

CONTRACT CT97-3044

EXCLUSION AND INTEGRATION DYNAMICS IN EUROPEAN
AGRICULTURE

Constantina Safiliou-Rothschild

With the collaboration of Sabine de Rooij, Bettina Bock, Maarit Sireni, Goran Djurfeldt and Pernille Gooch, Annie Rieu and Helene Cettolo

Pireas, February 2002

¹ The research was funded by Contract S)#2-CT97-3044 of DG XII. The composition of the research teams is as follows: Constantina Safiliou-Rothschild (Coordinator), National Center for Social Research in Greece; Sabine de Rooij and Bettina Bock, Wageningen Agricultural University in the Netherlands; Maarit Sireni, University of Joensuu in Finland; Goran Djurfeldt and Pernille Gooch, Lund University in Sweden; and Annie Rieu and Helene Cettolo, University of Toulouse in France.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
Introduction	5
CHAPTER ONE: THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION	7
CHAPTER TWO: WHO ARE THE SMALLHOLDERS ACROSS EUROPE	18
CHAPTER THREE: EUROPEAN DIFFERENTIALS IN RURAL LABOUR MARKET CONDITIONS	35
CHAPTER FOUR: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN SMALLHOLDERS' INTEGRATION OR EXCLUSION FROM THE AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION.	45
<i>A. Objective Indicators</i>	
a. Impact of national agricultural policies on smallholders' access to agricultural resources and services	45
b. Differential cost of production and marketing	50
c. Extent to which the number of small farms is decreasing	51
d. Differential access to membership in farmers' organizations	55
d. Differential access to agricultural training	59
f. Smallholders' access to agricultural information and advice	63
g. Smallholders' pluri-activity	63
<i>B. Subjective Indicators</i>	
a. Belonging and acceptance by farming community	67
b. Extent to which smallholders feel supported by farmers' organizations	70
c. Extent to which smallholders feel that CAP and national agricultural policies are supportive	74
Conclusions	80
CHAPTER FIVE: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN GENDER ISSUES AND THE ROLE OF GENDER ROLE IDEOLOGIES.	83
Men's and women's gender role ideology and beliefs regarding gender equality	83
Extent of husband's help with housework and child care	92

CHAPTER SIX: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN WOMEN SMALLHOLDERS' EXCLUSION FROM THE AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION	99
A. Women's integration at the institutional level	99
<i>A1. Objective Indicators</i>	
1. Women smallholders' access to membership in farmers' organizations	99
2. Women smallholders' access to agricultural training	110
3. Women's access to agricultural information and advice	113
4. Women farmers' representation in official agricultural statistics	116
<i>A2. Subjective Indicators</i>	
1. Women's belief regarding their recognition as farmers by local community.	117
B. Women's Integration at the Farm Level	118
<i>B1. Objective Indicators</i>	
1. Women's participation in farm labour	118
2. Women's participation in the decision making of the farm enterprise	123
3. Women's access to agricultural income	128
<i>B2. Subjective Indicators</i>	
a. Women's recognition as farmers by their husbands	130
C. <i>Correlates of Women's Integration/Exclusion</i>	133
Conclusions and Discussion	143
CHAPTER SEVEN: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN SMALLHOLDERS' SURVIVAL STRATEGIES	151
A. Prospects for the future: Economic viability and farm succession	151
B. Survival Strategies and options	160
CHAPTER EIGHT: EUROPEAN-WIDE AND COUNTRY- SPECIFIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	168
A. Theoretical Conclusions	168
B. Policy Implications of Research Findings	170
B1. Policy Recommendations Regarding Smallholders	174
B2. Indicators for the Monitoring of Smallholders' Integration/Exclusion	177

B3. Policy Recommendations Regarding Women Smallholders	178
B4. Indicators to Monitor the Integration of Women Smallholders	181

INTRODUCTION

The book is based on the research conducted by five research teams in Finland, France, Greece, the Netherlands and Sweden and coordinated by Greece. The main objectives of the research were : (a) the examination of the overt and hidden causes and mechanisms of farmers' social exclusion on the basis of farm size and gender; and (b) the identification of conditions and strategies conducive to the integration of all smallholders and of women smallholders in particular. Farm size and gender are, therefore, the fundamental analytical variables.

In addition to the final national research reports produced by the five teams, the comparisons required a considerable number of additional analyses, initiated by the project coordinator. The book, therefore, is by no means an edited version of the national research reports. Instead, it is a genuine synthesis of the research findings presented in the national reports as well as of a large number of additional analyses required for the cross-cultural comparisons.

Cross-cultural research is always quite difficult as it aims to achieve the portrayal of more universal trends, while retaining important cultural specificities. An effort has been made to satisfy both requirements of cross-cultural comparisons.

The research focuses on men and women smallholders, the "forgotten" farmers of Europe. Because of this, in all countries there were significant difficulties in defining and sampling smallholders, in some countries mainly because there has been a tendency to exclude smallholders, even from official agricultural statistics.

Based upon the conceptualization of exclusion and integration utilized in this synthesis, the design of the research and the analysis of the data were guided by the following research hypotheses:

1. Men and women smallholders' exclusion at the institutional level is hidden by the lack of official data on relevant indicators (access to agricultural training, access to membership and to decision making positions in agricultural organizations, access to agricultural advisors, etc.) desegregated by farm size and gender.
2. Men and women smallholders may exclude themselves from the agricultural profession at the farm and/or the institutional level for a number of different reasons, this exclusion being temporary (in the case of women with small children) or permanent.

3. Agriculturists' lack of contacts with smallholders is related to their institutional exclusion from the agricultural occupation.
4. Men smallholders significantly more often than women smallholders express their alienation from agricultural cooperatives and agricultural policies.
5. Flexible farm survival strategies that utilize men and women's farm labor, farm management and non-farm income contributions are positively related to smallholders' farm succession and sustainability.
6. When women's overall level of gainful employment is high, the lack of non-farm employment opportunities for women is positively related to their integration in the agricultural occupation.
7. Husband's pluri-activity is positively related to the wife's integration in the agricultural occupation.
8. The greater extent of women's involvement in farm labour is significantly related to women's integration in the agricultural occupation at both the farm and the institutional level.
9. Women who have received agricultural training have greater self-confidence as farmers and better chances to become recognized as farmers and integrated in the agricultural occupation.
10. When traditional/patriarchal gender role ideologies still prevail in rural areas, they are negatively related to women's integration in the agricultural occupation.
11. The lack of individualization of family members and of their roles in and contributions to the farm enterprise is to a considerable degree responsible for women smallholders' exclusion from the agricultural occupation.
12. Women farmers' official farmer status as a landowner, a farming partner, or a farm manager is positively related to women's integration in the agricultural occupation.
13. Membership in mainstream agricultural organizations is the most important indicator of women's institutional integration in the agricultural occupation.
14. Women's institutional integration in the agricultural occupation may not be necessarily related to their integration at the farm level.

CHAPTER ONE: THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

The Green Paper on European Social Policy (1993) describes social exclusion by emphasizing "... the structural nature of the process which excludes part of the population from economic and social opportunities... It affects not only individuals who have suffered serious setbacks but social groups (...) subject to discrimination, segregation or the weakening of the traditional forms of social relations... " Thus, exclusion is related to the way in which society functions: societies and economies through market and other types of inequalities systematically marginalize some and integrate others and distribute rewards in ways in which both exclude and integrate. "Exclusion occurs insofar as individuals are not well integrated into the mainstream groups around which society is constructed and also insofar as the dominant ideology does not recognize the importance of certain inequalities, for instance between genders" (Rodgers, 1994).

Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional concept with economic, social, socio-psychological, cultural and political dimensions. These dimensions are linked and interact with each other but are not necessarily congruent. Socially excluded groups may be excluded from some social or economic aspects and not from others. On the other hand, the inter linkage and interplay between the different dimensions can reinforce each other. Exclusion in one area can lead to exclusion in others (Rodgers, 1994).

The use of the general term 'social exclusion' has often created conceptual confusion. This is due to the fact that most people use the same term to refer to the economic, social and psychological dimensions of exclusion. The term "social" implies, however, difficulties in social relations and a diffuse exclusion from society in terms of social isolation, marginalization, feelings of alienation and powerlessness. This 'social' or rather the 'socio-psychological' aspect of exclusion is, however, only one aspect of exclusion that may be more salient for excluded groups that are 'stigmatized' such as, mentally ill, ex-convicts or ex-drug users and it was originally used in this context (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1999). The exclusion of these groups usually involves both exclusion from work as well as from most types of social relations.

In the context of this research, social exclusion refers to farmers' exclusion from the agricultural occupation because of their farm size and/or gender. The peculiar aspect of this type of exclusion is that they may be excluded from the

agricultural occupation but not from agricultural work. In the case of women smallholders, they are often included in farm work but excluded from farm management and from agricultural organizations. Although they may play an important or the most important role in the farm enterprise, their work contributions may not be 'counted'. Thus, smallholder women may be subjected to multiple exclusionary pressures as smallholders and as women.

Exclusion from the agricultural occupation can take place at the institutional level, the farm level and the interpersonal level (in relation to other farmers). Exclusion at the farm level refers to the exclusion from agricultural decision-making and farm management. Exclusion at the institutional level consists of not being accepted as members of agricultural organizations, not having access to agricultural credit and agricultural information, and not being considered eligible for EU and national subsidized agricultural programmes. Also they may not have access to agricultural training that is preferentially awarded to larger farmers.

Smallholders' exclusion from the agricultural occupation may also entail 'social' exclusion. They may also experience exclusion at the interpersonal level with other farmers and community members, when they do not feel accepted as professional farmers and are less influential due to the small size of their farm enterprise. This type of exclusion is experienced with feelings of social isolation, alienation and marginalization from mainstream agriculture, larger farmers and farmers' organizations and feelings of powerlessness with regard to promoting their own interests and to influencing policies and practices. They feel neglected and forgotten by the State, pessimistic about the future of smallholder agriculture and fearful that they will be obliged to become agricultural workers for larger farmers or to altogether abandon agriculture.

Furthermore, smallholder men's exclusion from agricultural institutions and resources may have different consequences for them than for smallholder women, for whom the agricultural professional identity may be less important and salient to their self-esteem. Thus, for some excluded women, this exclusion may not affect their self-esteem, social relations and standing in the community. Women's social integration may be achieved indirectly through their husbands and/or through their own integration in a variety of other social groups. Women may not experience professional exclusion as failure since their social integration depends to a large degree on their husband's characteristics, attitudes and behaviors (Lipietz, 1996). If

the husband wants to remain a full-time farmer and does not allow her to become actively involved in farm work and decision-making of the farm enterprise, she has no chance of becoming integrated. For excluded men, however, for whom the farmer identity may be salient to their self-esteem, there may be a number of social and psychological consequences, such as loss of social status, marginalization, social isolation, and feelings of powerlessness and alienation. Still it must be noted that whether or not smallholders subjected to exclusionary mechanisms will experience social exclusion depends mainly upon their definition of the situation (de Rooij 1996).

The exclusion literature makes the distinction between the concept of poverty and the concept of exclusion with the claim that poverty is «distributional» while exclusion is mostly «relational» (Room, 1994; Room, 1995; Schucksmith and Chapman, 1998). Again this distinction is due to the relatively greater emphasis given to the “social” aspects of exclusion (Room, 1995). In the case of exclusion from the agricultural occupation, however, this distinction is not clear or valid. Exclusion from the agricultural occupation involves “distributional” aspects, such as exclusion from valuable resources: agricultural training, agricultural credit and ineligibility for subsidized agricultural modernization programmes. Such exclusion, especially in the case of men smallholders, can also alienate them from the farmer community and make them feel powerless and isolated. It seems, therefore, that exclusion from the agricultural occupation is mainly «distributional», although it can also be “relational”. In fact the conceptual value of exclusion over poverty is that it encompasses both the situations and the processes and it points to the importance of the combination and interaction of distributional and relational components (de Haan, 1998; Bhalal and Lapeyre, 1999).

The social exclusion literature also states that exclusion is situated within a local context (Room, 1995). In the case of the exclusion from the agricultural occupation, however, the national, regional and international contexts are as important as the local context. Exclusion, for example, from agricultural improvement programmes is determined by local decisions regarding the implementation of European and national agricultural policies. An important such implementation decision is the adoption (in Greece and the Netherlands) of the family income instead of the individual farmer’s income in the determination of farmers’ eligibility for EU subsidized agricultural improvement programmes (See also later on in this chapter). In Greece, however, the exclusion from agricultural training of women smallholders

over 40 years old (who are the majority of Greek women farmers) is mainly due to the exaggerated emphasis on young farmers placed by the EU, that is not realistic in terms of the Greek reality.

At the institutional level, there are a number of overt, direct and indirect mechanisms of men and women smallholders' exclusion from agriculture. Agricultural and rural credit institutions overtly discriminate against smallholders and favour large, commercial farmers with regard to loans, agricultural subsidies and approval for participation in EU subsidized agricultural programmes. The existing exclusion is, however, hidden since available records do not provide breakdowns by farm size and gender and are legitimized by idiosyncratically interpreted EU agricultural policies and regulations.

Smallholders are viewed as marginal and on their way to extinction and, therefore, as not worth of support. Also their low level of general education and agricultural training marginalizes them as farming increasingly becomes modern and requires considerable agricultural knowledge. Furthermore, smallholders are deprived of agricultural information since there are no longer regular visits by extension workers. Agriculturists whether are bureaucrats working for the Ministry of Agriculture or are merchants of agricultural inputs, are not interested in smallholders, who they do not consider able to afford their products or advice and who they view as being in the process of extinction. They are mainly interested in larger farm owners, who are profitable clients and whom they befriend. In Greece, it has also been shown that the extension agriculturists distinguish farmers into 'dynamic' and non-dynamic ones and favour only the dynamic ones considered as having productive potential as farmers (Panagiotou *et al.*, 1994). Of course, smallholders are in most cases categorized as non-dynamic farmers. Furthermore, larger farmers can afford to pay the agricultural advisors of the private sector, while smallholders depend on the agriculturists of the Ministry of Agriculture, who do not want to lose their time with them.

Exclusion may exist at one level but not at others. Some women smallholders, for example, may be institutionally recognized as farmers but not by their husbands, so as not to be able to actively participate in the agricultural decision making of the farm enterprise. Such incongruities, between different levels at which exclusion occurs, raise important issues regarding the critical levels at which exclusion must be overcome, before it can be concluded that that integration has been achieved. Ideally,

of course, integration must exist at all levels. Short of this, it is important to determine whether or not integration at one level facilitates integration at other levels; and whether or not exclusion at one level prevents integration at other levels.

Gender is a crucial ground for exclusion from the agricultural occupation, since farming is considered to be a masculine occupation and husbands usually claim the farmer title, regardless of how much agricultural labour they contribute. Thus, in addition to the exclusion as smallholders, some women are also excluded from the agricultural occupation, because they are women. Previous research has shown that women smallholders on their own, mainly widows, can be recognized as heads of the farm enterprise and become integrated in the agricultural occupation. Married women, however, have had great difficulties to have their farm work and management contributions recognized at the household and the community level, because of the their husbands' presence, even when they were the substantive farm managers (Damianos, *et al.*, 1994). Furthermore, women smallholders face additional overt and hidden exclusion mechanisms resulting from the patriarchal values held by many agricultural officers, rural credit managers, agricultural trainers, presidents and secretaries of cooperatives and of rural communities, according to which women are not usually recognized as farmers.

All persons who are objectively excluded may not, however, experience such exclusion. This is due to the fact that an important aspect of social exclusion is the subjective element: "the feeling of exclusion from the dominant models of society may be as important in determining behavior as objective, material exclusion" (Rodgers, 1994). Some individuals may not feel excluded, although they can be considered excluded on the basis of objective criteria. This is often due to the internalization of an "inferior" status that further justifies for others and the society at large the processes of social exclusion (Andersen, *et al.*, 1994). Social exclusion can also be self-imposed through restrictive internalized values and norms. This has been often the case of women inflicted with low self-esteem. Gender relations entail all kinds of hidden forms of social exclusion such as sex-specific ideologies, sex stereotypes, sex-specific identities and sex-specific norms regarding role performance. Thus, women may impose on themselves some aspects of social exclusion because they espouse the definitions of a "typically female behavior", "typically male behavior," "good mother," and "good wife" (de Rooij, 1996). Some women internalize the stereotyped notions according to which agriculture is a masculine occupation and

accept to play a “helping”, invisible role to her husband. Also some women farmers hesitate to adopt professional strategies and to claim an independent entity as farmers, in order to avoid possible intra-familial conflicts and for the sake of family cohesion (Rieu, 1986).

Beyond the institutional level of social exclusion, for women smallholders very important causes and mechanisms of exclusion are located at the intra-household level. The mechanisms are most often hidden under the cover of «family» and entangled with the traditional definitions of the “proper” roles of men and women. One such cause for exclusion is women’s family responsibilities, housework and childcare. Women with small children may temporarily exclude themselves from agriculture. Another very important cause is the importance with which the husband vests his farmer identity as well as his beliefs regarding women’s ability and competence to perform agricultural tasks and to make agricultural decisions. When the husband feels very strongly about his identity as a farmer, he is not willing to share it or to transfer it to his wife, even when he has a full-time non-farm occupation. Furthermore, when he has little confidence to her farming ability, he tends to marginalize her and to treat her only as a “helper.” Yet another cause of women’s exclusion from agriculture at the farm level is the presence of parents, especially of her in-laws in the extended family. Their traditional, patriarchal values regarding the «proper» role of men and women can significantly influence the husband’s and/or the wife’s attitudes and behaviors. This influence is stronger when her parents or in-laws still own the farmland that is cultivated by the couple and are making many agricultural decisions. This pattern still exists in rural Greece and under these conditions, women become subjugated and face great difficulties to break through the different layers of traditional values and to gain recognition as farmers.

There are, of course, some women who are self-excluded. One such category are women with children under five years old who, unless they have a mother or a mother-in-law who is willing to take care of the children, are not able to actively participate in agricultural labour. This self-exclusion is usually temporary until their children grow up, since this type of self-exclusion disappears among women after the age of 40. Another category of more or less self-exclusion is that of women who become pluri-active with permanent jobs so that it is no longer possible for them to become integrated or are not interested in becoming integrated in the agricultural occupation. In Greece, women’s even part-time pluri-activity is a barrier to their

integration, because their pluri-active husbands cannot officially present them as full-time farmers when they want to transfer the farmer status to them. Finally, there is another numerically very small category of women who are not interested in agriculture and do not like agricultural work.

There are also some men and women smallholders who have in fact excluded themselves from the agricultural occupation at the institutional level. These are smallholders who, although are active farmers, have distanced themselves from agricultural institutions such as agricultural cooperatives and rural banks, because of accumulated disappointments regarding their functioning and the quality of services rendered. They are also cut off from agricultural information circuits as well as from access to agricultural resources. Furthermore, they discourage their children from succeeding them in agriculture and prepare them for other occupations. Their disengagement from agriculture will be sealed when they become quite old and will completely abandon agriculture.

Because integration in the agricultural occupation may be formal but not substantive and at two levels, the private, farm level of the farm enterprise and the public, institutional level, a different set of conditions must be fulfilled for different types of integration. It is, therefore, possible for women to be formally integrated at the institutional level in the agricultural occupation but not be substantively integrated at the level of the farm enterprise. Also it is possible for women to be actively involved in the agricultural labour and decision making of the farm enterprise but not be formally or substantively integrated at the public, institutional level.

Previous research has shown that women report being the heads of the farm enterprise and cooperative members significantly more often when husbands are pluri-active than when they are full-time farmers (Githarakou, 1994). It seems, however, that husband's pluri-activity is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for wife's integration. The wife's high degree of involvement in agricultural labour and more so than the husband and the husband's recognition of the wife as a farmer, that allows her to be active in the agricultural decision making of the farm enterprise, are the additional necessary and sufficient conditions for women's substantive integration at the farm level.

The professional exclusion of women smallholders may be experienced at different levels that are not necessarily interrelated. At the institutional level, women are often professionally excluded primarily because it is their husband who is

recognized as the farmer (even when he may not be fully integrated because he is a smallholder), regardless of the extent to which they are the *de facto* farmers. While women's considerable extent of involvement in farm work (greater or equal to that of her husband) diminishes considerably their chances of being excluded, it is not sufficient to guarantee their integration in the agricultural profession at any of the two levels. A crucial intervening variable is the importance of the farmer status for men's self-image that may lead to women's exclusion in order for men's farmer status to be safeguarded.

Women smallholders' exclusion at the farm level involves their exclusion from the agricultural decision-making and the management of the farm, even when they perform a considerable extent of the farm labour. Furthermore, exclusion at this level may take place even when women have been nominally integrated at the institutional level (in terms of membership in agricultural organizations) either because of opportunistic reasons (such as in order to maintain the full-time farmer status) or as a result of egalitarian ideological and policy pressures. In Greece, for example, women may be members of cooperatives and may be registered as the full-time farmers receiving EU subsidies, but may not be active participants in farm labour and farm management. This occurs when their pluri-active husbands have legally transferred the farmer status to them without relinquishing their farmer status in the decision-making and the management of the farm. Similarly in Finland and Sweden but for different reasons, the woman may be a member of cooperatives and farmers' unions because of prevailing egalitarian gender policies and practices, but may be excluded from farm decision-making and management.

As measures of smallholders' professional exclusion at the institutional level, the studies focus on men's access to agricultural cooperatives and farmers' unions as well as to agricultural subsidies and to EU or national subsidized agricultural programmes.

