: individuals (and families), groups (companies, charities, public sector, community-owned etc.) and contracted managers. These management structures and decision-making processes impact how the land is managed and used, as well as highlighting differences between core objectives and different motivating factors.

3.1.1 Individual/family decision-making

Most of Scotland's land is managed by individuals and families. There are many advantages of land being managed by one person or a family. From a management perspective, this can include: the ability to make decisions quickly and efficiently, decision makers are likely to have similar motivations about land use and how the land is managed, consistency in decision-making and direction as decision-makers remain constant (with the exception of a sale or succession). However, the decision-making process for this group can vary significantly according to their abilities and knowledge of the different options. It is well documented that decisions on family farms are often made at the kitchen table.

3.1.2 Group decision-making

There are a large variety of different groups that manage land in Scotland which include: charities, community groups, companies, institutions and public sector organisations. Group decision-making is very different from land managed by individuals. For example, decision-making on publicly managed land needs to be accountable and therefore often has many levels of bureaucracy with multiple decision-makers acting in a team.

The primary aim of land-use decisions are to achieve the overarching objectives of the organisation, which again are diverse. For example, conservation goals (e.g. RSPB), improvements to the environment (with or without economic benefits), energy provision (e.g. SSE), economic gains (e.g. private companies like commercial

foresters, farmers or investors), social gains (e.g. community-owned land or charities). In some cases, decisions are made around achieving a certain policy objective (e.g. achieving Net Zero, or improving access to land).

The main dynamic in group decision-making is reaching a consensus between those involved. These groups can vary according to their size, levels of decision-making (hierarchical or flat structures), aims and objectives, and control over decision-making (i.e. delegated to a contracted manager or managed in-house).

3.1.3 Examples of group decision-making

Companies, institutions, and private trusts. The private (for-profit) sector have the aims of satisfying their shareholders or clients with a return on investment. Land managed by the private sector typically involves a group of decision-makers (e.g. a board of directors/advisors) who make decisions according to the overarching goals of the beneficiaries. In some circumstances, the day-to-day management is contracted out to professional land managers/agents. A private trust is a common governance structure. Trusts are legal arrangements that manage the land for the benefit of an individual, group or the general public.

Public sector. The public sector own a decent degree of Scottish land (roughly 12%), which includes Council land (including hospitals, schools, council buildings), Forestry Land Scotland, Nature Scot and the Ministry of Defence. Another major public landowner in Scotland (but not the rest of the UK) is the [Crown Estate](#), who own substantial amounts of the seabed and coastlines, as well as some estates and farmland. The purpose of publicly managed land can vary, and, in many cases, it can be mixed-use. This land is managed on behalf of the public therefore there is an expectation that the decision-making processes are transparent.

Third sector organisations/Charitable Trusts. Third sector organisation are not-for-profit organisations including charities, social enterprises and voluntary groups. These organisations manage land for a variety of charitable purposes however this is usually to benefit the organisations goals. Like private trusts, this land is generally managed by trustees where decisions are made through a constituted process. Charities have more specific processes that they are required to follow to maintain their charitable status. Prominent examples in Scotland include the National Trust for Scotland (about 73,000 hectares), RSPB (about 72,000 hectares) and John Muir Trust (about 25,000 hectares).

Community owned land. Community owned land is a feature of the Scottish landscape (about 227,000 hectares), attained either through a Community Right to Buy or a Public Asset Transfer. It typically moves from an individual (negligent) decision-maker into a community group and can be seen as a democratising of the decision-making process. It can be governed by a suite of different governance structures, (e.g. Community Development/Interest Company, a Trust) and priorities are formed at the local level through a community consultation process.

Crofting. Land under secure crofting tenure is also a substantial amount (about 750,000 hectares), most of which is privately owned but also community-owned or publicly owned. Whilst crofters generally have a land unit that they have full autonomy to manage (individual or family decision-making process), they also often hold a right to graze stock on common grazings. Each common grazing has its own regulations which are managed by the grazing committee (group decision-making). The crofters that have a share in the common grazings can propose that the land is used for purposes other than grazing. Examples of this include forestry, peatland restoration projects and energy production.