As measures of smallholders' professional exclusion at the interpersonal level, the studies focus on smallholders' feelings of alienation, powerlessness and isolation within the context of farmers' organizations that cause them to not attend meetings or even to abstain from membership in these organizations. The measure, therefore, is feelings of uneasiness, inadequacy as farmers as well as feelings that farmers' organizations support only larger farmers and do not represent them or support their

interests, these feelings leading to lack of active participation or to self-exclusion from these organizations.

As measures of women's professional exclusion at the institutional level, the studies focus on access to membership in agricultural cooperatives and farmers' unions and to EU and national subsidized agricultural programmes. In addition, with the exception of the two Nordic countries (Sweden and Finland) in which access to agricultural training is available to all and not related to farm size, in the other three countries (France, Netherlands and Greece) such access is hypothesized to be an important factor of professional integration at the farm and at the institutional level. At the farm level, on the other hand, women's active participation in the agricultural decision-making and the management of the farm is defined as the crucial measure of women's professional integration.

In Finland, two additional criteria were used for the determination of whether or not women are integrated in agriculture at the farm level: whether or not the husband recognizes the wife as a farmer; and: whether or not men and women share equally the agricultural income. While the sharing of the agricultural income constitutes a very important indicator of women's integration, it could not be used in the other countries because it does not represent a meaningful and realistic indicator in the other cultural contexts. Also the husband's recognition of the wife as a farmer, while included in all country studies it did not prove to be a reliable and sensitive indicator of women's integration.

In conclusion, the concept of integration/exclusion is a dynamic concept that provides a good picture of the position of men and women smallholders within the agricultural sector, at the level of farm enterprise as well as at the institutional level of farmers' organizations and official agricultural institutions. It is possible for both men and women smallholders to move from exclusion to integration, as they change their perceptions and behaviors or as conditions at the macro-level change. Examples of macro-social changes include national and EU agricultural policies and regulations that may favour smallholders or specifically women smallholders or rural labour market conditions that favour men's or women's non-farm employment.

References

- Andersen, J, *et al.*, “Contribution of the ‘Poverty 3’ Programme to the Understanding of Poverty, Exclusion and Integration,” paper presented at the Seminar on the Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion, held in Bath, U. K., 17-18 June.
- Bhalla, A.S. and F. Lapeyre (1999). *Poverty and Exclusion in a Global World*, London/New York: MacMillan Press Ltd./St. Martin’s Press Inc.
- Damianos, *et al.*, 1994. *The Pluri-activity in the Agricultural Sector and Development Policy in Greece*, Athens: Foundation for Mediterranean Studies (in Greek).
- Githarakou, Isavella, 1994. “Work Relations in the Family Farms. Position and Perspectives of Farm Women,” in: *Government and Rural Space*, Proceedings of the Third Panhellenik Congress on Agricultural Economics, Athens: Papazisis, pp.453-467 (in Greek).
- De Haan, A.S. (1998). “Social Exclusion. An Alternative Concept for the Study of Deprivation,” *DS Bulletin*, Vol. 29, no. 1, pp.10-19.
- Lipietz, A. (1996). *Le Capital et son espace*, Paris: Maspero.
- Panagiotou, A. *et al.*, 1994. “The Need to Differentiate the Functioning of Agricultural Extension in Greece,” in: *Government and Rural Space*, Proceedings of the Third Panhellenik Congress on Agricultural Economics, Athens: Papazisis (in Greek).
- Rieu, A., 1986, “Le role de l’engagement professionnel dans la vie quotidienne des Agricultrices,” (The role of professional involvement in the every day laife of women farmers), paper presented at the Seminar on Life, Work and Health in Agriculture, Toulouse, France.
- Rodgers, G. *et al.* (1994), *Overcoming Exclusion: Livelihoods and Rights in Economic and Social Development*, Discussion paper no. 72, Geneva: Institute for Labour Studies.
- De Rooij, S. (1996), typewritten contribution to the conceptualization of social exclusion.
- Room, G. (1994). “Poverty Studies in the EU: Retrospect and Prospect”, paper presented at the Conference on ‘Understanding Social Exclusion: Lessons from Trans-National Research Studies’ at the Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Room G. (1995). “Poverty and Social Exclusion: The New European Agenda for Policy and Research,” in G.Room (Ed.), *Beyond the Threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Schuchsmith, M. and P. Chapman (1998), “Rural Development and Social

Exclusion,” *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38 (2): 225-242.

Sireni, M. (2000), *The Finish National Report on the Causes and Mechanisms of Social Exclusion of Women Smallholders*, Final Report of TSER CT97-3044, University of Joensuu, May.

CHAPTER TWO: WHO ARE THE SMALLHOLDERS ACROSS EUROPE

Across Europe there is great diversity in the extent and type of family farming and rurality, this diversity evident virtually in all indicators of economic and social performance. There are also enormous differences in existing institutional and policy frameworks, practices and actions, according to the level of economic and social development. In this way smallholders' identity across Europe depends significantly upon the different interconnections of productive sectors, human capital capacities and natural resources.

The differentials in level of economic development are evident from the fact that the countries involved in this research are classified under different EU policy objectives. In the case of Greece the entire country is classified under objective One, that is, as needing multi-sectoral action on the part of EU and as requiring structural policies in all development actions. Different parts of France and the Netherlands are classified under objective One, objective 5a (as areas suffering from particular disadvantages, such as problems in processing) and objective 5b (as areas having problems in rural development). Finally, different parts of Finland and Sweden are classified under objective 5a, objective 5b and objective 6, the latter being a new objective that concerns the support of problematic areas with small population density. These differences imply different policy priorities, measures and aims and different policy support to farmers channelled through the EU. Of course, in each country there are also different national agricultural policies. All these differences render the picture quite complex, especially if one takes into consideration that agriculture plays a different role in each of these countries.

Table 1 provides a first picture of the differential role of agriculture in each one of the five countries. Greece contains a large number of farm enterprises with the smallest average farm size in the EU. All other countries have a relatively small number of farm enterprises, in comparison with their population and utilised agricultural area (UAA), with an average farm size that equals or exceeds significantly the average EU size of 17.4 hectares. Moreover, those employed in the primary sector represent one fifth of the total employed population in Greece, exceeding by far the EU average. Apart from Finland where also those employed in the primary sector exceed the EU average, the three remaining countries are under the EU average.

The final agricultural production is larger in France and in the Netherlands, while in the other three countries it represents a much smaller amount. In terms of the share of agriculture in each country's GDP, Greece still seems to depend significantly on agriculture, having a share three and a-half times larger than the EU average. France and the Netherlands have a share somewhat higher than the EU average and the two Nordic countries have a much smaller share than the EU average. Finally, food and agriculture products represent a large proportion of Greece's, France's and the Netherlands' exports, thus showing a high degree of dependence upon agriculture, while the two Nordic countries have a small share near the EU average.

Moreover, there are significant differences among the five countries in terms of agricultural employment (see Table 2). The average annual work unit (AWU)¹ per person varies between 0.4 in Greece and 0.7 in the Netherlands. Thus, underemployment in agriculture is normally the case in Greece. Even when the AWU per farm is calculated, the average is only 0.8 in Greece and 1.9 in the Netherlands. Again Greek farm enterprises absorb on average less than one AWU, while in the rest of the countries farm enterprises absorb more than one AWU.

The contribution of members of family farm enterprises is significant and varies significantly from country to country. First, farm heads' contribution in AWU is nearly half of the total labour contribution in Greece, France and Sweden, while it is significantly smaller in the Netherlands and Finland. Spouses' (usually farmers' wives) contributions exceed one-fourth of total labour contributions in Greece, while it is only 11% in the Netherlands. In the rest of the countries, spouses' share varies between 16% and 19%. The proportion of labour provided by other family members (children and others) is very important in Finland (41%), while it is very low in Sweden (5%). Labour contributions of regularly employed non-family members appear to be significant in the Netherlands, Sweden and France, while it is minimal in Greece and Finland. Labour contributions of irregularly employed non-family members, on the other hand are significant in Greece due to the recent influx of legal and illegal immigrants, while in the other countries such

¹ The annual work unit (AWU) differs by country varying from 1,800 hours per year in Ireland to 2,200 hours in France and Greece.

Table 1. Key agricultural statistics, 1997

Countries	UAA (1,000 ha)	Number of holdings (1,000)	UAA per holding	Number of employed in the primary sector	% of employed in the primary sector in the total employed population	Final production of agriculture (Mio ECU)	Share of agriculture in the GDP (GVA/GDP)	% of exports of food and agricultural products in export of all products
Greece	3,465	802	4.5	765	19.9	8,815	5.9	29.9
France	30,168	735	38.5	1,029	4.6	46,953	1.9	13.6
Netherlands	1,848	113	17.7	251	3.5	16,385	2.6	21.4
Finland	2,150	101	21.7	164	7.7	2,306	0.7	7.9
Sweden	3,177	89	34.4	127	3.2	3,333	0.4	6.1
EU mean	134,261	7,370	17.4	7,434	5.0	217,538	1.6	7.6

Source: EC, 1999, pp. T24-25.

Table 2. Agricultural Employment Characteristics, 1995

Countries	Average AWU/persons working on agricultural holdings	Average AWU per agricultural holding	% of AWU provided by farm heads	% of AWU provided by spouses	% of AWU provided by other family members	% of AWU provided by regularly employed non-family members	% of AWU provided by irregularly employed non-family members	% of farmers over 55 years of age	% of farmers with other gainful activity
Greece	0.4	0.8	49.8	25.7	11.7	1.2	11.6	41.2	25.6
France	0.6	1.4	47.8	17.1	13.9	13.5	7.7	16.7	24.7
Netherlands	0.7	1.9	42.1	11.0	19.3	23.8	3.8	18.5	24.3
Finland	0.6	1.8	37.5	18.8	41.0	1.0	1.7	20.7	50.4
Sweden	0.5	1.0	53.2	16.3	4.7	20.9	4.9	32.4	54.4
EU mean	0.4	0.9	46.3	17.2	16.5	10.9	9.1	28.1	29.0

Source: EC, 1999, pp. T122-123.

contributions are less than the EU average.

Over half of all EU farmers are over 55 years of age. The proportion of farmers over 55 in Greece and Sweden exceeds the EU average and in the other countries is below the EU average of 28% (it ranges from 17% to 21% of all farmers). Finally, the proportion of farmers with other non-farm gainful activity differs significantly. It represents one fourth of farmers in Greece, France and the Netherlands and exceeds half of the total number of farmers in Finland and Sweden. In all countries, however, these percentages are much higher among smallholders, who are pluri-active much more often than larger farmers.

While the EU average number of full-time workers required to farm 100 ha. is five, in Greece nearly 16 people are needed on the average. Greek agriculture is less labour intensive when compared to the French and the Dutch agriculture, while agriculture in the two Nordic countries is in fact a small business. However, agriculture constitutes a central characteristic for Greek countryside and the overall economy, while for the rest of the countries primary production seems to be outmoded.

The diversity of small farms among the five countries becomes clear when we examine the distribution of farm enterprises by size. Table 3 shows that in Greece, the

Table 3. Distribution of farms by utilized area in percentages, 1995

Countries	< 5 ha	5-10 ha	10-20 ha	20-50 ha	50ha<	Total
Greece	75.1	15.0	6.8	2.7	0.4	773.8
France	27.3	9.5	12.1	24.1	27.0	734.8
Netherlands	33.0	16.0	18.4	26.3	6.3	113.2
Finland	10.5	17.7	30.0	35.0	6.7	101.0
Sweden	12.4	17.5	21.4	27.8	20.9	88.8
EU-15	56.8	13.0	10.6	11.5	8.0	7,341.5

Source: GraphAgri Europe, 1999, p. 48.

majority of farms are smaller than 5 hectares, while a little more than one-fourth of all farms in France and one-third of all farms in the Netherlands are of the same small size. In Finland and Sweden, on the other hand, only a little more than one-tenth of all farms are so small, while 47.7% of all farms in Finland and 38.9% of all farms in Sweden have 5-20 hectares. In this way, the importance of smallholders is significantly related to the national context of agriculture. This implies that comparisons between smallholders can only take place given the context of each

country and of its particularities in the structure and the dynamics of the primary sector. Consequently, one may not speak about a unified group of smallholders across Europe, but of a multi-collective entity which takes its meaning in the national and regional socio-economic context.

The problems of defining smallholders across Europe

Each research team stressed the difficulties involved in providing a theoretical definition of smallholders. However, the aim of the project was not to construct a theory for smallholders' dynamics, but to relate smallholders' situation with the wider economic, social, political and institutional national context. As a result, in the following paragraphs follows the basic discussion concerning the definition of smallholders in each country.

In the Greek case, there is a general problem in constructing sub-groups of farmers according to different criteria. The reason for that is that the majority of farm enterprises in the country are small family farms and there are two important problems that make the attempt to define smallholders difficult. First, there is a virtual absence of any general (pragmatological) illustration of the social and economic position of different farmer groups. And, second, there is a strong ideological and political connotation of concepts relating to the study of the situation of different farmer types and of their chances for agricultural development and modernization. Moreover, until now the study of small-scale farming has not been a concrete subject of analysis in Greece. Usually, the notion of small-scale farms is systematically obscured through the use of characterizations such as 'family farming', 'farmer' and 'agricultural ownership'. The term 'family farming' is often used regardless of type of enterprise and obscures the existing divisions of labour between men and women as well as their differential extent of employment and management responsibility within the farm enterprise. As for the label 'farmer', this still remains a general characterization and does not necessarily have a professional connotation, normally including some indication of the position in employment, the size of the farm or the social status of an actor. These socioeconomic characteristics are usually implied and even more often are defined uniformly (e.g. as petty bourgeois) or dualistically (e.g. bourgeois vs. proletarians) by rural researchers. Finally, often 'agricultural ownership' is considered as a multi-collective category by the National Statistical Service of Greece, that includes virtually a large number of land use types and that does not

constitute a strictly characterized geographical area. Very often agricultural land is transformed to urban land or is utilized for other productive or consumption operations (industrial, tourist, services or recreation) that in turn constitute a significant factor for the geographical and social differentiation of rural areas and of agricultural ownership.

Furthermore, there has not been a sufficient and clear distinction between the various types of farm family enterprises that are included or underlie different conceptual constructions. The real reason for this 'uncertainty' is the insufficient distinction between urban and agricultural ownership that is even more intense in coastal, peri-urban or tourist areas that present significant tourist and/or housing development interest. This so-called 'uncertainty' of land use is even more intensified due to the virtual absence of planning or land policy that would define distinctively and definitively land use in the Greek countryside. As a result, the terms: family farming, farmer and agricultural ownership are only conventional categories that conceal the existing differentiation in rural space, as well as the social differentiation of farm enterprises and, in extension, of the small farms.

In the French case, the very small farms are often marginal, maintained by old people and are no longer dynamic farm enterprises or are farms in which women's non-farm full-time employment is the most important source of income. Only in the mountainous zones, as in the area of Midi-Pyrenees, in which the study was undertaken, it is possible to find small dynamic farm enterprises.

In the Netherlands, the utilized concept of smallholders is a dynamic concept. The same can be said for the category of farms that belong to this group. Many farms that have been defined as small in the past, either disappeared or expanded and are now included in another statistical category. At the same time, the boundaries of what is defined as a small farm have moved continuously. So what used to be considered as a middle-size farm ten years ago is currently categorized as small. Smallholders were identified on the basis of standard production costs and profits summed up for each production unit, in order to enable the comparison of farms of different sectors. This is a unit of measure, which is used not only within the Netherlands but also by the European Union, using EURO as the base for calculation. According to the customary

definition, farms sized between 3 and 40 nge² (3.96-52.8 bss) are considered small farms.

In the Netherlands, agricultural institutions such as the Agricultural Statistical Office, extension services, and banks have rather explicit ideas about the character of farms within the different size categories. Thus, farms included in the smallholder' group are considered to be non-viable farms, since they are thought of as too small to survive. The second group of medium-size farms (40-79 nge) is considered as viable in a limited way. Extra sources of income are considered to be necessary to guarantee a sufficient income level. The third group of larger farmers (over 70 nge) is perceived as being definitely viable. Indications of the shifting definition of smallholders in agriculture can also be derived from the exclusion of the very small farms from the statistics. Since 1988, the Dutch Central Statistical Office excludes farms below 3 nge (3.96 bss) from official statistics. Also the Dutch institute LEI-DLO, which collects and analyses the accounting data of a sample of about one thousand farms (except horticulture), when making their standard calculations of farm development and production results, includes only farms above the size of 16 nge (21 bss). The specific farming-style of smaller farms is, thus, much less reflected in those figures than the farming-styles of larger farms. This may have a number of disadvantageous results for smallholders, as the Ministry of Agriculture uses these calculations for policy-making. It is, thus, clear that the definition used by the Dutch team is a normative one and based on an ideal type of farm, readjusted from time to time.

In the Finnish case, there does not seem to be a problem in identifying smallholders in agriculture but a problem of distinguishing them as a distinct category. It is clearly recognized that the key problem of small family farms is not lack of technological advancement but the fact that small farms are over-mechanized. Also small farms are able to market their produce through the same channels as large farms. Practically all active modern farms operate in the market economy. An important issue, however, is the inequality between small and larger farms caused by differences in the amount of farm produce, and therefore differences in income. In fact it is difficult for small family farms to compete with large ones when they produce the same basic agricultural products, especially because the agricultural policy aims at improving the competitive strength of large farms.

² One nge=1.43 bss (bruto standard saldo in ecu=average gross balance=output/production unit-direct costs/production unit).

However, there appears to be some ambivalence over the concept of Finnish smallholders. In the sense in which this concept is traditionally understood in Finnish social scientific research, smallholders no longer exist: the concept of smallholdings belongs to the era before the mechanization of agriculture and forestry and the birth of a modern specialized family farm (Alanen *et al*, 1973; Oksa, 1984). In Finland, however, small family farms are considered to be the smallholders, because they fulfill the characteristics specified by the project. The very large farms of over 100 ha. are rare in Finland, but the field area per holding is continuously increasing. Thus, the trend towards the increase of the farm size has led to a historical relativity of the concepts connected to farm size. As a result, the concept of the small farm seems to be changing along the socioeconomic process in agriculture. Thus, the concept of small farm is becoming only a historical and operational category that should be used in the particular contemporary economic and social context.

The Swedish team recognized the problems related to finding a workable definition of smallholders and reviewed existing current definitions. The Statistical Service of Sweden has used for some time the measure of 400 standard hours of farm work for defining smallholders. Standard hours are calculated from farm characteristics: its acreage, crop pattern and livestock. Assuming a standard technology, these data can be converted into a standard time, indicating how many hours of work are needed to run the farm with standard technology. Swedish statisticians regard standard hours as an underestimation of real time use among the smaller units. In terms of real time use, then, units below 400 standard hours may lie higher, and not so far from one of the following EU definitions.

In the EU system, on the other hand, there are two statistical conventions. One is the Eurostat version, which uses a standard time concept related to the Swedish one, but considered more conservative, in the sense that real time use may be even more underestimated than in the Swedish system. In the Eurostat system, however, there is no designation of smallholders as such. The other European system, that of the EU Commission's own FADN data, is built on time use as estimated by the farmers themselves. The system recognizes a maximum of 1,800 hours per year, and works with quarters of this. Again there is no official definition of smallholders, but they could be defined as either below a quarter year, or as below half a year. Neither of these definitions is strictly comparable to the Swedish one, while on the other hand,

Sweden has not yet started to implement EU standards. Thus there are presently no means of comparing conditions in Sweden to those in other countries.

The Swedish team considered all the above definitions as problematic. If they defined smallholders as all holdings below a certain limit, defined in standard time, some measure income or even acreage, they would be bound to get a large share of part-time farms in the sample. In other words, they would get many farms that are leisure or hobby farms, or clearly a sideline to a major occupation. Defining smallholders as all farms below a certain limit could not, therefore, solve the problem of sampling. Thus, the Swedish team concluded that there seems to be no ready-made and problem-free definition of smallholders, already agreed upon in the EU and it recognized that it is not realistic to expect the five-country project to reach a consensus over a theoretically grounded definition of smallholders. They, therefore, applied an operational definition of smallholder that arose out of previous research undertaken by them. After having modified and adapted it to the requirements of the study, they utilized a sample of farmers selected in 1992 that, although technically representative of the entire country, it includes the different major production zones of Sweden.

As a result of the above discussed problems, there has not been a common definition of smallholders across the five countries. Instead, there are five different operational definitions of smallholders that take into account the particular national agricultural and socio-economic context in each country.

The Selection of National Samples

In all countries, a number of selection criteria were agreed upon for the stratification of the sample in such a way as to allow the testing of the major hypotheses. The age criterion specifying the selection of men less than 55 years old and of women less than 50 years old, helped ensure that the selected farmers are still active and that there is no compounding effect of age-based social exclusion. The marital status criterion specifying the selection of married or couples living together allowed to study the dynamics of gender-based exclusionary mechanisms inhibiting the recognition of women as farmers when a husband is present, who traditionally is considered to be the farmer. The limited non-farm employment status in the selection of women, specifying that the selected women must not be work more than 20 hours a week in a non-farm occupation, allowed to study the integration chances of women

who are or could have been active in agriculture. It must also be noted that while men and women smallholders were the research target population, all research teams included a certain percentage of relatively larger farmers, in order to be able to assess the impact of farm size on men and women farmers' integration in the agricultural occupation.

The Greek team defined as smallholders those farmers who had less than 4.5 hectares and a mainly extensive agricultural production system (that is, arable crops and animal husbandry, mainly sheep and goats). Farmers with small farm size but with an intensive cultivation of arable crops (e.g. industrial crops), vegetables and trees were not included, because their incomes are high and cannot be considered as smallholders. Moreover, very small farm enterprises, i.e. less than one hectare, were excluded from the sample, since they provide the basis mainly for hobby farming or self-consumption. The sampling technique aimed at providing a stratified research population containing both men and women farmers. Furthermore, although nearly all respondents were selected among married couples, the research team also included a small number of single men in mountainous villages where men encounter great difficulties in securing a wife³. Young women prefer to marry a man living in the plain or a city and to thus escape the isolation of mountainous villages.

Preliminary field work in Greece showed that it was very difficult to interview the husbands of women who were active in agriculture, mainly because the majority of them held a full-time non-farm employment, often away from the village. Because of this, the interviewed men are not related to the interviewed women and constitute, in fact, an altogether different farm population with different salient characteristics. The majority of these men are full-time farmers (and landowners) and for this reason they could be located in the villages for interviews. This sampling allowed the Greek team to better cover the diversity of farmers' characteristics and attitudes in two distinct farm populations found in all villages sampled and to show existing biases in previous research studies that interviewed only men farmers.

The prefectures included in the study were selected on the basis of the following six indicators available in 1991 Census of Agriculture and Livestock:

- 1) proportion of small farm enterprises (under 5 ha);
- 2) proportion of women's workdays in the farm enterprise;

³ Similar patterns have been documented in other countries such as the Netherlands and parts of Sweden.

- 3) proportion of males having farming as a secondary occupation;
- 4) age distribution of men and women farm owners;
- 5) proportion of women farm owners;
- 6) proportion of women farm owners over 65 years of age.

In this way, it was possible to select prefectures with a high proportion of smallholders and a high proportion of men holding non-farm employment as well as a relatively high proportion of women farm owners or active farmers in different agricultural contexts.

The selection of villages was made on the basis of the following indicators from data available in the 1991 Census of Agriculture and Livestock: Proportion of farm owners under 40 years of age; proportion of women in the agriculturally employed population; and proportion of non-farm employed males. Finally, the lists of farmers to be interviewed were constructed on the basis of the information contained in the Farmers' Register for each village regarding farm size, age and farmer status (that is, whether the man is a full-time farmer or only a farm owner with a full-time non-farm employment). These initial lists were then examined with the community presidents or secretaries in each village who were able to provide information concerning marital status and residence in the village.

The empirical research took place in four areas: Karditsa, Evia, Chania and Lesvos, that provided diverse research settings in terms of farming systems, non-farm opportunities, male farmers' pluri-activity and prevailing gender role ideology that allow the testing of the research hypotheses. The non-response rate was below five percent and concentrated in a few villages in Chania, Crete.

The French team used an operational definition of smallholders in their country. In order to satisfy the criteria of having women less than 50 years old and not working more than 20 hours per week outside agriculture, the team created their sample partly by using the census lists of agricultural enterprises and partly by consulting with agriculturists and regional departments of agriculture. The empirical research took place in six different regions: Ariège, Aveyron, Gers, Haute Garonne, Hautes-Pyrenees, and Tarn and Garonne in all of which, it was possible to identify small farms that are active and not marginalized. They report very few cases of non-response and the sample is representative of small, subsidized and dynamic smallholders in the region.

The Dutch team adopted an operational definition, which considered farms sized between 3 and 40 nge as small farms. In order for size-specific comparisons to be possible also some larger farms from the next size category of 40-70 nge were selected (representing 10% of the sample) and subdivided the group of small farms into small and medium-sized farms. Even farms with 40-70 nge are not really large farms but rather medium-sized farms when compared to the rest of farms in the Netherlands. The empirical research was carried out in five different agricultural regions where smallholders are over-represented: Frisia, Veluwe and Achterhoek, northern Brabant and Limburg and in three agricultural sectors: horticulture, dairy farming and intensive husbandry. The team interviewed married (or living together) women and men. The other stratification criteria were the age of the farm-head (men under 55 years of age and women under 52 years) and the selection of only women whose work off the farm was limited to on average of 20 hours a week. The criterion regarding women's limited non-farm work was easy, since in the Netherlands married women are seldom engaged in full-time paid work. It was more difficult to abide to the age criterion, as especially in the horticultural sector smallholders tend to be relatively old. Because of this, the team had to include some respondents above the age limit to arrive at a satisfactory number of respondents.

The final selection of respondents was made by an agricultural mailing office, which sells addresses for various purposes and claims to cover 80-90% of all agricultural enterprises in any region in the Netherlands. It must be noted that because the interviews were undertaken during a time of agricultural crisis in the country, the response rate was very low-20%. Despite this low response rate, however, the sample was found to represent rather well the reality of the population of Dutch smallholders with regard to the incidence of pluri-activity and the distribution of agricultural sectors as well as with regard to involvement in farm work and participation in the farm union. Only the frequency of husband-wife partnerships is more frequent than in the general population of smallholders due to the over-representation of younger farm households with married (or cohabiting) couples. Also the sample is relatively younger than the population of Dutch smallholders.

The Finnish team referred to small family farms rather than smallholdings, since only 0,5% of farms specialize in green house cultivation that requires only a small land area (Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 1999). Because the cultivated field area owned or hired by active farms is, on the average, 24

ha. (*Ibid.*), according to present criteria, farms with less than 20 ha. of field area, can be considered as smallholdings. Thus, all farms included in the study have a size smaller than 20 ha.

Because the common characteristic agreed upon was that the women in the sample had to not work more than 20 hours per week outside the farm, in practice, this meant that the interviewed women generally work solely in agriculture, because part-time work contracts are not common in Finland. Some of the women, however, receive income from outside agriculture in the form of different social income transfers, mainly because they take care of small children.

The Finnish sample was selected from the register of rural occupations of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and included municipalities belonging to three different regions: North Karelia, Päijät-Häme and South Savo. The sample represents a considerable part of the target population. For some of the municipalities, the whole population fulfills the selection criteria and was included in the study. Thus, in municipalities situated in the province of North Karelia, 65 percent of the women fulfilling the selection criteria were interviewed. Altogether 60 percent of the women in the population meeting the criteria were interviewed. Farms in the entire farm population and the sample do not differ from each other significantly as to their field area. Farms in the population own on average 13 ha. whereas farms in the sample have 12 ha. Also farms in the entire farm population and the sample do not differ as to their line of production: 51 percent of the farms in the entire farm population and 53 percent of the farms in the sample are dairy farms. The remaining farms are crop producing (22%), livestock breeding farms (17%) and a few (9%) mixed production farms.

The Swedish team used a definition of smallholders that includes different types of farms⁴, excluding only large farms dependent on hired labour. Because “housewives” no longer exist in Sweden, especially among women below 50 years of age, the criterion agreed upon of women not working more than 20 hours per week off the farm, had to be changed into women working at least 20 hours per week on the farm. This allowed the Swedish team to include women who after working half time or more in non-farm jobs, contribute 20 or more hours per week to farm work. Thus,

⁴ The different types include ‘non-professional’ farms, i.e. ‘transference and part-time farms’ and ‘notional family farms’ (Djurfeldt, 1998). In ‘transference’ farms, farmers work most of the time in the

the Swedish sample includes to a considerable extent part-time farm women who combine activity in horse farming with a full-time job outside the farm.

The Swedish team encountered great difficulties in locating active women farmers below the age of 50. This is due to a high degree of masculinization of agriculture and to many rural women's holding non-farm wage employment. Also the fieldwork met considerable difficulties because of long distances between farmers. Typically, Swedish farms are not concentrated in villages but are spread out over the landscape, often with large tracts of forest in between. Given the low rate of women farmers, this meant long traveling distances between interviews. Because the phase of interviewing women took longer than anticipated, men farmers were interviewed by means of a mailed questionnaire. In addition, the interviews with women farmers included a number of factual questions about their husbands, regarding education, membership in agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, participation in agricultural protests, etc. It must also be noted that in one area, Scania, six in-depth interviews were conducted with women key informants.

The research was undertaken in municipalities in four different areas: Skåne, Västergötland, Norrland and Småland. The reported non-response rate is relatively high reaching 32% for some categories of interviewed farmers⁵. Although the sample is not truly representative of the whole country, when comparisons are possible between the sample and the farm population in the entire country, the figures are very close.

All national research teams used the same method, i.e. semi-structured interviews that were based upon a questionnaire that contained closed, semi-structured and/or open questions. However, additional data were drawn from interviews with agriculturists, key informants, the study of the literature, the analysis of the official national and regional statistics and the construction of composite indicators measuring aspects of smallholders' and women's integration/exclusion in agriculture. About 80% of the questions were the same in all countries but every team included also some country-specific questions. It must be noted that in comparison with other countries, the Dutch questionnaire focused somewhat more on the development of the farm, while the Swedish questionnaire gave more emphasis on the qualitative analysis

farm but have transferences as a major source of income. In part-time farms, farmers work more than half of their time off the farm and subsist from a combination of farm and off-farm income.

of exclusion and integration dynamics. Finally, the Greek study used a more detailed questionnaire for men respondents than in the other countries, since their wives were not interviewed and all farm-related information had to be derived from these interviews. Also the larger Greek sample allows the study of two co-existing distinct farm populations, the one resulting from interviewing men respondents and the other from interviewing women respondents.

All research teams used the SPSS for the quantitative analysis of their findings.

Each research team used different techniques in order to locate the target group. The reasons for these differences include the criteria used for the selection of the sample of smallholders, the problems of accessibility of men and women smallholders, difficulties involved in satisfying the stratification criteria and extent of dispersion of the farm population. Given specific constraints and problems in each country, each team interviewed a different number of men and women and a different number of smallholders and larger farmers (Table 4) and encountered different rates on non-response. Despite these difficulties, the samples can be considered representative of the population of smallholders in all countries and allow the testing of the research hypotheses.

⁵ No information is reported as whether the non-response rate for smallholders was lower or higher than for larger farmers.

Table 4. Distribution of the national samples by farm category and gender

	Men				Women				Total	
	Small size	Medium size (a)	Medium size (b)	Large size	Small size	Medium size (b)	Medium size (b)	Large size	Men	Women
Greece	78 (87%)	12 (13%)	-	-	178 (87%)	42 (13%)	-	-	90	206
France	6 (9%)	26 (37%)	20 (28%)	19 (27%)	23 (16%)	53 (37%)	42 (29%)	26 (18%)	72*	150**
Netherlands	42 (69%)	14 (23%)	-	5 (8%)	93 (63%)	41 (28%)	-	14 (9%)	62 *	149*
Finland	14 (28%)	27 (54%)	9 (18%)	-	24 (24%)	56 (56%)	20 (20%)	-	50	100
Sweden***	16 (19%)	20 (24%)	22 (26%)	26 (31%)	16 (19%)	20 (24%)	22 (26%)	26 (31%)	84	84

*In one case, farm size is unknown.

** In six cases, farm size is unknown.

***In Sweden, only 48 men were directly asked a number of questions by means of a mailed questionnaire, but in all 84 cases of interviewed women, questions were asked about their husbands (or companions) regarding education, agricultural training, membership in agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, participation in agricultural protests, etc.

References

- Bock, B. and de Rooij, S. (2000), *Social Exclusion of Smallholders and Women Smallholders in Dutch Agriculture*, Final Report of the TSER CT97-3044, Chairgroup of Rural Sociology University of Wageningen, June.
- Djurfeldt, Goran, (1998). "Kvinnor I svenski jordbruk-professionalisering och Marginalisering," (Women in Swedish Agriculture-Professionalization and Marginalisation), *Landbruksokonomisk Forum*, Vol. 15 (2): 68-80.
- European Commission (EC) (1999), *The Agricultural Situation in the European Union, 1998 Report*, Luxemburg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- GraphAgri Europe (1999), *Agriculture in the European Union*, Editions Agreste.
- Rieu, A. and Cettolo, H (2000), *Femmes et Hommes dans les Petites Exploitations Agricoles en Midi-Pyrenees*, Final Report of TSER CT97-3044, Universite de Toulouse.
- Safilios-Rothchild, C. and Papadopoulos, A.G. (2000), *Greek Men and Women Smallholders After CAP*, Final Report of TSER CT97-3044, Athens: National Centre for Social Research, Institute of Urban and Rural Sociology.
- Sireni, M. (2000), *The Finish National Report on the Causes and Mechanisms of Social Exclusion of Women Smallholders*, Final Report of TSER CT97-3044, University of Joensuu.
- Goran Djurfeldt and Pernille Gooch (2000), *Farm Women and Smallholders in Swedish Agriculture*, Final Report TSER CT97-3044, University of Lund, Department of Sociology.

CHAPTER THREE: EUROPEAN DIFFERENTIALS IN RURAL LABOUR MARKET CONDITIONS

Prevailing conditions of rural labour markets provide information regarding rural men's and women's employment potential in farm and non-farm occupations. At the onset of the research, it was hypothesized that in countries in which women's employment is almost universal, the lack of non-farm employment opportunities would lead to women's integration in the agricultural occupation. As we shall see, however, outcomes are much more complicated in the case of smallholders, because small farms can usually provide full-time employment only for one person and because men may also be faced with few occupational alternatives to agriculture. We shall now examine the rural labour market conditions in each country.

In Finland, the majority of women are active in the labour market. The traditional division of labour in the family according to which men are gainfully employed and women stay at home disappeared early in Finland (Haavio-Mannila, 1968). As early as in 1950, 42% of the professionally working population were women. Also in the rural areas, women generally work full-time outside the home, since there are no part-time jobs. At present, 42% of the labour force in rural areas are women, while in the cities and other population centres women's share of the labour force is slightly higher, 49% (Hogbacka, 1998).

The labour market in Finland is clearly divided by gender. It is rare that women or men work in an occupation atypical for their gender. Apart from different lines of work, the labour market is also divided vertically: employers, entrepreneurs and managerial personnel are more often men than women (Haavio-Mannila, 1984). It is, therefore, no surprise that men are the heads of farm enterprises. The division according to gender is also characteristic of the labour market in rural areas.

In the Finnish context of low unemployment rates in the 80's and 90's, the demand for skilled workers in the public sector, e.g. in health care, was high and farmers' wives were better qualified for these jobs than their husbands, being better educated. Thus, wives held a non-farm employment and agriculture became masculinized.

At present, only 5 percent of the entire Finnish work force is employed in agriculture. In rural areas, however, for about one-fifth of the population agriculture and forestry represent the most important line of business (Agricultural Economics

Research Institute, 1999). Approximately 40% of men living in rural areas of dispersed settlement⁶ are employed in agriculture and forestry. The second most common field of work is industry and construction which employs 29% of men. Agriculture and forestry are also the major fields of employment for rural women, namely for 29% of them. The second most common line of work for women in rural areas is health care and social work: 20% of women work as nurses, housekeepers or private daycare providers, that is jobs typically created in the countryside by the welfare state (Hogbacka, 1998).

In the late 90's, due to cuts in public sector employment, in rural areas Finnish women's employment opportunities diminished considerably. As a consequence, rural men's and women's unemployment rates are high, 19% for women and 23% for men. Thus, both men and women have been equally in danger of losing their non-farm jobs⁷. This has resulted to an increase of new forms of entrepreneurship undertaken by women, such as firms providing services for the elderly. In fact, since the beginning of the 80's the development of small entrepreneurship and secondary occupations has been included in the main objectives of agricultural policy. However, the potential of these activities as a source of employment remains an open issue (Andersson, 1997). Paid employment, however, remains more common and financially more important as a source of income than small businesses on farms (Volk, 1999). Farmers and women farmers particularly with small farms consider paid work as a better alternative to starting their own business, because it is expected to provide more permanent earnings and does not require capital investment. Even though policy makers often recommend small entrepreneurship as a solution to problems related to income and livelihood in small farms, their prerequisites to practice small-scale business activities are, in reality, poorer than on larger farms (Sireni, 1994).

Conditions in Sweden are considerably similar to those in Finland. In 1988 the employment rate for both sexes was quite high: 84.2 percent for men and 80.1 percent

⁶ In areas of dispersed settlement the size of the population is less than 200 and the distance between dwellings is over 200 meters on the average (Hogbacka, 1998).

⁷ It must be noted that in Finland, unemployed men and women who live on the farm are to some extent treated differently by authorities than other unemployed persons and they may be excluded from unemployment benefits.

for women. In the 90's, however, the recess of the economy lowered these rates. Thus, in 1998 only 73.5 percent of men and 69.4 percent of women were employed. Up to the 90's, rural women were able to find non-farm employment because they were relatively well educated and employment opportunities, created by the welfare state, were readily available. As in the 90's, however, there were considerable cut backs in the welfare state, the rural labour market became weaker and many rural women were not able to find non-farm employment. In response to these employment difficulties, the Swedish government provided women with an alternative, namely adult education and a monthly payment. This was particularly widespread in forested regions with few possibilities for paid work. This alternative provided rural women with 'artificial breathing', since it is rather doubtful that when these courses will be over the women will be able to secure employment within the area.

While the Swedish team had hypothesized that rural women's decreased opportunities for non-farm employment would lead to their greater integration in agriculture, the statistics showed that while in 1992, 29.5 percent of those employed in agriculture were women, in 1998 the percentage was down to 25.7. Thus, the economic decline and women's lesser access to non-farm employment does not seem to have diminished the masculinization of agriculture.

In France, less than 20% of rural employment is agricultural employment and it diminishes continuously. In 1990, the structure of employment in rural areas was as follows: 29% in services, 27% in agriculture, 17% in energy and other industries, 10% in building, 8% in transport and communications and 4% in agro-food industries. Thus even in rural areas, there are three times more industrial workers than persons working in agriculture. In March 1996, one in five unemployed people lived in rural areas, the numbers of unemployed being higher among the young, the less qualified and the women. Despite the fact that rural women are better educated than men, in 1997 rural women's unemployment was 12,5%, while rural men's was 6% (and for urban women was 14.5%).

There is no difference in the economic activity rate of rural and urban women (34% and 35% respectively). In rural areas, paid employment for women has increased from 1982 to 1990 (from 67.7% to 77,3%), because more women are in paid employment in agriculture but also in the transport and communications sector.

In general, employment opportunities for women in rural areas are precarious and poorly paid and are most often in exclusively “feminine” occupations such as nurses, teachers, domestic and maternal assistants. Few new employment opportunities open up for women such as school bus drivers.

French women increasingly play an important role in the agricultural sector. In 1995, women headed 21% of the farms, while in 1970 women headed only 8% of the farms. Many women become farm heads succeeding their husbands, when they retire or die, but also a considerable number of farm heads are single women. Overall, the tendency is for fewer women to work in agriculture but more of them to work full-time. Also women increasingly refuse to be unpaid family workers and demand an equal status with their spouses through participation in partnerships (through which the farm family is organized as a production society).

In France, legal reforms have contributed to the upgrading of women in the agricultural sector. Thus, the law of “agricultural orientation” of 1980 allowed women to have a joint farmer status with their husbands. Although the husband remains the farm head, women with this joint farmer status acquire professional responsibility in the farm and decision making power. They are also able to represent the farm enterprise in agricultural cooperatives, in assemblies and for agricultural loans.

Furthermore, the legal reform of 1988, that allows spouses to contribute capital for the establishment of the farm enterprise, led to the professional recognition of women and became the catalyst for the important development of business partnerships between husbands and wives. The creation of these partnerships has given women a formal and substantive farmer status as well as tax and financial benefits to the farm enterprise. Such partnerships, however, do not involve smallholders and the women involved are young and well educated.

In the Netherlands, women are increasingly involved in agriculture: their relative share in the total agricultural labour force increased from 25% in 1990 to 34% in 1998. This reflects a more general tendency of women’s integration in the labour market. During the last 10 years their participation has increased by 14% so that in 1998, women constitute 53% of the active labour force between 20 and 64 years (CBS, 1999). The increased participation of women workers is mainly due to the relative and absolute growth of female non-family workers: their number doubled between 1990 and 1999. Conversely, the number of family workers decreased as a

result of a decrease of “assisting spouses”. Many cooperating farm wives shifted to the category ‘farm heads’ when they changed the legal status of the farm to a partnership. The number of ‘female farm heads’ increased substantially during the last decade: in 1990, 5% of farm heads were women and in 1999, 26%. This striking change is mainly caused by the rapid increase in the number of female heads in partnerships. Whereas the number of single female farm heads remained stable, the number of husband-wife partnerships went up radically as a consequence of fiscal advantages offered to partnerships by the 1990 tax reform. The number of women farm heads in partnerships increases with farm size, while the number of single women farm decreases with farm size. The relative importance of women’s farm labour is also negatively related to farm size: the larger the farm, the more men dominate agricultural labour.

The increasing integration of Dutch women in agriculture, is also a result of their involvement in farm diversification activities. Women often initiate new on-farm activities and are usually responsible for activities like agro-tourism and the processing and farm gate selling of products (Bock 1999,1998, 1997, 1996; de Rooij *et al.* 1995). These new activities enhance women’s involvement in the farm with respect to the extent of on-farm labour and their (direct and indirect) influence on farm-management, even if their participation in primary farm work may diminish (Bock, 1994). The positive relation between diversification and involvement of women in farm labour has already been proven in the case of agro-tourist activities (Koulik, Teeuwen & Voskuilen 1998 in Meesters & Oudejans, 1999). Research shows moreover that diversification implies an improvement in the nature of women’s work in terms of autonomy (de Rooij *et al.*, 1995; Bock, 1997).