3.1.4 Contracted managers

Not all landowners manage the land they own, and instead employ a land manager to assist with the day-to-day running. This may be because the owner does not live near the land, they own too much land to manage by themselves, or they do not have the expertise. For example, institutional funds who purchase land as an investment opportunity for natural capital purposes (see Section 3.2.1) lack the expertise to conduct the management of the site. Alternatively, the owner(s) of a commercially focused estate (see Section 3.2.1) may have too many enterprises or land to manage themselves, so many employ or sub-contract an estate manager. In both examples the land manager is employed to enact the overarching objectives of the owner.

Two main types of managers were identified as managing land within Scotland, these were land managers responsible for the overall running of a land parcel (often an estate) and specialist land managers who offer advice and other services.

Land Managers, managing multiple sites. These are qualified land agents and other professionals that manage parcels of land on behalf of other groups. They may be employed internally as part of the organisation (e.g. nature reserve managers working for John Muir Trust, or an estate manager) or be sub-contracted.

Land managers offer their services to food producing businesses (i.e. contract farming) or estates. These managers can oversee management from a high level and can sometimes assist in decision-making processes by providing their professional opinion to the owner. In other cases they are employed to oversee and conduct the on-the-ground activities (e.g. applying for tree planting consent and planting the trees when approved). Sometimes they can manage multiple pieces of land from afar.

Experts/specialists. This group are specialists in their chosen field and will be employed or contracted to provide specialist services on all or some of the land predominantly managed by others. These include specialisms in forestry, food production, nature conservation, environmental management and ESG. These experts are usually contracted to perform a task (e.g. an Environmental Impact

Assessment or a bird survey) on a one-off basis, rather than employed as a full time member of staff.

3.2 Part 2: Land manager motivations and behaviours

The main types of landowner in Scotland have been identified according to their decision-making processes. This in turn also reflects their ownership status. Now we turn to motivations and behaviours. This is an interim analysis that will be returned to, with more detail added in the next year of the project.

3.2.1 Group 1: Financial Gain through Development/Land Use Change

Natural capital buyers with financial motivations. This group buy/rent land to facilitate financial gain from natural capital markets by offsetting emissions and by selling carbon credits. The main activities in this group include tree planting and peatland restoration. Both of these activities require investment into the land, but grants including the Forestry Grant Scheme and Peatland ACTION are available to cover some of the costs. To achieve the scale required for some of these natural capital schemes, there are many estates now being bought for natural capital purposes.

Commercially focussed estates (capital-building). These estates are usually privately owned with the main objective of generating income and these estates are constantly looking for new opportunities. Income can be achieved from a range of land-based activities, including forestry, tenanted/in-house farming, natural capital schemes, renewable energy or commercial sporting activities. Land-based assets can also be used for income generation such as holiday cottages/lodges/huts for tourism (sometimes supporting the sporting aspects of the estate), breweries or distilleries, wedding and event spaces or (more recently) business workspaces. On larger estates with diverse income streams different management structures and teams are present for the different assets, therefore not all areas may be managed in the same way. Some activities may subsidise other less profitable activities.

Developers. This group own land to build on it. Many different development projects can occur including house building or infrastructure projects. This group have historically been involved in land-banking whereby they buy land to develop on (or sell) at a later date. These development sites have often been on greenfield sites, but the new NPF4 is moving these towards brownfield sites. They look for appropriate sites close to other infrastructures like road and energy networks.

Energy producers/storers. These land managers buy/rent land with the main purpose of producing and/or storing energy. The most common of these are wind farms, solar farms, hydroelectric dams and battery farms. Plans show that these three technologies are increasingly being housed in the same site to create energy farms. Commercial-scale energy farms in Scotland are required to undertake stringent biodiversity audits and are required to maintain/enhance the biodiversity on the site. Many are also required to provide a community fund. Selecting where these energy

parks go is highly dependent on the means of energy production and how close they are to the existing electricity grid.