There are also indications that Dutch women’s access to farm succession has improved. The number of daughters that regularly work in the farm increased and went up by 43% in the 90’s. In 1998, however, still daughters’ farm work accounts for 3% of the total regular agricultural labour force while sons’ account for 8%.

In Greece, women’s labour force participation in rural areas fell from 44% in 1988 to 38% in 1998. It seems that among the economically active women in rural areas the weight of women over 45 years has significantly increased, when compared to economically active women in the entire country. This is possibly due to the large proportion of women of this age employed in agriculture.

In Greek rural areas there has been a rapid decrease in the number of employed women by one fifth. Among employed women, especially increased is the proportion (48%) of women who belong to the 45-64 age category. Women's unemployment in rural areas increased from 4.9% in 1988 to 8.5% in 1998 and is primarily encountered (65%) among women in the age category 25-44 years, while the unemployment rate is significantly higher (39%) among those younger than 25. In reality, women newcomers face the more intense problems for their integration in the labour market and remain unemployed for longer periods.

Moreover, there is significant divergence between married and single women's labour force participation. In general, married women show higher labour force participation when compared to single women (41% against 35%) and an unemployment rate less than half of that of single women (11.3% versus 26.4%).

It must be noted that large proportion of those employed in the agricultural sector can be attributed to the fact that this sector includes very large segments of employed men and women over 45. Only one in ten employed persons in the age category 25-44 years is employed in the agricultural sector. The professional orientation of women outside the agricultural sector is distinctively clear for those under 25. Most probably, this orientation is related to women's expectations for a change in life style and a higher status, better paid and more 'independent' employment than that predisposed by the family farm enterprise. As a result, one could say that regionally there are weak trends towards the occupational integration of young people in the agricultural sector, these trends being even weaker in the case of young women.

The importance of agricultural employment in rural areas is evident by the fact that the proportion of men employed in the agricultural sector in rural areas reaches 51% of all employed rural men, while the respective proportion for women exceeds 66%. This means that one out of two men employed and two out three women employed in rural areas are occupied in the agricultural sector. Consequently, in Greece the agricultural sector constitutes the main employer in rural areas, despite the remarkable decline of the rural labour force in this sector. In most rural areas, there are very few opportunities for non-farm employment for women. The only notable exception are rural areas where tourism provides employment for women, as was true for one of the villages (Lichada in Evia) included in the study. Thus, the proportion of

women employed in the agricultural sector in Greece is significantly higher (43%) than the EU average (34%), while only in Portugal and in Austria the proportion of women employed in the agricultural sector exceeds (52% and 49% respectively) that of Greece.

From 1993 to 1998, the increase in the number of women 'employers' in the agricultural sector accelerated with an annual increase of 8.9% and the category of 'self-employed' women increased by 0.6%. The number of women has been decreasing, on the other hand, in the categories of 'unpaid and assisting household members' and 'wage labourers'. Thus, it seems that in the last decade there has been a slight improvement of women's employment position in the agricultural sector.

Despite these recent developments, however, men's employment position in the agricultural sector remains distinctively better than that of women. Despite the recent increase of women 'entrepreneurs' (i.e. employers and self-employed), only 34% of women employed in the agricultural sector are 'entrepreneurs' while the large majority of men employed in the agricultural sector (79%) are 'entrepreneurs'⁸. Moreover, only 16% of men and less than two thirds of women employed in the agricultural sector are declared as 'unpaid and assisting household members'. It seems, therefore, that while the CAP⁹ and rural restructuring has brought about a degree of upgrading for some women employed in the agricultural sector, this change does not constitute a total reversal of previously existing traditional social and economic relations that still dominate the agricultural sector.

The occupational integration of Greek men and women is significantly differentiated. Especially in rural areas this differentiation is intensified due to the importance of the agricultural sector and the employment position of women in this sector. Thus, two out of three women are classified professionally as farmers, one out of ten is employed in the services and one out of twenty is employed as an unskilled labourer. Respectively, half of men are employed as farmers, one out of seven is employed as skilled technician, one out of ten has managerial position and one out of thirteen is skilled labourer. In this way, there is clear distinction between the two

⁸ In the period 1988-1998, the changes which occurred in employment in rural areas led to the decline of unpaid assistants in the family enterprise by one third, the increase of wage labourers by 15%, the increase of self-employed by 13% and the increase of employers by 53%. However, despite the fact that women employers increased in rural areas, the number of men employers (who represent the numerical majority of employers) increased much more (by 65%).

sexes: men hold the more skilled and higher social status professional positions and women are crowded in the less skilled and lower status professions. It is remarkable that even inside each professional category (or group of professions), women appear to hold a hierarchically and occupationally weaker and lower professional position (Labour Force Survey, 1998).

In conclusion, in countries in which in the past women's participation in the agricultural sector was small and at a low level, it has now considerably improved. Thus in France and the Netherlands, women's participation in the agricultural sector has improved mainly because of legal reforms that have led to the recognition of women's farmer status and overall national and European efforts to improve the status of women. These improvements, however, have benefited women in larger farms rather than in smallholder households. In Greece, on the other hand, women's participation in the agricultural sector has improved because of the unintended impact of the application of CAP primarily on smallholders. Since most of the smallholders are pluri-active when the Farmers' Register was established in 1997, many men afraid that their farm enterprises would lose the full-time status, transferred legally the farmer status to their wives by legally transferring to them either the land title or the farm management. As a result, women officially changed their status from unpaid family workers to full-time farmers and in most cases they became substantively integrated in the agricultural occupation.

In all countries, among smallholders they are the husbands who are pluri-active, the extent of pluri-activity being significantly higher than that of larger farmers but not significantly different from country to country. It seems, therefore, that among smallholders, men are pluri-active and women's involvement in farm work and farm management is more important than in larger farms and crucial for the survival of small farms. Furthermore, changes in the employment opportunities available to rural women do not seem to impact on who is pluri-active among smallholders.

⁹ As we shall see later on, the CAP has had an unintended positive impact on Greek rural women's

References

- Andersson, S. (1997). "Osuuskunnat ja sosiaalipalvelut (Cooperatives and Social Services)". *Maaseudun Uusi Aika (New Rural Policy)*, 2.
- Bock, B. (1996) *Nieuwe ondernemers op het platteland (New female rural entrepreneurs)*, Dordrecht: de Jong & Van Doorne-Huiskens.
- Bock, B. (1997) *Vrouwen, pluriactiviteit en vernieuwing (Women, pluri-activity and renewal)*, Wageningen: Wageningen University
- Bock, B. (1998) *Vrouwen en vernieuwing van landbouw en platteland; De kloof tussen praktijk en beleid in Nederland en andere Europese landen (Women and renewal of agriculture and rural areas. The gap between practice and policy in the Netherlands and other European countries)*, Wageningen: Wageningen University
- Bock, B. (1999), *Women in rural development in Europe – appreciated but undervalued*, paper for the conference 'Gender and 'Rural Transformations in Europe', Wageningen, October 1999
- CBS, *Landbouwtelling 1999 (Agricultural Census)*, Den Haag
- Central Statistical Office of Finland (1999). *Maa-ja metsätalous (Agriculture and Forestry) 1999:3 . Maatilatalouden yrittäjä- ja tulotilasto (Income Statistics of Agriculture) 1997*, Helsinki.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. (1968). *Suomalainen nainen ja mies (Finnish Woman and Man)*, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. (1984). *Perhe, työ Suomalainen nainen ja mies (Finnish Woman and Man), ja tunteet: ristiriitaja ja ratkaisuja (Family, Work and Emotions: Conflicts and Solutions)*, Porvoo: WSOY.
- Hogbacka, R. (1998). *Maaseudun työmarkkinat ja sukupuoli. Vertaileva tutkimus vuosista 1986 ja 1994 (Rural Labour Market and Gender, Comparative Study 1986-1994)*. Mikkeli: University of Helsinki, Rural Publications, no. 59
- Koulil, M.C.C., J.L. Teeuwen & M.J. Voskuilen (1998), *Aanbod aan agrotourisme in Nederland (Supply of agri-tourism in the Netherlands)*, The Hague.
- Labour Force Survey, 1998. Athens: National Statistical Service of Greece.
- Meesters & Oudejans (1999), *Onderwijs en onderzoek op het beleidsterrein van het Ministerie van LNV (concept) (Draft report on education and research on the policy area of the Ministry of Agriculture)*, The Hague: Ministry of

status as farmers.

Agriculture and Fisheries.

Rooij, S., de, E. Brouwer, R. van Broekhuizen (1995), *Vrouwen en bedrijfsontwikkeling (Farming women and farm development)*, Wageningen: Wageningen University/WLTO.

Sireni, Maarit (1994). *Monitoimisuus: Syrjaseudun maatalouden selviytymiskeino? (Pluri-activity: Survival of Remote Agriculture?)*. In Oksa, J. (Ed.), *Syrjaisen maaseudun uudet kerrostumat (New Activities in Remote Areas)*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Publications of the Karelian University, no.110.

Volk, R. (1999). *Muuttuva maaseutu. Maaseutupoliittinen selvitysraportti*. Helsinki: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, publication no. 9.

CHAPTER FOUR: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN SMALLHOLDERS' INTEGRATION OR EXCLUSION FROM THE AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION.

Smallholders' integration or exclusion from the agricultural occupation can be judged on the basis of the following objective and subjective indicators.

A. Objective indicators include:

- (a) Impact of national agricultural policies on smallholders' access to agricultural resources and services.
- (b) Differential cost of production and marketing .
- (c) Extent to which the number of small farms is decreasing
- (d) Differential access to membership in farmers' organizations
- (e) Differential access to agricultural training
- (f) Differential access to agricultural information and advice
- (g) Differential involvement in pluri-activity

.B. Subjective indicators include:

- (a) Belonging and perceived acceptance by farming community: extent of alienation from larger farmers.
- (b) Extent to Which Smallholders Feel Supported by Farmers' Organizations.
- (c) Extent to Which smallholders feel that CAP and national agricultural policies are supportive.

A. Objective Indicators

a. Impact of National Agricultural Policies on Smallholders' Access to Agricultural Resources and Services

Agricultural and rural credit institutions usually discriminate against smallholders and favor large, commercial farmers with regard to loans. In some cases, their regulations are clearly exclusionary, such as the Dutch subsidy regulations that exclude small farms. Also in Finland, even though agricultural policy supports production on small farms, it does not back the agricultural expansion and development investments of primary production farms that are smaller than the average. There are conditions attached to investment and other national and partly

EU-funded structural aids that are related to farm size: investment aids and young farmers' start-up aids are targeted at farms larger than the average. In addition, there are conditions regarding the professional skills of farmers and the full-time of the farming occupation. Thus, small farms are excluded from subsidized forms of financing and other measures aiming to improve agricultural competitiveness and to increase farm size. For instance, in dairy cattle production, the most common line of agricultural production in Finland, investment subsidies and grants are targeted only at larger farms. Small farms are also left outside measures facilitating farming succession by the next generation¹⁰. Thus, the upgrading of small family farms and securing their vitality in the future is not a part of Finnish agricultural policies and small farms have to finance their investments themselves and be faced with discriminatory practices in their efforts to secure loans. Furthermore, Finland's EU membership has brought about new demands, such as those related to the protection of the environment. The research in Finland shows, for example, that smallholders are uncertain as to whether it is worth their while to build a new type manure pit that would fulfill the new demands.

Recently researchers make it very clear that over time Dutch smallholders have become a 'forgotten' group as far as government policy is concerned. Unlike some other European countries (e.g. Germany, see Abel 1988), there are no Dutch specific regulations for small farms. As a consequence smallholders experience extra obstacles in their struggle to continue farming. Thus, they are often directly or indirectly excluded from subsidies because they are unable to meet the preconditions regarding minimum farm size or minimum investment (Korpel 1989). Furthermore it is difficult for small farms to comply with new regulations on environment and animal well being as they imply high investments. These investments may never pay back in small farms because of the small number of production units. The policy of increasing nature conservation also affects them more negatively than larger farms; they are generally unable to pay the extremely high land-prices, which are a result of the increasing scarcity of farmland. Shortages in production rights also hit small farms extremely hard because they are already at the stage of survival. Because of limited

¹⁰ In Finland, children succeed their parents as farmers by buying the land, thus, needing a large loan in order to realize the succession.

financial means they are often unable to take part in the trade of production rights. As a consequence growth is nearly impossible.

As hypothesized, research results in the Netherlands confirm that small farms have less access to economic resources than larger farms. Smallholders have less access to loans, to subsidies and to agricultural knowledge and information, obtained by means of education or extension services. Moreover, farmers with small farms choose different types of advisors than those with larger farms. Whereas smallholders prefer advice given for free by the industry, farmers with larger farms make more often use of commercial and specialized advisors.

Smallholders' lesser access to agricultural loans and subsidies can be characterized as an indicator of economic exclusion. As a result of their greater economic strength, large farms can obtain additional financial means more easily compared to small farms, and are able to further reinforce their position. For the same reason, larger farmers have more access to commercial agricultural knowledge and information and, thus, their development potential is reinforced. Smallholders have fewer resources to begin with and as a result are less able to obtain additional resources. Wealth attracts wealth.

But there is also another side of the coin. The reluctance to take loans is also a characteristic of smallholders' specific style of farming. Smallholders prefer to or are obliged to develop their farms step by step and without major financial means, in order to protect their independence from banks and other creditors and to safeguard their financial situation. This is also the strength of smallholders compared to large farmers, whose greater access to economic resources is accompanied by greater economic risk.

In Greece, there are no data about agricultural loans disaggregated by farm size or gender. The collected detailed data show, however, considerable variation by farm size, region and type of farm population. Overall, farmers with farms larger than 4.5 ha. significantly more often than smallholders take agricultural loans. In Karditsa, a region with capital-intensive farms, all larger farmers in both farm populations take agricultural loans, (mostly large, long-term agricultural loans), while more than half of smallholders do the same. In Chania, Crete, also all large farmers in both farm

populations take agricultural loans but less than half of smallholders do the same.¹¹ In the other two regions, Evia and Lesvos, overall fewer farmers take loans (ranging from 12% to 41%), but always agricultural loans are taken more often by the larger farmers and in the farm population of men respondents.

With regard to EU and national or regional agricultural subsidies, only in two countries, there is significant differentiation regarding national agricultural subsidies by farm size (Tables 1 and 2). Only in France and the Netherlands, smallholders

*Table 1. Access to European agricultural subsidies by farm size**

Access to CAP policies	Finland**	France	Netherlands
<i>A. Small farm size</i>			
Yes	23 (96%)	-	40 (41%)
No	1 (4%)	6 (100%)	43 (44%)
In the past	-	-	15 (15%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>			
Yes	56 (100%)	14 (54%)	17 (39%)
No	-	12 (46%)	21 (49%)
In the past	-	-	5 (12%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>			
Yes	20 (100%)	15 (75%)	10 (63%)
No	-	5 (25%)	5 (31%)
In the past	-	-	1 (6%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>			
Yes	-	10 (53%)	-
No	-	9 (47%)	-
In the past	-	-	-

* In Sweden, all farmers receive at least one EU agricultural subsidy and in Greece, practically all farmers receive EU agricultural subsidies so that cross-tabulations are not meaningful.

** For Finland, there are only data about any type of agricultural subsidy without differentiation as to whether it is EU or national subsidy.

significantly less often than larger farmers receive national subsidies¹². In France, while 34% of smallholders receive national or regional subsidies, almost twice as many (65%) larger farmers receive such subsidies. Also in France, no smallholder receives a EU agricultural subsidy, while 40% of larger farmers do. Furthermore,

¹¹ In the farm population of women respondents only 23% of smallholders take agricultural loans and 43% in the farm population of men respondents.

¹² For France the chi-square = 5.6340, $p < 0.02$ and for the Netherlands, chi-square = 10.3823, $p < 0.001$.

while no smallholder has participated in agricultural programmes subsidized by the EU, 18% of larger farmers have participated in such programmes.

In the other countries, particularly with regard to EU subsidies, there is no differentiation because either practically all farmers or no farmer receives such subsidies. Thus, in Sweden, all farmers receive at least one EU agricultural subsidy and in Greece, practically all farmers receive EU agricultural subsidies (only 17 do not) and farmers in both countries do not receive separate national or regional agricultural subsidies. Similarly in Finland, practically all farmers receive some kind of agricultural subsidy and although the question asked in this country did not differentiate between EU and national agricultural subsidies, these subsidies are mainly of EU origin. Finally, in the Netherlands, there is no significant relationship between farm size and receiving or not an EU agricultural subsidy.

Table 2. Access to national (or regional) agricultural subsidies by farm size

Access to national agricultural policies	France	Netherlands
<i>A. Small farm size</i>		
Yes	2 (33%)	13 (14%)
No	4 (67%)	57 (61%)
In the past	-	23 (25%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>		
Yes	13 (50%)	4 (10%)
No	13 (50%)	18 (44%)
In the past	-	19 (46%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>		
Yes	15 (75%)	7 (44%)
No	5 (25%)	4 (25%)
In the past	-	5 (31%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>		
Yes	14 (74%)	-
No	5 (26%)	-
In the past	-	-

* In Sweden and Greece, very few farmers receive national agricultural subsidies so that cross-tabulations are not meaningful. In Finland, on the other hand, respondents do not differentiate EU from national subsidies and most subsidies received are EU subsidies, so they have been included in Table 1.

b. Differential cost of production and marketing

An important economic resource of a different kind is the opportunity to enter the production chain in order to buy production means or to sell products under

favourable conditions¹³. The research in the Netherlands confirms what earlier researchers have previously indicated: the conditions under which small and big farms enter the production chain differ and generally the difference is to the disadvantage of smallholders. This is due to the differential effects of the preconditions for entry formulated by law or agribusiness regulations. The Dutch data give evidence that the access to the production chain becomes more and more obstructed by regulations that exclude smallholders or hit them harder compared to larger farmers.

Many government policies that apply to all farmers regardless of size, often have much more negative consequences for smallholders. An example of this in the Netherlands, is the forced reduction of the pig stock by 20% that hurts disproportionately farmers with a small number of pigs. Also government regulations concerning environmental protection, animal welfare and product quality continuously reduce producers' autonomy and flexibility and increase the cost of production significantly more for smallholders than for larger farmers.

As a result of all these obligatory adaptations demanded by the government, many smallholders feel being pushed out of agriculture and perceive the government, co-operatives and the market as collaborating against them. New governmental regulations are moreover seen as the most important threat to the survival of their farm.

Within the horticultural sector, several farmers mentioned the policy of the main auction, which adapts rules to promote the deliverance of big quantities. As a result the deliverance of small quantities becomes more complicated and more expensive. In some cases the problem is caused by a change in governmental regulations. For example, after the pig plague in order to prevent further epidemics, the government decided that a fattening firm is allowed to take piglets only from three breeding farms. As a result, small breeders are considerably restricted in selling their piglets and sometimes it even becomes impossible to sell them. Another aspect of the same principle is the quantity discounts firms offer to large farmers when buying large amounts of fodder or other production means or when delivering big quantities. This is considered as discriminating behavior by smallholders that have to pay more per piece.

¹³Although similar conditions hold true for all countries, the detailed discussion of these issues comes from the Dutch report.

Furthermore, the problems that smallholders encounter when buying production means or selling their products have considerably increased and multiplied. It is that they have to pay relatively more for necessary production means or services compared to larger farmers, they also often have to spend more money to place their products on the markets. This increases their production and transaction costs even more, whereas it becomes more and more difficult to realize a better price by increasing the added value (e.g. by packaging) because of new governmental or market regulations. This accumulation of relative disadvantages may result in the exclusion of smallholders from the general market. It may force them even more to look for new and very specific markets to stay out of the competition with big producers and the need of big distributors to continuously increase efficiency and thus the scale of trade. In this way, local trade between small producers and traders becomes impossible because of the new transport regulations regarding pigs. These regulations are meant to restrict long distance and inter-regional transport of pigs but they also affect intra-regional and local transport.

c. Extent to which the number of small farms is decreasing

In the Netherlands, in the seventies several regional research studies were carried out to find out whether or not and which farmers considered giving up farming and changing occupation (Spierings 1974; Biemans 1974). Though small farmers without successors considered changing their occupation more often than larger farmers, the research revealed that farmers were generally little motivated to leave agriculture.

At the end of the 80's and the start of the 90's, a striking shift in research perspectives can be noticed instead of focusing on the negative aspects of small farms, research starts to emphasize their positive characteristics (de Bruin & Oostindië 1991; de Bruin *et al.* 1991; Wijnen 1987). Small farms are now presented as being ahead of larger farms concerning environment-friendly production methods, respect for animal well being, care of nature and landscape and significance given to the quality of life in rural areas. It is also shown that smallholders develop their farms in a different way, with small and step-by-step investments, focusing primarily on the lowering of production costs rather than the expansion of production, thus, better ensuring survival (de Bruin & Oostindië 1991; van der Ploeg 1999). Some studies even make

the case for special policy measures for smallholders such as giving them extra production rights (e.g.. milk quota), when rights are to be redistributed.

For many years, the specific style of large and specialized farms has been the reference point for banks, accountants and extension services in their judgement on the development plans of a particular farm enterprise. Since 1994, however, when the Dutch agricultural policy started following the CAP reform in the implementation of a rural development policy, they began providing more support to new survival strategies such as pluriactivity and giving more attention to the continuity of smaller farms. However, there is still a tendency in the Netherlands to distinguish between 'real', big, modern and business-like farms that allow for full-time employment, and 'idyllic', smaller, seemingly more old-fashioned and multi-functional farms, important to preserve for tourists and the quality of life in rural areas. Large farms are supposed to go on expanding and modernizing production. Diversification and 'rural entrepreneurship' is presented as appropriate potential solutions for medium-sized farms. Again the smallest farms seem to miss the boat. Their gradual disappearance is often described as inevitable and 'natural'. Sometimes the foreclosure of small farms is even presented as a precondition for the survival of others, as it sets free new production assets, especially land. This way of thinking reinforces the division within the group of farmers and splits solidarity within farm unions.

Finally, as Somers (1991) points out, in the Netherlands the way small farmers are presented in politics and research, depends in part on the overall employment situation. When unemployment figures are high (as in the late eighties and early nineties), the need to sustain smallholders in farming is emphasized. When there are plenty alternative employment opportunities as in the early seventies, smallholders are encouraged to consider other occupations.

In the Netherlands, for more than two decades a dramatic decline of farms has taken place. Between 1975 and 1998, the number of farms decreased by about a third (35.5%) (LEI 1999). Small farms have been hit especially hard. In the period between 1990 and 1999, the number of small farms (<40 nge)¹⁴ decreased from 52% to 42%, while the number of large farms (>100 nge) increased from 10% to 25% (LEI 1999). According to most recent statistics, this is mainly due to the enlargement of the very

¹⁴ One nge=1.43 bss (bruto standard saldo in ECU=average gross balance=output/production unit-direct costs/production unit).

large farms, the so-called ‘mega-farms’ (>150 nge) (CBS 1999; Verhaar & Hoeve 1999). Smallholders have, however, stopped farming more often than farmers of larger enterprises (Silvis and van Bruchem 1999). In the smallest farms (below 40 nge), 1.6% of the farmers younger than 50 years stopped farming; the same is true for 3% of the farmers between 55 and 60 years; and 5.3% of the farmers older than 60 years (Table 3). The percentages of farmers having stopped farming are considerably lower in the group of farms between 40 and 70 nge and the lowest percentages of farm business termination for all three age categories are observed among farmers with farms of 70 nge and more (van der Ploeg, 1999).

Table 3. Dutch Farm business termination related to farm size and age category

Farm size category	Aged <55	Aged 55-60	Aged >60
3-40 nge	1.6%	3%	5.3%
40-70 nge	0.8%	1.2%	1.8%
>70 nge	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%

Source: van der Ploeg, 1999

It is, however, important to stress that not all smallholders left agriculture. A part of them expanded their farms and thus moved into a larger size category. Others just persisted and continued with their smallholdings. In 1998, about a quarter (28%) of the farms is smaller than 20 nge and nearly half (42%) of all farms is smaller than 40 nge. Moreover, it is striking that in the period 1990-98, the smallest category of farms (<20 nge) decreased less (from 33% to 28% of the total number of farms), compared to the next bigger category of 20-50 nge (29% to 19%) (LEI 1999).¹⁵ One can even notice the start of new smallholdings by people strongly motivated to be farmers and to live in the countryside. This is the more surprising finding, since farms of such size are not considered as viable by Dutch agricultural policy-makers as well as by a large part of the agricultural professional world.

In Sweden, at the beginning of the 20th century 69 percent of the total population was occupied in agriculture. Family farming was dominating and farm size was on the average 2-4 ha. At the middle of the century, however, only 24,6 percent of the population was occupied within the farming sector and the overall policy was rationalization and professionalization with an ideal farm size of around 20-30 ha. of

¹⁵ In absolute numbers farms with less than 20 nge decreased from 40.667 in 1990 to 29.672 in 1998 (-27%). The number of farms in the size category of 20-50 nge went down from 36.213 farms in 1990 to 20.054 farms in 1998 (-45%).

arable land (Salamonsson, 1999). By 1998, only 1,7 percent of the total population worked in agriculture and in 2000, the average acreage of arable land per farm was 35 ha. for Sweden's 80000 farm units, that is an increase of 6 ha. over the average acreage in 1999 (Jordbruksverket, 2000). Progressively, smaller farms became incorporated into larger units, a process that is continuing. Mainly smaller and middle-sized farms disappear, while the number of larger farms remain the same or increase.

In Finland, between 1975 and 1995 the number of farms with less than 20 ha. and especially farms with less than 10 ha. significantly decreased, while the number of farms with 30 or more ha. significantly increased during the same period (Central Statistical Office of Finland, 1999, p. 12). Furthermore, since Finland's membership in the European Union in 1995, the total number of farms has decreased, especially those with less than 20 ha. from 62 percent of all farms in 1992 to 53 percent in 1997 (Central Statistical Office of Finland, 1999, p.12).

In France, between 1970 and 1997 the average size of farms doubled (from 20 ha. to 42 ha.), predominantly because small farms became incorporated into larger farms. Thus, at present only 6 percent of all farms have less than 20 ha. while three-fourths of the farms have 50 ha. or more. In the region of Midi-Pyrenees, however, the area of the present research, 45 percent of the farms have less than 20 ha., hence the choice of the area for the study of smallholders. Also an indication of the economic exclusion of French smallholders is the increase of the number of beneficiaries of Minimum Income (Revenue Minimum d' Insertion) who belong to the agricultural sector, most of them smallholders (and single men and women farmers).

Also in the Netherlands, a study showed that in the period 1993-1998 a fifth (19%) of farm households had an average income below the social minimum as defined by researchers. Smallholders were more frequently found among the poor farm households than farmers with larger farms, not only with respect to agricultural income but also when the non-farm income was included (Evading *et al.*, 1999).

In Greece, farm size has increased the least in comparison to the other four countries. Between 1985 and 1995, the number of farm enterprises diminished by 15,7% and the average size increased only by 0,2 ha. Thus, in 1995 the average farm

size diminished very little from 4,5 ha to 4,3 ha. (*Farm Structure Research*, 1995). Furthermore, the decrease in the number of farm enterprises did not occur in mountainous and disadvantaged areas. On the contrary in 1995, 35,7% of farm enterprises instead of 34,8% in 1985 were located in mountainous areas and 59,3% instead of 47,8% in disadvantaged rural areas. It seems that the special subsidies for these areas as well as the subsidies for goat and sheep breeding helped maintain the farm enterprises in these areas (Kassimis *et al.*, 2000).

d. Differential access to membership in farmers' organizations

In all countries, larger farmers are significantly more often members of agricultural cooperatives than smallholders or even medium size farmers (Table 4). It must also be noted that in Sweden, both men and women are excluded from all types of farmers' organizations only among smallholders and middle-sized farmers. This exclusion or self-exclusion from agricultural organizations is more frequent among smallholders with a low level of education.

In Greece, smallholders in both farmers population of men and women respondents were significantly less often members of agricultural cooperatives than larger farmers. In the case of France, this holds true for all types of cooperatives, especially for the 'cooperatives d' utilization de materiel agricole' (CUMA), that is cooperatives that undertake to perform different farm tasks for their members. However, this is true only for men and not for women smallholders for whom farm size does not differentiate their access to cooperative membership.

Smallholders, however, are not members of agricultural cooperatives not only because they are excluded but also because they do not believe that the cooperatives support smallholders. In fact, the qualitative data from all countries indicate that smallholders, even many of those who are members, believe that cooperatives do not

Table 4. Access to membership in agricultural cooperatives by farm size and gender

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland*		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Member	11 (46%)	11 (46%)	5 (22%)	1 (17%)	92 (56%)	58 (84%)	8 (8%)	27 (66%)	5 (23%)	11 (67%)
Not a member	13 (54%)	13 (54%)	18 (78%)	5 (83%)	72 (44%)	11 (16%)	90 (92%)	14 (34%)	11 (77%)	5 (33%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Member	44 (79%)	44(79%)	14 (26%)	6 (23%)	12 (41%)	9 (82%)	2 (5%)	7 (56%)	10 (47%)	15 (70%)
Not a member	12 (21%)	12 (21%)	39 (74%)	20 (77%)	17 (59%)	2 (18%)	39 (95%)	6 (46%)	10 (53%)	5 (30%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Member	16 (80%)	16 (80%)	9 (22%)	9 (45%)	-	-	3 (21%)	4 (80%)	18 (84%)	21 (97%)
Not a member	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	33 (78%)	11 (55%)	-	-	11 (79%)	1 (20%)	4 (16%)	1 (3%)
<i>D. Large size</i>										
Member	-	-	5 (19%)	7 (37%)	-	-	-	-	16 (46%)	23 (96%)
Not a member	-	-	21 (81%)	12 (63%)	-	-	-	-	9 (54%)	2 (4%)

* In the case of Finland, the farms are members not individuals so men's and women's answers are the same.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

represent them and are instead mainly concerned with and serve larger farmers. Table 20 later on in this chapter shows that the majority of all farmers in all countries hold negative views about cooperatives. The same negative attitudes and the reasons for these attitudes are the same concerning farmers' unions. It seems, therefore, that while self-exclusion is partly responsible for smallholders not being members of cooperatives, it is not the main or sole reason, since non-members are not particularly more negative than members¹⁶. Most probably a vicious circle is operating in that the neglect of smallholders' issues and interests on the part of agricultural cooperatives leads to and is intensified by smallholders' self-exclusion from these organizations.

Regarding membership in farm unions, in Finland, Netherlands and Sweden significantly fewer smallholders are members than larger farmers (Table 5). In France, where farm characteristics and not individual characteristics are important for membership in farm unions, farm size does not differentiate such membership. Finally in Greece, farm unions are either defunct or only formally operational. In Finland, farms are cooperative members if they produce milk, meat or organically grown products. Membership, on the other hand, in the Central Union of Agricultural Producers (CUAP) is usually a very conscious decision influenced by ideological concerns. In the Finnish context, the lack of membership cannot, therefore, be interpreted as exclusion from agriculture.

In the Netherlands, about two thirds of the farm-households (62%) are affiliated with a farm-union or a co-operative (60%). Sector and farm-size influence membership. Smallholders tend to be less often engaged in farm unions and cooperatives than medium and large farmers (but the difference is not statistically significant). Nearly one out of two farm households (44%) is a member of the farm union and a cooperative. Only a minority (15%) is not affiliated with any farmers' organization. The latter are mainly small dairy and intensive husbandry farms and farms with extra income generating activities.

Most of Dutch farm households are passive members of either a farm union or a cooperative. Women practically never visit reunions while about one-third of men,

¹⁶ In the case of Finland, membership in a cooperative is dependent on the line of production of the farm so that there are farms the produce of which is not relevant to any existing cooperative.

Table 5. Membership in farm unions by farm size and gender (1)

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden***	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
A. Small farm size										
Member	12 (50%)	6 (46%)	6 (26%)	2 (33%)	-	-	10 (10%)	30 (75%)	5 (33%)	9 (58%)
Not a member	12 (50%)	7 (54%)	17 (74%)	4 (67%)	-	-	86 (90%)	10 (25%)	11 (67%)	7 (42%)
B. Medium size (a)					-	-				
Member	35 (62%)	25 (86%)	9 (17%)	12 (46%)	-	-	7 (17%)	14 (100%)	12 (59%)	12 (58%)
Not a member	21 (38%)	4 (14%)	44 (83%)	13 (50%)	-	-	35 (83%)	-	8 (42%)	8 (42%)
C. Medium size (b)					-	-				
Member	16 (80%)	8 (100%)	12 (28%)	6 (30%)	-	-	2 (13%)-	5 (100%)	22 (79%)	26 (93%)
Not a member	4 (20%)	-	30 (72%)	14 (70%)	-	-	14 (88%)	-	6 (21%)	2 (7%)
D. Large size					-	-				
Member	-	-	6 (23%)	6 (32%)	-	-	-	-	20 (100%)	20 (100%)
Not a member	-	-	20 (77%)	11 (58%)	-	-	-	-	-	-

* In France, they are the syndicates

** In Greece farm unions are either defunct or only formally functioning

(1) When the percentages do not add to 100%, the remaining percentages are those who do not know or are indecisive.

*** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

mainly from large and horticultural farms, are regular visitors. Extra income-generating activities tend to inhibit the visiting of cooperative and union meetings by men as well as by women. Smallholders feel often inhibited from visiting farmers unions' or cooperative meetings because of their pluri-activity and the resulting lack of time. Also sometimes the meeting schedules are not convenient. Still more important is smallholders' feeling of not being welcome and not being taken seriously as 'one of the club'. The feeling of belonging is not, however, necessarily due to the behavior of others. Some smallholders exclude themselves because they do not perceive themselves as professional farmers. The Greek data show similar trends.

Similarly, only a few Finnish men and women who are members of cooperatives and farmers' unions attend meetings regularly or even occasionally, men's attendance being somewhat higher than that of women. It is notable, however, that twice as many women than men in the Finnish sample hold an office in the farmers' union.

Greek men smallholders have more easily access to cooperative membership than women and such access is diminished, only when no land is owned by the farm enterprise or the wife owns all or half of the land and when the husband is practically replaced by the wife in the farm since she undertakes most or all agricultural labour.

Engagement in farmers' organizations offers the possibility to put one's interests forward and make sure that the political institutions are representing these interests in other bodies. In this way farmers are able to lobby for themselves. Because of their more intensive participation, larger farmers are more able to lobby for their interests than smallholders. Through networking and active participation in different organizations, they try to influence policy and decision making, while smallholders are forgotten and become marginalized.

e. Differential access to agricultural training

Male farmers' access to agricultural training is significantly positively related to farm size in Greece and France, while in the Netherlands, the tendency is similar but not statistically significant (Table 6). Larger farmers receive significantly more often agricultural training than smallholders and in the Netherlands, larger farmers, more often than smallholders have a high level agricultural education. In Finland and Sweden, there is no relationship between access to agricultural training and farm size.

Table 6. Men's and women's access to agricultural training and farm size

Access to Agricultural Training	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Smallest Size</i>										
Have received agricultural training	9 (64%)	14 (58%)	2 (33%)	5 (22%)	12 (15%)	19 (11%)	25 (60%)	25 (28%)	4 (24%)	6 (27%)
Have not received agricultural training	5 (36%)	10 (42%)	4 (67%)	18 (78%)	66 (85%)	159 (89%)	17 (40%)	65 (72%)	11 (76%)	10 (73%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Have received agricultural training	15 (44%)	23 (41%)	21 (81%)	14 (27%)	5 (42%)	5 (18%)	12 (86%)	13 (34%)	7 (57%)	7 (46%)
Have not received agricultural training	12 (56%)	33 (59%)	5 (19%)	38 (73%)	7 (58%)	23 (82%)	2 (14%)	25 (66%)	13 (43%)	13 (54%)
<i>C. Medium Size (b)</i>										
Have received agricultural training	7 (88%)	12 (60%)	12 (63%)	15 (36%)	-	-	4 (80%)	7 (44%)	4 (51%)	4 (23%)
Have not received agricultural training	2 (22%)	8 (40%)	7 (37%)	27 (64%)	-	-	1 (20%)	9 (56%)	22 (49%)	24 (77%)
<i>D. Large Size</i>										
Have received agricultural training	-	-	18 (95%)	12 (46%)	-	-	-	-	8 (29%)	8 (30%)
Have not received agricultural training	-	-	1 (5%)	14 (54%)	-	-	-	-	22 (71%)	12 (70%)

* Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Available Greek national data refer to farm owners, who are not necessarily active farmers, and show that only 0.4% of them have any agricultural training. Only for larger farmers with 15 ha., the situation is somewhat better (Kassimis, 2000). The collected Greek data and regional data for Lesvos show the existence of an age and an education bias built-in the selection process of trainees, responsible for all smallholders' exclusion, particularly in the case of women smallholders (See Chapter Six).

The Greek data shed light on an important factor responsible for restricting smallholders' access to agricultural training. The frequency of contacts with the area agriculturist plays a key role in farmers' selection for agricultural training. Smallholders who have significantly less often frequent contacts with the area agriculturists than larger farmers, are less often selected for agricultural training. Agriculturists seem to prefer to contact larger farmers who are better clients for agricultural inputs.

In the Netherlands, in most farm households (75%) at least one member of the couple has an agricultural degree. The significant difference between smallholders' and larger farmers' access to agricultural training is clearly shown by the fact that while in 35% of smallholder households neither spouse has any such training, in all farm households with medium-size or large farms at least one of the spouses has such training (Table 8). Also in large farms, significantly more Dutch men have a high level agricultural education than in smaller farms ($p < 0.01$).

The situation is quite similar regarding the attendance of additional agricultural courses and farmers' study-groups. Furthermore, such attendance is less accessible to smallholders than to farmers in medium-size and larger farms (statistically not significant). Attending study-groups and extra courses is not only a question of interest. It may also imply considerable expenses and there are time restrictions when farmers are pluri-active.

The relationship between smallholders' access to agricultural training and membership in agricultural cooperatives is significantly positive in the case of France, Netherlands, Greece and Sweden (Table 9). This significant relationship indicates that smallholders, who are defined as "professional" farmers by the local community and are members of agricultural cooperatives, also have more chances to acquire some agricultural competence.

Finally, in Finland there is no relationship between men's and women farmers' access to agricultural training and membership in agricultural cooperatives. Most probably this is due to the fact that farm rather than individual characteristics determine cooperative membership and, as we saw above, farm size is a decisive factor.

Table 8. Additional agricultural courses by farm size (Netherlands)

	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Both	24%	56%	40%	15
Husband only	38%	33%	40%	18
Wife only	3%	11%	20%	3
None	35%			12
Total (100%)	34	9	5	48

Table 9. Access to agricultural training by cooperative membership

Country	Gender		Men's and Women's extent of agricultural training			
			None has agricultural training	Only the husband agricultural training	Both have agricultural training	Only the wife has agricultural training
Finland	Men	Member	33 (69%)	23 (77%)	6 (67%)	9 (69%)
		Not member	15 (31%)	7 (23%)	3 (33%)	4 (31%)
	Women	Member	33 (69%)	23 (77%)	6 (67%)	9 (69%)
		Not member	15 (31%)	7 (23%)	3 (33%)	4 (31%)
France	Men	Member	8 (25%)	10 (42%)	5 (36%)	1 (50%)
		Not member	24 (75%)	14 (58%)	9 (64%)	1 (50%)
	Women	Member	18 (25%)	9 (24%)	5 (19%)	2 (15%)
		Not member	55 (75%)	28 (76%)	22 (81%)	11 (85%)
Greece*	Men	Member				
		Not member				
	Women	Member				
		Not member				
Netherlands	Men	Member	6 (55%)	12 (80%)	5 (42%)	2 (67%)
		Not member	5 (45%)	3 (20%)	7 (58%)	1 (33%)
	Women	Member	-	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	1 (25%)
		Not member	12 (100%)	15 (80%)	12 (80%)	3 (75%)
Sweden**	Men	Member	34 (96%)	16 (90%)	13 (65%)	7 (70%)
		Not member	2 (4%)	2 (10%)	5 (35%)	3 (30%)
	Women	Member	20 (53%)	10 (50%)	13 (61%)	7 (70%)
		Not member	16 (47%)	8 (50%)	5 (39%)	3 (30%)

*In Greece, it is not possible to assess the extent to which husbands and wives have or have not access to agricultural training because the interviewed men and women are not married to each other.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be calculated directly from the frequencies which are unweighted.

f. Differential access to agricultural information and advice

In the Netherlands, Greece and France significantly fewer smallholders have contacts with agricultural advisors (extension workers) than larger farmers¹⁷ (Table 10). Also in the Netherlands, most agricultural advisors are now commercial (that is privately paid advisors), although there is still a small number of government paid extension agents. The latter type of extension agents are most often contacted probably because their advice is for free. About one third of all participating households meets them regularly. In general larger farms make use of all sorts of extension agents more often than smaller farms. Nearly one out of two households has never any contact to extension agents and most of those are small farms (Table 11).

Several Dutch farmers report having experienced discrimination because of their small farm size. This concerns the former governmental extension service but also extension agents of industrial firms. The data show Dutch smallholders significantly more often than larger farmers having no contact with any kind of agricultural advisor, commercial or government sponsored, and significantly fewer of them than of larger farmers having contacts with both types of agricultural advisors. In general, Dutch smallholders have few contacts and hardly any trust in extension agents (Somers, 1991; Korpel, 1989). In their opinion extension agents still believe in expansion as the most suitable farm management strategy and do not take them seriously.

In Finland, on the other hand, it is reported that all men and women farmers have contacts with an agricultural advisor, while in Sweden there is no relationship between farm size and contacts with agricultural advisors.

g. Differential involvement in pluri-activity

In all countries, pluri-activity of the husband, of the wife or of both is higher among smallholders than among larger farmers and abstention from non-farm employment is lower among smallholders than among larger farmers (Table 12).

¹⁷ It must be noted that in the Netherlands only women's answers are available, men were not asked this question.