Commercial foresters. The main purpose of this land is to generate income through commercial forestry. To achieve this some land may be used for conservation or amenity (non-commercial) forests, depending on the outcome of community consultation. Some areas may also have additional amenities including paths and cafes etc. However, the aim is to maximise the amount of commercial timber grown. Commercial forestry companies are often backed by institutional investors who see the long-term profitability of forestry as a positive investment case. These companies are looking to invest in bare land suitable for planting, ideally between grades 5-6.

Land as an investment. These are typically landowners that purchase land with the sole purpose of it being for financial gain, this can be achieved in many ways which include: income from rent, subsidy payments, selling it on at an increased price or benefiting from agricultural tax relief. The landowners may not have connections to the land, and some may not reside in Scotland.

3.2.2 Group 2: Self-Serving Motivations

Philanthropic Environmentalists. This group purchase (or may even be gifted/transferred) land to enhance or change its use to achieve environmental goals, e.g. improve biodiversity or 'rewild'. Financial gain is not a large motivator, and they instead act philanthropically. These could be wealthy individuals, community groups or charities. The land managers may also undertake additional activities including research and education. The scale of this land varies from small pieces (such as an individual nature reserve) to larger areas for rewilding. In the future, with the introduction of biodiversity credits and the ability to monetise nature recovery, the motivations of groups wishing to rewild will probably change to align more with the motives of the *Natural capital buyers with financial motivations* group.

Family run estates (custodians). These estates are privately owned and, in some cases, have been for multiple generations. They see themselves as custodians of the countryside and/or their own family's heritage. Many of these estates have a *contracted land manager* that oversees management but often the family are very involved in the decision-making process. Compared to the *Commercially focussed estates* group, these estate owners may be more restrained in their finances and unwilling to invest significant amount of funds to take advantage of new opportunities. They may also be unwilling to sell their land to maintain the family's connection to the estate. As such, these estates tend to stick to the traditional estate activities of sporting and some farming or forestry. They may also desire for the estate to be a part of the local community and economy through providing employment and leisure opportunities.

Private amenity/leisure. This group manages land for the sole purpose of recreation and pleasure. They are typically wealthy enough to own the land merely for their own

enjoyment and sometimes value the prestige of owning a Scottish estate. There is no requirement for this land to generate any income. It may be managed and used for private sporting (e.g. fishing, deer stalking) to graze pets (e.g. horses), for dog walking etc.

Crofting as an identity/culture. This group is mainly motivated to croft as a way of preserving their cultural identity. For many, crofting is an intergenerational vocation that has enabled them to learn traditional skills that this group utilise to run their croft. Other crofters have alternative motivations, covered below in the *Food Producers* group.

3.2.3 Group 3: Food Producers

This group focus on using their land for food production. There are multiple sub-groups according to the behaviours and motivations. This group includes but is not limited to farmers and crofters.

Pioneers. This group look to continually increase productivity and are willing to invest in new technologies or equipment to achieve this. They are often seen as early adopters and make moves before grants or subsidies are introduced as financial incentives. One example is on-farm renewables.

Diversifiers. In the past this group were traditional farmers and through a combination of push and pull factors they have diversified their farm businesses and set up new enterprises including tourism and farm contracting. These alternative enterprises now sometimes take more time to run than the farm and can generate more income than farming activities. Sometimes the diversified activity is managed by a partner or another family member.

Grant followers. This group generally want to farm using mainly traditional and restorative methods and are highly motivated by grants available. They are willing to change land use on at least part of their land if grants are available. Some have made small changes that are “win-wins” (e.g. squaring off arable fields, increasing field margins, planting hedges). This planting has often been on non-productive or marginal land which is placed in strategic positions on the farm which is not important to food production. Grants and subsidies help keep the farm profitable.