10. Contacts with agricultural advisors/extension workers by farm size and respondent's gender

Contacts with agricultural advisors	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men*	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Yes	11 (100%)	24 (100%)	3 (50%)	12 (52%)	26 (37%)	42 (25%)		46 (49%)	-	9 (65%)
No	-	-	3 (50%)	11 (48%)	44 (63%)	129 (75%)		48 (51%)	-	4 (35%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Yes	24 (100%)	56 (100%)	15 (58%)	27 (51%)	9 (75%)	5 (19%)		27 (68%)	-	13 (50%)
No	-	-	11 (42%)	26 (49%)	3 (25%)	22 (81%)		13 (32%)	-	7 (50%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Yes	8 (100%)	20 (100%)	15 (75%)	20 (48%)	-	-		10 (71%)	-	13 (74%)
No	-	-	5 (25%)	22 (52%)	-	-		4 (29%)	-	6 (26%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Yes			15 (79%)	14 (54%)	-	-		-	-	11 (43%)
No			4 (21%)	12 (46%)	-	-		-	-	14 (57%)

*In the Netherlands, the question was not asked from men.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 11. Regular contact with various advisors by farm –size (multiple response question)-the Netherlands

	Small	Medium	Big	Total
Ex government Extension service	14%	18%	43%	26
Industrial extension service*	23%	37%	67%	42
Regional advisors*	13%	14%	36%	22
Ministry of agriculture	1%			1

Statistically

significant

(p<0.05).

The difference, however, is statistically significant only in Finland and Greece.¹⁸ In France, Greece,¹⁹ Sweden and the Netherlands, in significantly more smallholder households rather than in households with larger farms, the husband is pluri-active (only he or both he and his wife) (Table 12). In Finland, on the other hand, the pluri-activity pattern is quite different. Men are pluri-active in all farm sizes without significant differences, while the percent of farms in which no spouse is pluri-active is significantly higher in larger-sized farms.

Table 12. Husbands' and Wives' non-farm employment by farm size

Men's and women's off-farm employment status by farm size	Finland	France	Greece**		Netherlands	Sweden*
	Women	Women	Women	Men	Women	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>						
Men only pluriactive	10 (42%)	8 (35%)	123 (69%)	20 (46%)	32 (35%)	6 (42%)
Women only pluriactive	-	1 (4%)	2 (1%)	2 (5%)	6 (6%)	2 (10%)
Both work off-farm	10 (42%)	-	25 (14%)	8(15%)	9 (10%)	-
None works off-farm	4 (16%)	14 (61%)	28 (16%)	14(33%)	45 (50%)	8 (48%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>						
Men only pluriactive	23 (41%)	17 (30%)	16 (57%)	18(41%)	8 (20%)	10 (51%)
Women only pluriactive	5 (9%)	2 (4%)	-	4 (9%)	4 (10%)	2 (8%)
Both work off-farm	15 (27%)	4 (7%)	3 (11%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	-
None works off-farm	13 (23%)	33 (59%)	9 (32%)	20(45%)	26 (65%)	8 (42%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>						
Men only pluriactive	7 (35%)	5 (12%)	-	-	1 (7%)	2 (7%)
Women only pluriactive	1 (5%)	4 (9%)	-	-	3 (20%)	3 (11%)
Both work off-farm	3 (15%)	4 (9%)	-	-	-	-
None works off-farm	9 (45%)	31 (70%)	-	-	11 (73%)-	23 (82%)
<i>D. Large size</i>						
Men only pluriactive	-	3 (11%)	-	-	-	2 (11%)
Women only pluriactive	-	3 (11%)	-	-	-	3 (16%)
Both work off-farm	-	-	-	-	-	-
None works off-farm	-	21 (78%)	-	-	-	15 (73%)

*In Sweden, the percentages are weighted and cannot be calculated on the basis of the frequencies.

**Only in Greece the men and women are not related to each other.

Dutch smallholders are indirectly discriminated since for a long time only so-called 'full-time farmers' with farming as their principal occupation, were qualified for subsidies.²⁰ As Table 13 illustrates in the Netherlands, farming as a secondary

¹⁸ The chi-square for Finland is 4.2071, $p < 0.05$ and for Greece for the farm population of women respondents, 4.3583, $p < 0.05$. The difference is not significant for the farm population of men respondents.

¹⁹ This is true for both the farm population of women and men respondents.

²⁰ The boundary between 'full-time' and 'part-time' farmers (or those with farming as a principal or secondary occupation) is set by the labor input of the official farm-head, who has to spend more than 50% of his or her daily working time on the farm to be considered as a full-time farmer (CBS, 1999).

occupation is a frequently occurring phenomenon among the smallest farms (3-20 nge).

Table 13. Main and secondary occupation by farm size, 1997

Main and secondary occupation	3-20 nge	20-40 nge	40-70 nge	> 70 nge	Mean
Farming main occupation, no secondary occupation	33%	66%	87%	95%	71%
Farming first occupation and a secondary occupation	7%	13%	7%	3%	5%
Farming not the main occupation	47%	19%	5%	2%	6%
Pensioner farmer	13%	2%	1%	0	18%
Total (100%)	33.137	15.710	21.014	43.342	

Source: CBS 1998

In the Greek farm population of men respondents, significantly fewer men than in the farm population of women respondents are pluri-active (chi-square =5,0061, P<0.05) and smallholders significantly more often than larger farmers follow the traditional model of full-time farming relying entirely on agricultural income (chi-square = 4.9160, p< 0.05). This pattern is accentuated by the fact that in one-third of these farm households also women do not hold a non-farm employment.

In all countries, wives' only or together with their husbands are significantly less often pluri-active than their husbands. Only in Finland women smallholders are more frequently pluri-active than all other farm groups and more than smallholders in the other countries. It is also of particular interest to note that women smallholders in France and Sweden are rarely pluri-active.

In conclusion, it seems that in all countries smallholder men are most often pluri-active, regardless of prevailing rural labour market conditions for men and women. Only in Finland, women more actively than in the other countries participate in non-farm employment. It must be noted, however, that smallholder men's pluri-activity does not necessarily render them part-time farmers. A good part of pluri-active men farmers in several of the countries studied manage to in fact hold two nearly full-time occupations, one as farmers and another as employed in a non-farm occupation. Even more important, the farms cannot be necessarily considered to

be part-time farms. When husbands are pluri-active, quite often the wives work full-time or part-time as farmers. Since most small farms provide full-time employment for one or even less than one adult, one adult who is a nearly full-time farmer or two adults part-time farmers are sufficient for the farm to be considered an active full-time farm.

B. SUBJECTIVE INDICATORS

a. Belonging and perceived acceptance by farming community

The majority of Dutch women (68%) and men (69%) are convinced that they belong to and are accepted by the local farming community.²¹ The more women and men are involved in agricultural and other organizations, the more integrated they feel in the farming community. The feeling of belonging is also influenced by farm characteristics: men and women with intensive husbandry farms, with small farms and farms engaged in non-farm income generating activities feel less integrated than others²²(Table 14). Age makes no difference.

Table 14. Feeling of belonging by men's extent of non-farm work (Netherlands)²³

<i>Feeling of Belonging</i>	Irregular	Regular	No non-farm work	Total
Yes	80%	50%	79%	39
No		50%	21%	14
Sometimes	20%			2
Total (100%)	140	16	29	55

The feeling of not belonging is most pronounced among those families in which the husband is involved in full-time non-farm employment and who depend on non-farm employment as their most important source of income (Table 15). Among smallholders, 41% of them refer to his or her non-farm employment as the most important income generating activity. The large majority, on the other hand, of farmers with medium-size and large farms (74% and 93% respectively) considers agricultural production their most important source of income (Table 16). In addition,

²¹ Husbands and wives generally agree. In about 52% of the (49) couples both have the feeling to belong to the farming community, in 21% none of them does so.

²² Statistically significant is only the relation between women's feeling of belonging and farm size ($p < 0.02$).

¹⁴ Women's answers point into the same direction but are not statistically significant.

a small number of (mainly smaller) farm relies in the first place on income from the renting of productions means, social benefits or other funds.

Table 15. Feeling of belonging of women and men by farm size (Netherlands)

<i>Feeling of belonging</i>	Small	Medium	Big	Total
Women*				
Yes	59%	87%	82%	91
No	38%	11%	18%	39
Sometimes	3			3
Total	87	35	11	133
Men				
Yes	63%	100%	80%	39
No	32%		20%	14
Sometimes	5%			2
Total	40	10	5	55

* Statistically significant (p=0.05)

Table 16. Main income source by farm size (Netherlands-women's answers)

<i>Main Income source</i>	Small	Medium	Big	<i>Mean</i>
Agriculture	51%	74%	93%	61%
His work	34%	14%		25%
Her work	7%			4%
Rent of production means	6%	6%	7%	6%
Social benefits	1%	6%		3%
Other	1%			1%
Total (100%)	85	34	14	133

Statistically not significant

The relation between income sources and integration in the farming community illustrates the effect of norms and values within the Dutch agricultural sector, indicating which farms and farmers do and which ones do not deserve respect. Not being able to make a living as a full time farmer for instance makes many men believe not to be 'one of them' any more. More than once farmers who had to sell or rent their milking quota said: "*Since I stopped milking, I am not a farmer anymore.*" As a consequence they often quit visiting professional reunions and in doing so, they aggravate their professional isolation and exclusion. The same may also happen to those who have to scale down their farm because of financial problems or because of age.

Furthermore, interpersonal integration is related to institutional integration. Membership and trust in the farm union affect the level of interpersonal integration. Those who are not affiliated with farm unions and do not believe that they are being represented by them, feel considerably less integrated in the farming community than satisfied members (Table 17). This is true for women as well as for men. ²⁴

Table 17. Feeling of belonging to the farming community by union membership (the Netherlands, women's answers)

<i>Feeling of Belonging</i>	Member	No member	Total
Yes	77%	43%	88
No	22%	54%	40
Sometimes	1%	3%	2
Total (100%)	95	35	130

Statistically significant ($p < 0.01$)

The relation, of course, works also the other way around. Those who do not feel a part of the farming community, are not motivated to become involved in the farm union and have little trust in farm unions (Table 18). It is interesting to note that though most of the men and women are suspicious towards the national government, some have confidence in the EU support. They demonstrate even more trust in European policymakers than those do who feel included in the farming community. Apparently they acknowledge the fact that the EU is indeed more resolute than the Dutch government to support small and pluri-active farms within the new rural development schemes.

Interpersonal integration is also related to economic integration. Farm families threatened by economic exclusion, are often less integrated in the community of farmers (Table 19), but is difficult to say if they are actually expelled from the community. Probably it is also a question of self-exclusion. Especially men fear not to be respected anymore and dissociate from the community of farmers, when they think not be able to comply anymore with the norms of mainstream agriculture. The same trends have been found in Karditsa, Greece where large farmers constitute the agricultural mainstream. In this context, smallholders feel marginal and alienated

²⁴ For women the following relations are significant: feeling of belonging and general and personal union membership ($p < 0,01$), and trust in union defending the interest of their farm ($p = 0.000$). For men only the relation between feeling of belonging and trust in union defending the interests of their farm is statistically significant ($p < 0.003$).

from agricultural cooperatives which are dominated by larger farmers. They, therefore, often drop out from membership, thus, increasing their feelings of powerlessness and alienation.

Table 18. Institutional integration by feeling of belonging to the farming community (Netherlands-women's answers)²⁵

<i>Feeling of Belonging to the Farming Community</i>	Yes	No	Sometimes	Total
Union member**	83%	53%	50%	82
Union defends interests of our farm **	56%	14%	100%	48
Union puts to little effort in defending interests of smallholders	78%	87%	100%	98
In favour of a smallholder's union	58%	69%	50%	75
National government sustains us	5%	8%		7
EU sustains us	9%	25%		15

** Statistically significant (p<0.01)

In Sweden, smallholder men who, much more often than other farmers, have a non-farm employment and particularly those with a low level of education, feel powerless and not belonging to the farming community. As a result, they more often than others exclude themselves and the farm household from agricultural organizations and maintain a traditional division of labour and farm management. All Swedish farmers, however, feel powerless because the survival of the farms is decided in Brussels and they do not trust that Swedish politicians act in the interest of Swedish farmers.

Table 19. Feeling of belonging by expectation of future economic viability (Netherlands-women's answers)

Feeling of Belonging	Optimistic	Pessimistic	Uncertain	Total
Yes	76%	46%	65%	77
No	20%	54%	35%	34
Sometimes	4%			2
Total (100%)	51	13	49	113

²⁵ Men's answers are similar. Statistically significant is only the relation with independent unions for smallholders (p<0.003).

b. Extent to Which Smallholders Feel Supported by Farmers' Organizations

In all countries, low organizational involvement in farmers' organizations can be explained by low expectations of support by these organizations. This is especially true for men and women smallholders who demonstrate little trust in the ability and willingness of farm unions to defend their interests. They perceive the unions as dominated by larger farmers whose priority is to stand by them. Furthermore smallholders often lack the time to visit reunions because of their engagement in various income-generating activities or do not want to spend money on a membership which may not pay back. The feeling and experience of being looked down upon because of the small size of their farm also plays an important role.

Table 20 shows that in Greece, smallholders more often than larger farmers and men more often than women believe that cooperatives help smallholders but in both cases, the difference is not significant. Most of the negative comments focus on the lack of interest on the part of cooperatives because they cater more to large farmers, ignoring smallholders and on the fact that they are not trustworthy. Attitudes toward cooperatives do not vary with farm size and men and women who are members do not hold more positive views than those who are not members. Only in the farm population of women respondents, when the husband is pluri-active, women have significantly more often positive views regarding cooperatives than when the husband is not pluri-active (chi-square = 5.2308, $p < 0.05$). The same trend does not, however, hold true for the farm population of men respondents. Possibly women who are active in the farm enterprise and recognized as farmers, are satisfied that they are able to be cooperative members and tend to be less critical.

When it comes to farmers' unions, most Greek women (82%) and a little more than one-fourth of Greek men do not answer or do not know even whether or not there is a farmers' union in the community and are not sure whether or not they are members. Most smallholders can identify as a farm union function, the issuing of certificate that they are farmers, with which they can buy an agricultural pick up vehicle. Of those who express an opinion, 84% of them have a very negative view of them, mostly complaining that they are all talk but no action. Men, on the other hand, seem to be divided in their opinion about farmers' unions, 48% of them see them in a positive light and another 48% in a negative light but their most frequent complaints are similar to those of women.

Table 20. Attitudes toward agricultural cooperatives by farm size and gender (if they think that they support smallholders)

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Women	Men*	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men***
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Positive	2 (15%)	5 (36%)	7 (32%)	2 (33%)	76 (46%)	47 (66%)	38 (49%)	18 (50%)	5 (74%)	-
Negative	11 (85%)	3 (21%)	11 (50%)	4 (67%)	66 (40%)	24 (34%)	39 (51%)	18 (50%)	2 (26%)	-
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Positive	20 (46%)	17 (63%)	19 (36%)	12 (48%)	8 (33%)	5 (50%)	17 (61%)	4 (31%)	5 (71%)	--
Negative	24 (54%)	6 (22%)	29 (55%)	13 (52%)	13 (54%)	5 (50%)	11 (39%)	9 (69%)	2 (29%)	-
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Positive	5 (39%)	5 (56%)	16 (39%)	6 (30%)	-	-	9 (64%)	2 (50%)	16 (84%)	-
Negative	8 (61%)	4 (44%)	21 (51%)	14 (70%)	-	-	5 (36%)	2 (50%)	3 (16%)	-
<i>D. Large size</i>										
Positive	-	-	11 (42%)	6 (32%)	-	-	-	-	8 (85%)	-
Negative	-	-	12 (46%)	11 (58%)	-	-	-	-	1 (15%)	-

* When the percentages do not add to 100%, the remaining percentages are those who do not know or are indecisive.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

*** The question was not asked from men.

Overall, the distrust expressed toward cooperatives and farm unions is impressive. In the Netherlands, more than half of the women and men do not believe that the farm union is representing the interests of their farm. Neither do they trust the farm union to put enough effort in defending smallholders' interests. Many smallholders never enter a farm union. They believe that farm unions defend foremost the interests of large farms (de Bruin & Oostindië 1991; Korpel 1989; Wijnen 1987; Somers 1991). They also point to an uneven representation of smallholders within the boards and commissions (Korpel 1989). Their beliefs are justified since the main farm union shows little confidence in the new trends of diversification and pluri-activity and considers non-farm work as a sign of defeat. In public, union representatives usually question the income generating potential of diversification activities and stress that their markets will quickly be saturated. In doing so they show little respect for those strategies, which are of special importance to smallholders.

Those who have not joined the farm union, are significantly more suspicious compared to union members, but even more than half of those who are members (women 53%, men 57%) have little trust in the union.²⁶ It is not surprising to find that more than half of the women and men approve the idea to start a special union of smallholders. Women and men generally confide in the trustworthiness of farmers' institutions to more or less the same extent. Husbands and wives generally agree on this subject, except when it comes to separate smallholders' unions of which women are more in favour than men²⁷.

Trust in the main farm union is affected by farm size and varies by farm sector. Horticultural farmers have more trust in the union compared to other sectors.²⁸ Small and medium dairy and intensive husbandry farms have the lowest expectations of farm unions and co-operatives. They are also most in favour of an independent union of smallholders²⁹ (Table 21). Finally, trust in the intentions of the farm union does not depend on age.

In the other countries, there are no differences between smallholders' and larger farmers' attitudes toward agricultural cooperatives and no differences between

²⁶ The members of the co-operative demonstrate somewhat more trust in their organisation (distrust of 32% of the female and 45% of the male members).

²⁷ Statistically significant (p=0.002).

²⁸ Statistically significant only for women (p=0.01).

²⁹ For men only the relation between farm size and being in favour of an independent smallholders' union is statistically significant (p=0.028)

men' and women's positive and negative attitudes toward cooperatives. Only in Finland and Greece, men tend to be less negative than women toward cooperatives. It seems, therefore, that the hypothesis regarding men's greater extent of alienation from

Table 21. Expressions of trust in agricultural organizations by size (Netherlands-women's answers)³⁰

Expressions of Trust in agricultural organizations	Small	Medium	Big	Total
Farm union does not represent the interests of our farm.	58%	69%	50%	72 (60%)
Farm union puts too little effort in defending the interests of smallholders.	83%	85%	57%	105 (81%)
Co-operatives do not represent our interest.	51%	38%	36%	55 (46%)
In favour of an independent smallholder's union.*	69%	47%	47%	80 (61%)

* Statistically significant (p<0.05)

mainstream agricultural institutions is not supported by the data. On the contrary, in the case of Greek and Finnish men the data indicate that they report being less alienated than women. In France, however, men and women smallholders hold equally often a negative opinion about agricultural cooperatives.

Dutch farmers expect more of the co-operatives but still the distrust is considerable.³¹ This is mainly caused by the size-related agreements made by the Cooperatives concerning the prize of products or services, and the sometimes limited access of smallholders to co-operatives.

c. Extent to Which smallholders feel that CAP and national agricultural policies are supportive

Farmers' attitudes toward CAP are not influenced by whether or not they receive agricultural subsidies³² but in some countries they are related to farm size. In Greece, however, practically all men and women farmers who participate or have participated

³⁰ Men's answers point to the same direction and confirm the conclusions based on women's answers.

³¹ On household level this means that only a quarter of the farm families is convinced of the good intentions of the farm-union (25%) and a little more than one-third that the co-operatives (35%) act on their behalf.

³² In Finland and Greece, since practically all farmers receive a EU agricultural subsidy, it is not possible to differentiate attitudes according to whether or not they receive subsidies.

in EU subsidized agricultural programmes believe that the CAP is helpful to farmers. Also in regions in which there is great dependency on agricultural subsidies (such as Karditsa), the attitude toward CAP is much more negative and than in regions in which such dependency is smaller (e.g. Lesvos).³³

The importance of farm size is different for men and women respondents. Dutch women smallholders believe that such policies are supportive of smallholders significantly more often than women in larger farms (chi-square = 5.0977, $p < 0.05$). Greek women smallholders, on the other hand, are less positive toward CAP than women with larger farms. This attitude is not related to farm size, however, according to the answers of Dutch, French and Greek men farmers and Swedish women. In the case of Finland, practically all men and women farmers think that CAP does not support the smallholders and there is no differentiation by farm size (Table 22).

Farmers' attitudes toward national or regional agricultural policies are to some extent related to farm size (Table 23) and are influenced by whether or not farmers receive national or regional agricultural subsidies. In France, Greece and the Netherlands, men (but not women) smallholders more often than larger farmers think that national agricultural policies support smallholders, the difference, however, is statistically significant only in France. In the Nordic countries, farm size is not related to farmers' attitudes. Furthermore in the Netherlands, men and women who receive national or regional agricultural subsidies significantly more often than farmers who receive such subsidies report that national and regional agricultural policies support smallholders. In France, however, there is no relationship between whether or not farmers receive national or regional agricultural subsidies and attitudes toward national/regional agricultural policies.

Active participation in agricultural protests (usually about subsidies or quota) among Greek farmers is equally important for smallholders and larger farmers and for both Karditsa and Lesvos. In fact, agricultural protests in Karditsa (and the entire

³³ In Thessaly (where Karditsa belongs), the income transfer of CAP per full-time employed farmer (AWU) is twice as much as the country average while in North Aegean (where Lesvos belongs), it is half the country average.

Table 22. Attitudes towards CAP by farm size and respondent's

Attitudes towards CAP	Finland*		France		Greece		N
	Men**	Women	Men	Women*	Men	Women	
A. Small farm size							
Supportive of smallholders	-	1 (4%)	2 (33%)	3 (16%)	56 (72%)	95 (57%)	4 (
Not supportive	9 (64%)	18 (75%)	4 (67%)	16 (84%)	18 (23%)	55 (33%)	35 (
B. Medium size (a)							
Supportive of smallholders	-	1 (2%)	5 (19%)	2 (4%)	8 (67%)	18 (69%)	3 (
Not supportive	15 (55%)	48 (89%)	21 (81%)	44 (96%)	4 (33%)	6 (23%)	11 (
C. Medium size (b)							
Supportive of smallholders	1 (11%)	-	4 (21%)	1 (3%)	-	-	1 (
Not supportive	3 (33%)	16 (80%)	15 (79%)	39 (97%)	-	-	3 (
D. Larger size							
Supportive of smallholders	-	-	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	-	-	
Not supportive	-	-	16 (84%)	21 (81%)	-	-	

* When the percentages do not add to 100, this is due to the fact that the remaining percentage of women answered that they did not know or gave other answers that cannot be classified as supportive or not supportive.

** In Finland, men were not asked this question.

*** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 23. Attitudes towards national agricultural policies by farm size and respondent's gender

Attitudes towards national agricultural policies	Finland*		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Supportive of smallholders	-	3 (13%)	3 (50%)	3 (15%)	9 (12%)	12 (7%)	2 (5%)	4 (5%)	2 (31%)	3 (30%)
Not supportive	10 (71%)	13 (54%)	3 (50%)	17 (85%)	67 (88%)	151 (93%)	39 (95%)	81 (95%)	6 (69%)	8 (70%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Supportive of smallholders	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	5 (19%)	2 (4%)	1 (8%)	2 (8%)	3 (21%)	1 (3%)	4 (40%)	6 (46%)
Not supportive	18 (70%)	33 (59%)	21 (81%)	47 (96%)	11 (92%)	22 (92%)	11 (79%)	35 (97%)	8 (60%)	10 (54%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Supportive of smallholders	1 (11%)	1 (5%)	6 (30%)	5 (13%)	-	-	-	3 (20%)	2 (10%)	7 (40%)
Not supportive	6 (67%)	10 (50%)	14 (70%)	35 (87%)	-	-	5 (100%)	12 (80%)	8 (90%)	10 (60%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Supportive of smallholders	-	-	3 (16%)	3 (13%)	-	-	-	-	5 (63%)	4 (44%)
Not supportive	-	-	16 (84%)	20 (87%)	-	-	-	-	4 (37%)	13 (56%)

*For Finland, there are only data about any type of agricultural subsidy without differentiation as to whether it is EU or national subsidy.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Thessaly) have been widely publicized because they involve blocking of main transport arteries. Overall, more than half of men farmers alone or with their wives participate in protests. Although women's participation in protests is low (about one-fourth of them), those who are integrated in the agricultural occupation participate significantly more often than excluded women. It seems that the professionalization of Greek women farmers entails also more active participation in agricultural protests.

Farmers try to influence governmental policies and express their anger and concern by taking part in demonstrations. Half of the Dutch men and about a quarter (22%) of the interviewed women farmers have participated in demonstrations. Men smallholders participate in demonstrations more often than larger farmers, whereas the situation is opposite among women: smallholder women take part in demonstrations less often than women in larger farms. The majority of women (71%) and men (69%) do not consider demonstrations a useful and effective instrument. Active women farmers, however, who are integrated in the agricultural occupation more often than other women participate in agricultural protests. Furthermore, women, who take part in demonstrations are more optimistic about the effect of these demonstrations compared to those who do not, but the difference is statistically not significant. For men the actual participation in demonstration makes no difference for their attitudes toward the effectiveness of protests.

In Finland, agricultural protests are rarely organized and is, therefore, understandable why only 8 percent of the interviewed women and 6 percent of the men have participated in some demonstration. Finally in France, agricultural protests remain entirely a masculine domain from which women are altogether absent .

Swedish farmers have clearly expressed their dissatisfaction with EU agricultural policies and regulations that involve a great deal of bureaucracy and are insensitive of local conditions of agricultural production. On the hand, they feel that Swedish farmers, more than their European counterparts, have high ethical standards concerning animal husbandry and the environment. This makes Swedish products more expensive and more difficult to be competitive on a market based on price than on quality. Many Swedish farmers, therefore, find the existing support system demeaning but because prices for agricultural products are low, the farms cannot survive without support. As a dairy farmer aptly expressed his dilemma: "If they take away the support, we are finished. It is a necessary evil." As a consequence, Swedish

farmers find that they have become “support maximizers rather than production maximizers.” As a young woman farmer with a small farm and active in farmers’ organizations said: “The thing is to get all the EU subsidies that is possible. We try to pick up as much as we can. That is necessary.” On the other hand, Swedish farmers feel that they are no longer free, they feel controlled and watched and that bureaucratic requirements and controls take a lot of time away from producing food. Finally, an indication that Swedish smallholders are more dissatisfied than larger farmers is the fact that they participate significantly more often in agricultural protests than large farmers.

Many men and women feel powerless to do anything to influence agricultural policy. In their view they have no grip on laws and regulations, which limit their production, raise their costs and threaten the very existence of their farm. Dutch farmers of smaller farms feel unjustly treated, as they did not cause the overproduction and pollution but have to pay the price for the bad practices of larger farmers. Many feel isolated from society as a whole as other farmers, environmentalists, consumers and urban dwellers do not seem to accept any more their right to existence. They feel powerless to confront those interest groups that also demand access to land. They are threatened by the increasing need for land for other than agricultural purposes, the different opinions about how to use the land, the growing interest for living in the countryside, the hostility towards the production methods of farmers and their negative image in modern society.

Dutch farmers feel let down by the national government and, in a somewhat lesser degree, by the European Union. During the interviews, the national policy of restructuring the intensive pig sector and the EU-policy of production restriction were mentioned regularly by men and women as examples of policy instruments that damage the development of their farms. Farmers active in intensive husbandry and dairy farming judge the national and European government most harshly. They have already experienced a cut back by production restriction and fear they may experience another in the near future. Furthermore prices are low and every new measure taken by the government feels like ‘a kick in the back’. Horticultural farms are generally in a better economic situation and have better prospects. They have seen their income increase during the last season whereas small pig farmers have lost most of their income (LEI-DLO, 1999).

Nearly all Dutch women (94%) and men (93%), young and old, think that the national rural and agricultural policies constitute an obstacle for their farm. A large majority also considers the EU-policies as working against them, though fewer women (74%) than men (95%).³⁴ This difference, however, between men's and women's answers is mainly due to the fact that women twice as often as men have no opinion on EU policy (women 15%, men 7%). Women are more outspoken about the effect of the national government.³⁵ Men and women with small farms are significantly more suspicious of the intentions of the national government than those with larger farms.³⁶ The differences by size are less significant, when the EU-policy is concerned (for men and women). They are the medium-size farmer who demonstrate most distrust towards the EU.

Conclusion

All the objective and subjective indicators of integration/exclusion examined indicate that smallholders are excluded from mainstream agriculture, by being excluded from a number of critical resources, services and benefits extended to larger farmers. There is, of course, variation among the five countries as to what are these resources, services and benefits from which they are excluded, but there is no single country in which it can be said that smallholders are not excluded. These resources, services and benefits include, among others, agricultural loans, entry into the production chain under favorable conditions for buying production means and for selling their products, membership in agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, agricultural training, participation in EU subsidized agricultural programs and access to agricultural information and advice. Smallholders entry into the production chain and profitable markets is problematic and expensive because they do not enjoy privileges extended to larger farmers by cooperatives and because adherence to EU environmental and animal health regulations penalizes them disproportionately to their financial means.

Furthermore, the perceived lack of commitment of farmers' organizations to represent and defend smallholders' interests often leads to smallholders' alienation

³⁴ Mainly because young women have more trust in the EU but the relation with age is statistically not significant; men's trust in the EU does not differ by age.

³⁵ Only 7% of the women and 2% of the men don't know how to answer this question.

³⁶ Statistically significant for women (p=0.044) but not for men.

from these organizations and to self-exclusion from membership. In this way, a vicious cycle is established that further weakens the position of smallholders in farmers' organizations. The same type of vicious cycle is set up with agricultural advisors who are not interested in advising and assisting smallholders about appropriate solutions and with smallholders who do not seek to contact them, because they feel that such contacts would not be helpful. In this way, farmers' organizations and advisors marginalize smallholders and smallholders further extend and reinforce the ongoing process of marginalization and exclusion by their withdrawal.

Most men in smallholder households have to be pluri-active in order to survive while women are also quite often pluri-active only in Finland. This frequent pluri-activity is responsible for their having less time to become actively involved in the activities of farmers' organizations than larger farmers who rely only on their agricultural income.

Despite the exclusionary dynamics exerted on smallholders that create unfavorable conditions for their functioning, the decrease in the numbers of small farms does not indicate their eventual disappearance. Many of the persisting small farms, as we shall see later on, represent successful new and adapted modes of farm management.

REFERENCES

- Abel W. (eds.) (1988), *Kleinbauern in Europa, Leistungen – Lasten – Lebenschancen (Smallholders in Europe – efforts – problems - life chances)*, Göttingen: ASG.
- Biemans, J.M. (1974), *Toekomstplannen van boeren met kleine bedrijven (Future plans of farmer with small enterprises)*, Wageningen: Wageningen University.
- Bruin, R. de & H. Oostindië (1991), *Kansen voor kleinere bedrijven in de valle (Chances for smaller farms in the 'Valley')*, Wageningen: Wageningen University.
- Bruin, R., H. Oostindië & J.D. van der Ploeg (1991) *Niet klein te krijgen. Bedrijfsstijlen in de Gelderse Vallei (Not to be defeated, farming styles in the Gelderland-Valley)*, Wageningen: Wageningen Univeristy.
- CBS, Landbouwtelling 1999 (*Agricultural Census 1999*), The Hague.
- Central Statistical Office of Finland (1999). *Tilastokeskus, SVT, Maa-ja metsatalous 1999:3 (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery). Maatilatalouden yritysten tulotilasto (Income Statistics of Agriculture) 1997*. Helsinki.
- Everdingen, W. H., van, G. S, Venema and K. H. M. van Bommel (1999). *Agrarische gezinnen en hun inkomens: Is er sprake van armoede? (Agrarian families and their incomes: Is there poverty?)*, The Hague: LEI-DLO.
- Farm Structure Research (1995)*. Athens: National Statistical Service of Greece, Table 39.
- Kassimis C. et al.(2000).*The Profile of the Modern Farmer: Determination of the Needs for Education and Training*, Athens: National Center for Social Research, Institute of Urban and Rural Sociology (In Greek).
- Korpel, H.J. (1989), *Kring Nijmegen en de kleine bedrijven (Small enterprises around Nijmegen)*, Wageningen: Wageningen University/NCB.
- LEI-DLO/CBS (1999), *Land- en Tuinbouwcijfers, 1999 (Agricultural and Horticultural data, 1999)*, The Hague.
- Ploeg, J.D. van der (1999), *De virtuele boer (The virtual farmer)*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Silvis, H.J. & C. van Bruchem (eds.) (1999), *Landbouw-Economisch Bericht 1999 (Agricultural-economic report 1999)*, The Hague: LEI-DLO.
- Somers, B.M. (1991), *Small farmers and agricultural extension: surviving on a small farm in the Netherlands and possibilities for agricultural extension to reach a hard-to-reach category*, Wageningen: Wageningen University.

Spierings, C.J.M. (1974), *Boer blijven of van beroep veranderen? (Staying a farmer or changing profession?)*, The Hague: LEI.

Verhaar, C.H.A. & A. Hoeve (1999), *Megabedrijven in agrarisch Nederland (Mega Enterprises in Dutch Agriculture)*, Wageningen: STOAS

Wijnen (1987), *Problemen en perspectieven van kleine land- en tuinbouwbedrijven (Problems and perspectives of small agricultural and horticultural enterprises)*, The Hague: LEI.

CHAPTER FIVE: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN GENDER ISSUES AND THE ROLE OF GENDER ROLE IDEOLOGIES.

In the five countries included in this study, there is considerable variation in terms of prevailing gender role ideologies. In Sweden and Finland, for the last three decades official gender role ideologies have been egalitarian and a number of governmental policies have been implementing gender equality. The resulting degree of equality, however, has been uneven and not entirely satisfactory, especially when it comes to the division of labor in the rural household and in the farm enterprise. In rural areas, in Sweden more than in Finland and particularly among smallholders, traditional gender role ideologies seem to be operational despite the overall egalitarian discourse.

At the other end in rural Greece, the Netherlands and France, men's and women's lives are still to a considerable degree determined by traditional/patriarchal gender role ideologies. While in Greece there have not been particular efforts to achieve gender equality and no feminist movement, in the Netherlands, despite the existence of a feminist movement, efforts to achieve gender equality have not been particularly effective, especially in rural areas. Finally, France represents a country in transition from a traditional/patriarchal to a more egalitarian society for men and women, where feminist battles are still being fought.

In this chapter, we shall examine men's and women's gender role ideology and their beliefs regarding gender equality; whether or not women feel discriminated against as women; and the extent to which egalitarian gender ideologies are translated into behavior in the critical division of labour at home.

Men's and women's gender role ideology and beliefs regarding gender equality

The majority of Finnish men (90%) and women (70%) think that men and women farmers are equal from a legal point of view as well as in the way agricultural authorities and bank managers treat them. The minority that thinks that there is inequality, finds it manifested in the way local agricultural authorities prefer to do business with men farmers and give them better service than to women. Young women who have recently started as farmers or who married a farmer report not being taken seriously. Finnish women consider the ownership structure of the farm as an important factor affecting attitudes toward them as well as how they are treated in

professional matters. They feel that the ownership of the farm and the air of influence that it entails as more influential than gender.

The majority of Finnish men (62%) and women (65%) think that gender does not cause problems for women working in agriculture and that Finnish women farmers do not have more problems than men. A few men and women (13% and 16% respectively) think that women have more problems, because of lingering gender stereotypes held by some men and another 14% of men and women, because agricultural work is strenuous. In Table 1, however, the presented detailed data, regarding women's ability to perform agricultural skills, show that in fact women much more often than men have negative views about such ability³⁷. Responding, on the other hand, to the more general question of whether women are as competent farmers as men, the majority of interviewed men and women (76% and 85% respectively) believe that women are as good farmers as men and can manage farms

Table 1. Finnish men's and women's beliefs about women's competence to perform farm tasks

Belief about competence to perform tasks	Women (N=100)	Men (N=50)
Can perform all tasks	16 (16%)	28 (56%)
Cannot perform forest work or machine work	5 (5%)	2 (4%)
Cannot cope with field cultivation and machine work	54 (54%)	18 (36%)
Cannot cope with machine repair	17 (17%)	-

as well as men (Table 2). It seems, therefore, that when confronted with the more general question of equality between men and women, women tend to give a more conventional answer than when they respond to women's specific ability to perform farm tasks. As a result of the overall egalitarian attitudes, about one-fourth of men and women do not think that particular changes are needed to improve the position of Finnish women farmers. Only a few men and women (8% and 11%) think that there is a need for a change in the mentality of the professional agricultural world regarding women farmers and another small percentage (10% and 9%) that women need to change the way they think about themselves.

³⁷ The difference almost reaches statistical significance: chi-square = 3.3325.

Table 2. Opinions about women's competence as farmers by farm size and respondent's Gender*

Opinions about women's competence	Finland		Greece		Sweden	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men**	Women
<i>A. Smallest Size</i>						
Equally competent as men	9 (64%)	21 (91%)	25 (33%)	89 (54%)	-	9 (87%)
Women less competent than men	1 (7%)	1 (4%)	40 (52%)	39 (24%)	-	2 (13%)
Women more competent than men	1 (7%)	-	7 (9%)	36 (22%)	-	-
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>						
Equally competent as men	23 (85%)	45 (80%)	6 (54%)	12 (44%)	-	13 (79%)
Women less competent than men	2 (7%)	7 (13%)	5 (46%)	9 (33%)	-	2 (3%)
Women more competent than men	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	-	6 (22%)	-	3 (18%)
<i>C. Medium Size (b)</i>						
Equally competent as men	6 (67%)	18 (100%)	-	-	-	16 (79%)
Women less competent than men	1 (11%)	-	-	-	-	2 (8%)
Women more competent than men	1 (11%)	-	-	-	-	4 (13%)
<i>D. Large Size</i>						
Equally competent as men	-	-	-	-	-	14 (76%)
Women less competent than men	-	-	-	-	-	3 (10%)
Women more competent than men	-	-	-	-	-	5 (15%)

* In France and the Netherlands, the question asked was more general: "whether or not there is any difference in quality between men and women farmers", without an evaluation of the differences and is not, therefore, comparable with the answers from the other countries.

**In Sweden, this question was not asked from men. Also percentages are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

It must be also noted that in Finland, egalitarian gender role ideologies prescribe that women full-time farmers must receive half of the agricultural income. The data show that indeed 73% of women full-time farmers receive at least half of the agricultural income. Of course, there is variation according to women's extent of involvement in farm work, land ownership structure and whether or not they receive child care allowances (See Chapter Six).

The picture from Sweden is less clear-cut regarding gender equality in agriculture. The prevailing ambivalence regarding gender equality in agriculture is reflected in women's frequent "no answer" responses and in the fact that there is a significant difference between men's and women's answers. In the case of women, only 18% answered clearly that within Swedish farming men and women are equal

and 26% that are not equal; otherwise answers were qualified and 49% did not know or did not answer. The majority (85%) of women, however, believe that women are as competent farmers as men and only 6% that they are less competent than men. Men, on the other hand, do not believe that there is equality: 65% of them answered that there is no equality and only one-third that there is equality. It is also interesting that when men were asked whether or not they think that women are as competent farmers as men, 92% of them answered that they are as competent as men and only 6% answered that they were less competent. When, however, the question was asked in a more indirect manner, namely what they thought other people think about women's competence as farmers, 45% of them answered that other people think that women farmers are less competent than men farmers and only 35% that they are as competent as men. This difference in the two sets of answers indicates that the answers to the direct question are conventional, while the answers to the indirect question represent men's more genuine attitudes, since being able to attribute negative attitude toward women farmers to "other people", frees them to express attitudes contrary to the official egalitarian gender ideology. It seems, therefore, that almost half of the Swedish men interviewed have stereotyped attitudes about women, considering them as not competent farmers.

The majority of the interviewed Swedish women report having a good self-image as farmers: 62% of them think that women farmers are equally competent farm managers as men, 17% that they are more competent and only 12% that they are less competent (Table 2). Despite this good self-image, however, the majority (67%) of them think that women farmers face more problems than men, mainly because of differences in physical strength (28%), but also because they are less respected in the agricultural world (18%). Finally, when it comes to changes needed in order to improve the status of women farmers, the most frequent answers are "change in the mentality of the agricultural world" (19%), "general improvement in the economic conditions of agriculture" (13%), "better agricultural training" (12%) and "change in attitudes and behaviors of the women themselves" (7%).

It seems that while the self-image of both Swedish and Finnish women farmers is good, Swedish women feel that they have more problems than men and are less convinced about gender equality in agriculture than Finnish women, while about

half of the Swedish men still hold stereotyped negative attitudes regarding women farmers.

In Greece, instead of the general question as to whether or not there is gender equality in agriculture, the more specific question was asked referring to women's equal or unequal treatment by agricultural authorities and bank managers. Only one-third of women and men think that women are being discriminated by being less well served and assisted with their problems. Furthermore, women are significantly more often more aware of the existence of gender discrimination, when they have been denied access to a desirable resource: those who had not received agricultural training and those who do not hold a non-farm employment significantly more often report the existence of gender discrimination than women who had received such training or held such jobs. Furthermore, when women perceive that women are as competent in farm management as men, they overwhelmingly perceive that there is no discrimination against women. When, on the other hand that women are more or less competent than men, about one-third of them believe that there is discrimination (Table 3).

Greek men more often than women hold negative stereotypes about women farmers. Almost twice as many men as women (46.7 versus 28.4 per cent) think that women are less competent as farmers than men and almost twice as many women as men (20.2 versus 11.7 per cent) think that women are more competent farmers than men. Similarly, almost twice as many men as women (35.4 versus 19.6 per cent) think that women are less competent than men in farm management and almost three times as many women as men (22.7 versus 7.3 per cent) think that women are more competent than men in farm management .

It must be noted, however, that this significant difference between Greek men and women respondents reflect not so much a gender difference but more a difference in the attitudes held by respondents belonging to two farm populations with different characteristics. Most of the interviewed men are landowners and full-time farmers with wives only occasionally working in agriculture as their assistants³⁸, but most probably the attitudes of the husbands of the interviewed women are much more positive regarding women's competence as farmers. This can be deduced from the

³⁸ In this farm population, even when the men are pluri-active they retain the farmer status and do not transfer it to their wife, since they do not believe in their wives' competence as farmers.

fact that half of these pluri-active husbands have transferred the farmer status to their wives, most of whom become integrated in the agricultural occupation.

Greek women have a good self-esteem as farmers: three-fifths of them think that they are as good or better farmers than men smallholders with the same agronomic conditions and only one-third that they are less good. While, in general their belief about women's competence as farmers and as farm managers coincides with their self-esteem as farmers, the degree of agreement is almost perfect when they believe that women are better than men. It must also be noted that only women who are self-excluded from the agricultural profession have a low self-esteem as farmers: three-fourths of them think that men are better farmers than women³⁹.