Maintainers. This group of farmers focus on producing food and have little or no diversification. These are typically arable or larger commercial farmers and are not easily swayed by government policies, subsidies, or grants. They plan to keep the farm largely as it has been with food production being the large majority/ sole land use. Any changes that do occur are to help increase yield (e.g. there might be trees planted for shelter belts to protect crops). This group are interested in investing in neighbouring farms if they come to the market.

Winding down. This group tend to be in their later years often with no successors and are happy to farm with little or no new investment. Their motivation is to stay on their farm for as long as they can as it considered their residence.

Constrained. This group - which includes tenant and contract farmers - can be constrained in changing land use by their tenure. They may be interested in alternative land uses to agriculture however they face additional challenges in that most will require additional agreements from their landlords or clients. They may want to enter natural capital schemes, however there is currently uncertainty about how to broker these with landlords.

Expanders. This group are focused on intensive food production and one of their main aims is to expand the size of their holding, to increase the quantity of food produced and, in some cases, increase efficiency. Specialist farmers are more likely to be in this group e.g. dairy and arable.

Agro-ecologists. This group apply ecological concepts and principles to their farming, they aim to mitigate climate change, work with wildlife and are interested in the social aspects of food production. This often includes getting a fair price for produce and using direct selling as a way to differentiate their produce. Agro- forestry is also part of the agro-ecological principals. These farmers are often the beneficiaries of subsidies or grants which try to encourage more environmentally friendly activities.

3.2.4 Group 4: Public (Environmental) Goals

Managed for Conservation or Scientific Purposes. Certain groups have the goal of managing land specifically for conservation or scientific interests. These sites include nature reserves, SSSIs and National Parks. They are typically in public or charity ownership and make group decisions based on the overall objectives of the organisation but are also site-specific to ensure correct techniques are used.

Public Amenity. This land is managed for public amenity and recreation usually by public institutions such as councils. Whilst the specific land use can vary from commons, paths to playparks the land is managed by similar structures. Increasingly, this group of managers are under pressure to maintain the land and facilities as the resources available are ever reducing. In some areas this is leading to downgrading of the facilities and services provided to the public. Some areas are encouraging residents to take more of a management role of the land and in some cases encouraging communities to take over its management.

3.2.5 Group 5: Locally Defined Goals

Land for Social Gains. This is primarily community-owned land. Each community-owned piece of land has different objectives and these are defined locally according to the needs and desires of the group. There are commonalities around housing, service provision and job opportunities, but in each case the context is different.

They are however still grouped together as they have common motivations to improve their local communities.

Maintaining Community. The motivations and behaviours to some (limited) groups is to acquire the land to block certain activities occurring. For example, land might move into community ownership to prevent an asset from being destroyed or to block developments occurring.

Conclusion and Next Steps

This report has showcased the work-to-date on analysing the 45 interviews conducted with different land managers and owners across Scotland as part of Work Package 2 of the project. The group had diverse land use objectives and investment strategies into their land. Some groups invested significant amounts of capital, whilst others invested very little. The decision-making processes were split between individuals (sometimes with help from their families) and groups, and examples were provided of each of these.

Next, the interviewees were split into 5 different groups according to their main motivations and the behaviours they express when trying to achieve their goals. The five groups are: Financial Gain through Development/Land Use Change, Self-Serving Motivations, Food Producers, Public (Environmental) Goals, and Locally Defined Goals. The levels of investment for each of these groups vary, even within different sub-groups.

The next step is to expand the analysis further, moving beyond defining the different groups to providing each with more details. Firstly, [the framework](#) developed in Merrell *et al* (2023) will be applied to the interviewee groups. The individual, social and material factors that influence the of each group decision-making will be explored. Each of the interviews will be explored in depth to uncover whether certain 'moments of change' occurred.

In the case of a sale of land causing a change in ownership (and therefore potentially a behaviour change), we will draw on the interview with land agents we have utilised elsewhere in this project (see Glendinning *et al* (2024) for a recent example) to demonstrate motivations of both seller and buyer.

Cited Sources

- Barnes, A. P., Willock, J., Toma, L., & Hall, C. (2011). Utilising a farmer typology to understand farmer behaviour towards water quality management: Nitrate Vulnerable Zones in Scotland. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 54(4), 477–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2010.515880>
- Barnes, A. P., Islam, M., Toma, L. (2013) Heterogeneity in climate change risk perception amongst dairy farmers: A latent class clustering analysis, *Applied Geography*, 41, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2013.03.011>.

- Barnes, AP., Thompson, B., & Toma, L. (2022). Finding the ecological farmer: a farmer typology to understand ecological practices within Europe. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, 4, (100125).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsust.2022.100125>
- Bartkowski, B., Schüßler, C. & Müller, B. Typologies of European farmers: approaches, methods and research gaps. *Reg Environ Change* **22**, 43 (2022).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-022-01899-y>
- Dolničar, S. (2004), "Beyond "commonsense segmentation": A systematics of segmentation approaches in tourism", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 244-250.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503258830>
- Eves, C., Johnson, M., Smith, S., Quick, T., Langley, E., Jenner, M., Richardson, W., Glynn, M., Anable, J. and Crabtree, B. (2015), "[Analysis of the potential effects of various influences and interventions on woodland management and creation decisions, using a segmentation model to categorise sub-groups](#)", Defra, London.
- Glenk, K., Thomson, SG., Burns, J., Liebe, U., & Potts, J. M. (2022). [Perceived legitimacy of agricultural support and priorities for a future support scheme in Scotland](#). SRUC.
- Graymore, M., Schwarz, I. and Brownell, B. (2015), "[Development of quick tool for farmer segmentation: Practical uses for extension work](#)", *Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 33-42.
- Hopkins, J., Sutherland, L.-A., Ehlers, M.-H., Matthews, K., Barnes, A. and Toma, L. (2017), "Scottish farmers' intentions to afforest land in the context of farm diversification", *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol. 78, pp. 122-132.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2017.01.014>
- Jansen, B. J., Jung, S.-G., Nielsen, L., Guan, K. W. and Salminen, J. (2022), "How to create personas: Three persona creation methodologies with implications for practical employment", *Pacific Asia Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 14 No. 3, p. 1. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1pais.14301>
- Schwarz, I., McRae-Williams, P. and Park, D. (2009), "[Identifying and utilising a farmer typology for targeted practice change programs: A case study of changing water supply in the Wimmera Mallee](#)", *Extension Farming Systems Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 33-42.
- Staddon, P. L., Urquhart, J., Mills, J., Goodenough, A., Powell, J. R., Vigani, M., Simmonds, P. and Rowe, E. (2021), "[Encouraging woodland creation, regeneration and tree planting on agricultural land: a literature review](#)", *Natural England*, pp. 1-126.
- Sutherland, L.-A., Barnes, A., McCrum, G., Blackstock, K. and Toma, L. (2011), "Towards a cross-sectoral analysis of land use decision-making in Scotland", *Landscape and urban planning*, Vol. 100 No. 1-2, pp. 1-10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2010.10.005>
- Tkaczynski, A., Rundle-Thiele, S. R. and Beaumont, N. (2009), "Segmentation: A tourism stakeholder view", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 169-175.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.05.010>
- Tu, N., Dong, X., Rau, P.-L. P. and Zhang, T. (2010), "Using cluster analysis in persona development", in *2010 8th International Conference on Supply Chain Management and Information*, pp. 1-5.
- Urquhart, J., Courtney, P., Slee, B. (2012) "Private woodland owners' perspectives on multifunctionality in English woodlands", *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28 (1),
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.08.006>



For further information contact:

Ian Merrell – ian.merrell@sruc.ac.uk

Lorna Pate – lorna.pate@sruc.ac.uk

[@RuralPolicySRUC](#)

This work was supported by the Scottish Government's [Strategic Research Programme 2022 to 2027](#) on environment, natural resources and agriculture that is managed by the **Rural and Environmental Science and Analytical Services Division**.