Table 3. Perceived gender discrimination by Greek women's belief about women's competence in farm management

Belief about competence in farm management	No gender discrimination	Yes, there is discrimination	Do not know	Total
Both are the same	75 (84.3%)	14 (15.7%)	-	89 (58.5%)
The woman is better	23 (69.7%)	10 (30.3%)	-	33 (21.7%)
The woman is worse	17 (60.7%)	10 (35.7%)	1 (3.6%)	28 (18.4%)
It depends	2 (0.2%)	-	-	2 (0.1%)
Total	117 (77.0%)	34 (22.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (100%)

When Greek women were asked whether they thought that women smallholders have more problems than men smallholders, three-fifths of them responded that women have more problems, most of them attributing this to the fact that women, in addition to agricultural work, also have family responsibilities. Men's responses are quite different in that while one-third of women think that men and women have the same problems or that women have more problems, more than half (52%) of the men think that men and women have the same problems. It is also noteworthy that twice as many men as women think that men have more problems than women and that while almost one-third (30%) of men think that women have more problems than men because they cannot manage physically, not one woman thinks so. As it was explained earlier, again this seemingly gender difference is

³⁹ It must be kept in mind that all data about Greek women are derived from the farm population of women respondents in which women play active farmer roles. There are no data about wives in the farm population of men respondents in which women play secondary roles and are most often excluded.

most probably a difference between two distinct farm populations of men and women.

Finally, when Greek women were asked what changes are needed in order to improve their condition as farmers, about one-fourth of them (22%) did not give an answer because they never had thought about this matter; 13.6% thought that improvements must be made for both men and women farmers; and 5% that there was no need for improvement. Thus, altogether two-fifths of women did not mention a specific improvement needed in favour of women farmers. The most frequent specific changes reported are: agricultural training (17.0%), followed by childcare and an early pension (in 8.3% of the answers). The large (65.5%) majority of men farmers, on the other hand, either did not know what to answer (33.3%), or did not think that women needed any special measure (32.2%). When they mentioned a needed specific change, their most frequent (18%) response was agricultural training.

In the Netherlands, women are concerned about being respected as farmers by the farming community in the context of a male dominated agricultural world. All women farmers encounter difficulties in their efforts to achieve acceptance as a professional and integration within the farming community. The majority of Dutch women respondents are convinced that women farmers are different from men farmers and that they experience more problems being farmers and becoming respected as much as men farmers. About a quarter of women have experienced problems themselves. The encountered problems are foremost related to the traditional gender ideology prevalent in the agricultural sector, the male culture and traditional beliefs about women's capacities and "natural" duties. It is important to note that women with agricultural training do not see differences between men and women as farmers and have experienced less gender-specific problems as farmers than women without agricultural training.

Dutch men, on the other hand, perceive less gender-specific differences and problems than women (only one-third of them think that there are gender-specific differences), but believe that women farmers' position in the agricultural sector needs to be improved. In addition, about half of the men and women (48% and 53% respectively) think that women themselves need to change by becoming more self-confident and more knowledgeable; by developing more interest in agricultural politics; and by participating in the farm union in order to take full responsibility as farmers. The other important change thought to be needed is the development of an

integration policy for women on the part of farm unions (62% of men and 49% of women), including explicit invitations of women to union meetings and positive discrimination of women in the selection of board members. They, furthermore, think that these integration measures should be sustained by policy measures on the part of the Ministry of Agriculture and the European Union.

More than half of the interviewed French⁴⁰ women believe that there are differences between men and women farmers and 83% of them think that women face more difficulties as farmers than men, most of them (64%) attributing the difficulties to differences in physical strength. As to how existing gender inequalities in agriculture can be diminished, slightly more than half (53%) of the women think that this can be achieved by recognizing women as farmers, by recognizing their competence, by obtaining equality in salary and by being respected as professionals. One-third of men have the same opinion. Furthermore, one-third of women and 17% of men think that a change in the traditional gender role mentality is needed but 17% of women and 5% of men think that gender inequalities have always existed and cannot be diminished.

Women's ability to express themselves freely in public gatherings such as cooperative meetings could be considered as another indicator of gender equality. Table 4 shows that in all countries the great majority of those who participate in such meetings report being able to freely express themselves at such meetings. Some of them, however, do not dare express their opinions. In the Netherlands, for example, about a third of the women do not dare express their ideas in cooperative or farm union meetings. Mainly women who never attend cooperative meetings feel that women are constrained from speaking up in those meetings. The Dutch data also show that women who are integrated at the farm level by being active in agricultural labour and agricultural decision making feel that they are free to express themselves in cooperative and farm union meetings and they actually do so. Dutch men are much less convinced than women that women are not free to express themselves in

⁴⁰ In both France and the Netherlands, the questions regarding the relative competence of men and women as farmers was asked in a different way than in the other countries: only the existence of differences was asked without any evaluation of these differences.

Table 4. Women's ability to express themselves freely at cooperative meetings by farm size and respondent's gender

Women's ability to express themselves freely at meetings	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Men*	Women	Men	Women	Men*	Women	Men	Women	Men*	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Yes		4 (100%)	4 (80%)	14 (88%)			18 (100%)	21 (80%)	-	5 (100%)
No		-	1 (20%)	2 (12%)			-	5 (20%)	-	-
It depends		-	-	-			-	-	-	-
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Yes		12 (92%)	18 (75%)	25 (89%)			7 (100%)	14 (93%)	-	6 (90%)
No		1 (8%)	4 (17%)	3 (11%)			-	1 (7%)	-	2 (10%)
It depends		-	2 (8%)	-			-	-	-	-
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Yes		8 (100%)	14 (74%)	21 (78%)			4 (100%)	3 (60%)	-	7 (65%)
No		-	4 (21%)	6 (22%)			-	2 (40%)	-	5 (35%)
It depends		-	1 (5%)	-			-	-	-	-
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Yes		-	15 (83%)	12 (80%)			-	-	-	11 (100%)
No		-	2 (11%)	2 (20%)			-	-	-	-
It depends		-	1 (6%)	-			-	-	-	-

* In Finland, the question was not asked from men

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

cooperative meetings or that women are treated differently than men in these meetings.

It seems, therefore, that while women farmers' self-image is positive in Finland, Sweden and Greece (no data available for France and the Netherlands), in four of the five countries women report having more problems as farmers than men because of differences in physical strength, because of having family responsibilities in addition to their farmer role, and/or because of the traditional/patriarchal gender role ideology still prevailing in rural areas and in the agricultural sector. In Finland, however, only a few Finnish women think that they have more problems as farmers than men because of the above reasons.

Regarding needed changes for the improvement of the status of women farmers, only in Greece child care centers and an early pension were mentioned, while needed changes in women's behavior so as to become more self-confident and to take full responsibility as farmers were never mentioned. On the contrary, in Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands, both men and women think that women need to change their mentality and their behaviors as farmers. The fact that Greek women do not recognize the need to change the way they think and act reflects a general lack of introspection and a tendency to externalize blame rather than to examine their own behavior. Furthermore, in all countries men and women think that it is necessary for the prevailing mentality to change, that is the traditional stereotypes about women farmers still encountered in the agricultural sector.

An important difference between Greece and the Netherlands, on the one hand, and France, Sweden and Finland on the other is the educational hypergamy of women in the latter countries. In the three countries, women are significantly better educated than their husbands (in terms of general education), a fact that gives them some bargaining power in interpersonal dynamics, including agricultural decision making.

Extent of husband's help with housework and child care

While in the Netherlands there is no difference between men and women farmers' answers regarding the extent of help provided by the husband with household tasks and child care, in the other countries there are significant differences. In Finland, France and Greece, men significantly more often than women report that

they help regularly or occasionally with household tasks and child care, while women report that men do not help at all⁴¹ (Table 5). In Sweden, the question was not asked from men so a comparison between men's and women's answers is not possible.

When the extent of husband's help with household tasks and child care is examined by farm size, in Finland and Sweden we find that smallholder women significantly more often than women in larger farms report that their husband helps regularly (chi-square = 16.1184, $p < 0.001$), but the same trend does not hold true according to Finnish men's answers⁴² (Table 6). In France, on the other hand, the data show that smallholder men significantly less often than farmers with the largest farm size report that they do not help at all, but women's answers show no difference by farm size. Finally, in Greece and the Netherlands, according to men's and women's answers farm size is not related to whether or not or how regularly the husband helps with housework and childcare.

Overall, the data show that the least helpful husbands, according both to men's and women's answers are Greek and Dutch husbands and the most helpful are Finnish husbands. The fact that rural Greek and Dutch men are not helpful is not a surprise, since it is known that they hold traditional values concerning men's and women's appropriate work. Even in the Athenian family the situation is not different. A study of Athenian married women showed that in 57.3% of the households women report that their husbands do not help them at all and even find it "normal" that men do not help. Furthermore, even helpful husbands mainly do the shopping and only 27% of them assist with one or more housework items (cooking, cleaning, etc.) (Maratou-Alipranti, 1995).

Furthermore, the Dutch data show that an important cause of men's lack of greater participation in child care is men's and women's traditional norms and values regarding the "natural" responsibility of mothers for child care. Furthermore, both men and women have traditional beliefs, about which work is "owned" by whom, that

⁴¹ The chi-square for Finland = 20.1714, $p < 0.001$; for France = 27.4245, $p < 0.001$; and for Greece = 10.2140, $p < 0.01$.

⁴² Swedish men were not asked this question.

Table 5. Husband's help with household tasks and childcare by respondents

Extent of help	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Helps regularly	22 (44%)	40 (40%)	21 (28%)	68 (47%)	23 (30%)	37 (19%)	14 (24%)	24 (17%)	-	25 (30%)
Helps occasionally	21 (42%)	8 (8%)	26 (36%)	9 (6%)	24 (31%)	26 (13%)	23 (39%)	64 (44%)	-	1 (1%)
Does not help	7 (14%)	52 (52%)	25 (35%)	67 (47%)	30 (39%)	133(68%)	22 (37%)	56 (39%)	-	58 (69%)

Table 6. Husband's help with household tasks and childcare by farm size and respondent's gender

Farm size and extent of help	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Helps regularly	7 (50%)	18 (75%)	3 (50%)	12 (55%)	20 (29%)	32 (19%)	8 (20%)	13 (15%)	-	8 (62%)
Helps occasionally	5 (36%)	2 (8%)	1 (17%)	-	21 (30%)	20 (12%)	17 (43%)	44 (49%)	-	-
Does not help	2 (14%)	4 (17%)	2 (33%)	10 (45%)	28 (41%)	117(69%)	15 (37%)	32 (36%)	-	7 (38%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Helps regularly	11 (41%)	18 (32%)	5 (20%)	24 (46%)	3 (38%)	5 (19%)	5 (38%)	6 (16%)	-	6 (31%)
Helps occasionally	13 (48%)	5 (9%)	10 (38%)	3 (6%)	3 (38%)	6 (22%)	5 (39%)	13 (35%)	-	-
Does not help	3 (11%)	33 (59%)	11 (42%)	25 (48%)	2 (25%)	16 (59%)	3 (23%)	18 (49%)	-	14 (69%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Helps regularly	4 (44%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)	19 (46%)	-	-	1 (20%)	3 (20%)	-	5 (24%)
Helps occasionally	3 (33%)	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	3 (7%)	-	-	1 (20%)	7 (47%)	-	-
Does not help	2 (22%)	15 (75%)	4 (20%)	19 (46%)	-	-	3 (60%)	5 (33%)	-	16 (76%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Helps regularly			4 (21%)	12 (50%)	-	-	-	-	-	5 (13%)
Helps occasionally			8 (42%)	3 (13%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Does not help			7 (37%)	9 (37%)	-	-	-	-	-	21 (87%)

prevent a change in the division of labour. The fact that 70% of men respondents say that they are willing to do more housework seems to indicate that it is possible for the division of labour to change. Of course, it is possible that at least some of these men give socially desirable answers. No change in the division of labour can, however, occur if the women do not agree with the shift in household tasks. From an earlier Dutch research, it has been found that women are more willing to share the domain of household affairs, if men are also willing to share the domain of farm work and management (de Rooij *et al.*, 1995).

It is more surprising to find that despite the relatively greater degree of reported helping, equality between men and women has not been attained within Finnish rural households, even when the woman shares the breadwinner role equally with the husband. The time spent on housework by men farmers is on the average one-third of the time spent by women farmers (Niemi and Paakkonen, 1989). According to Finnish men's and women's answers only in one family the man does as much housework as the woman. Moreover, because of the widespread gender egalitarian ideology in Finland, it is quite possible that the Finnish answers that portray husbands as the most helpful European men, may be socially desirable answers reflecting conventionality rather than actual outstanding egalitarian behavior.

Regarding childcare, the majority of Finnish women prefer to not use day care facilities⁴³ and to take care of their children by themselves at home, since they consider this an important advantage of the farmer occupation. The fact that when there are child care centers available, women prefer not to use them and instead choose to take care of their children at home is somewhat ironic and raises disturbing questions. In Sweden, on the contrary, in more than half (55 per cent) of farm households studied in 1992 pre-school children are taken care in day care institutions, while in 45 per cent of the households they are taken care within the extended family (Djurfeldt, unpublished data).

All the data collected in this research project indicate that little has changed in the intra-household division of labour, regardless of the type of prevailing gender role ideology and the extent of women's farm and/or off-farm employment. The data show that in all countries women's entitlement to help by their husband does not increase

⁴³ While day care facilities, they are not always conveniently located and their working hours are not the most appropriate for the women.

with the extent to which she works in the farm or with her full-time non-farm employment. Only in Sweden, when the wife works as much or more than the husband in the farm and the husband has a high school education, he belongs to the small minority of husbands helping with housework. Most probably, these husbands hold egalitarian values more often than husbands with an elementary education. Also in the Netherlands but not in Greece, when the children are very small, husbands tend to help more with housework than when they are grown up. In general pluri-active husbands have less time to help and could be considered to some extent justified, at least in the eyes of most wives.

In Greece, while women's involvement in farm work does not affect their entitlement to help on the part of their husbands, the type of land ownership structure, women's level of education and the relative education of spouses play an important role in the division of labour. Wives who are landowners and wives with secondary education report that their husbands help them significantly more often than wives with only primary education. Husbands' education does not seem to differentiate the extent of help offered by the husband but the educational difference between spouses does matter: when wives are more educated than their husbands, especially when they are higher by four or more grades, they report more often that their husbands help them than women with an equal or lower education than their husbands. The same and even more clear-cut pattern also emerges from men's answers. It seems that in Greece when a wife has low education and much less than her husband, she is perceived as the one who has to provide all household services.

The usual reasons given for the fact that husbands help a little or not at all are: "he has other work to do, he is tired when he gets home," "he does not know how to do the needed tasks," and the woman does not ask for his help. When the French wives were asked whether or not the division of labour at home is satisfactory to them, 80% answered positively and this, despite the fact that they feel that housework and childcare inhibits them from participating more actively in cooperative meetings.

When men report that they help at home, it is mainly with childcare. In France, for example, one in two interviewed couples husbands help with childcare. It is interesting to note that men report helping mainly with the children, meaning that they help them with their lessons, or they spend time playing with them. Similar findings are reported in Athens as well as in other countries, suggesting that men find

it more acceptable to help with children rather than with housework but they tend to undertake the 'pleasant' aspects of child care (walks, play, reading) rather than more intensive, time-consuming work such as meal preparation, washing, etc.(Maratou-Alipranti, 1995; Mousourou, 1985).

REFERENCES

- Rooij, S. de, E. Brouwer and R. van Broekhuizen (1995). *Vrouwen en bedrijfsontwikkeling* (Farming Women and Farm Development), Wageningen: Wageningen Agricultural University/WLTO.
- Maratou-Alipranti, Laoura, 1995. *The Family in Athens: Family Models and Spousal Behaviors* (In Greek), Athens: National Center for Social Research.
- Mousourou, Loukia, 1985. *Family and Children in Athens* (In Greek). Athens: Estia Publishers.
- Niemi, I. and H. Paakkonen (1989). *Ajankayton muutokset 1980-luvulla (Changes in Time Use in the 1980s)*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus (Statistics Finland), Tutkimuksia (Research Publications) no.153.
- Djurfeldt, unpublished data included in the Research Progress Report for the project "Causes and Mechanisms of the Exclusion of Women Smallholders."

CHAPTER SIX: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN WOMEN SMALLHOLDERS' EXCLUSION FROM THE AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION

Women smallholders' integration/exclusion from the agricultural occupation at the institutional and farm level is examined by means of the following objective and subjective indicators:

A. Integration at the Institutional Level

A1. Objective Indicators

- a. Women's membership in farmers' organizations
- b. Women's access to agricultural training
- c. Women's access to agricultural information and advice
- d. Women farmers' representation in official agricultural statistics

A2. Subjective Indicators

- a. Women's belief regarding their recognition as farmers by local community.

B. Integration at the Farm level

B1. Objective Indicators

- a. Women's participation in farm labour
- b. Women's participation in the decision-making of the farm enterprise
- c. Women's access to agricultural income

B2. Subjective Indicators

- a. Women's recognition as farmers by their husband

A. Women's Integration at the Institutional Level

A1. Objective Indicators

a. Women Smallholders' Access to Membership in Farmers' Organizations

In most countries there are no gender-disaggregated data concerning membership in agricultural cooperatives. The sparse existing data indicate that women's participation in agricultural organizations varies considerably in the countries included in the study. In the Netherlands, although there are no national

gender desegregated statistics, it is known that very few women are members of agricultural cooperatives and farm unions. Women's membership in all professional agricultural organizations is low (11%), the lowest percentage (2.5%) of women members found in two cooperatives for arable farms. Also 0.8% of board functions are held by women in a cooperative for potato starch and the highest percentage of women holding board functions is found in a dairy cooperative (10%). Furthermore in 1998, only 12% of farmers' union members were women and 15% of the administrators and there was only one woman representative in the national board of the union (Bock and van Lith, 1999). An important barrier to women's membership in the farmers' union lies in the fact that there is a separate farm women's organization. While in the early 90's the farming women's organizations became officially integrated in the main farmers' union, there is still a specific women's commission. Another obstacle is of financial nature: wives have to pay to be members and smallholders do not consider such a double membership necessary.

In Finland, membership in an agricultural cooperative depends on farm characteristics such as size and agricultural sector. There are no national data regarding men and women smallholders' membership in farmers' unions but the findings from the sample of interviewed farmers show no gender differences: 63 percent of women and 78 per cent of men are members of the Central Union of Agricultural Producers (CUAP). While 92 percent of full-time farmers are members, only 47 percent of men with non-farm employment are members. In the case of women, the reverse is true: 67 per cent of women earning income solely from agriculture and 79 per cent of those with an non-farm employment are members and 40 per cent of women receiving child home-care allowances (who are mostly temporarily self-excluded from farming).

In Greece, there are no national data regarding women's membership in agricultural cooperatives. There are only data for the four prefectures selected by the project indicating great variation. In some areas, agricultural cooperatives have folded and in others are inactive. In the areas in which the existing cooperatives are active, women's membership is an indication of their integration in the agricultural occupation, especially when only one household member can be a member, the one with the formal full-time farmer status. Thus, the highest percentage (87%) of women members is reported in the island of Lesbos, followed by the prefecture of Chania in

Crete (67%) and the lowest rate of women's cooperative membership in Evia (14%), where in many villages there is no cooperative or the cooperative is weak and dysfunctional.

Women smallholders' access to membership in agricultural cooperatives is impacted not only by gender but also by farm size. Thus, in the Netherlands, Greece, Finland and Sweden, women in larger farms have significantly more access to cooperative membership than women smallholders, while only in France there is no significant difference between women smallholders and women in larger farms (Table 1).

In Greece and the Netherlands, gender seems to be more important than farm size: women regardless of farm size are significantly less often than men cooperative members, while in Sweden this holds true only among smallholders (Table 1).

Only in the Netherlands, women smallholders' access to membership in agricultural cooperatives is also related to whether or not they have received agricultural education/training only in the Netherlands (Table 2). In Greece, Sweden, Finland and France, there is no significant difference between access to membership in agricultural cooperatives of women with and without agricultural training. In Sweden and Finland, most probably this is due to the fact that existing egalitarian policies dictate the enlargement of women's membership and office holding in agricultural cooperatives, in order to obtain a more gender balanced constituency. Hence, having or not agricultural training does not play an important role. In Greece where very few women have received agricultural training, the reasons for this lack of difference are, however, very different. Membership in agricultural cooperatives depends primarily on whether women have a formal full-time farmer status recognized by the local community. When only one household member can be cooperative member, women recognized as farmers are allowed to become members usually instead of their husbands.

Regarding membership in farm unions, in Finland and Sweden there is no significant difference between men and women farmers' access to such membership, regardless of farm size (Table 3). In the Netherlands, on the other hand, gender is more important than farm size: women farmers at all farm sizes are significantly less often members than men. In Greece, the issue is not relevant because farm unions are either defunct or functioning only marginally. Finally, in France farm characteristics

Table 1. Access to membership in agricultural cooperatives by farm size and gender

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland*		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Member	11 (46%)	11 (46%)	5 (22%)	1 (17%)	92 (56%)	58 (84%)	8 (8%)	27 (66%)	5 (23%)	11 (67%)
Not a member	13 (54%)	13 (54%)	18 (78%)	5 (83%)	72 (44%)	11 (16%)	90 (92%)	14 (34%)	11 (77%)	5 (33%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Member	44 (79%)	44(79%)	14 (26%)	6 (23%)	12 (41%)	9 (82%)	2 (5%)	7 (56%)	10 (47%)	15 (70%)
Not a member	12 (21%)	12 (21%)	39 (74%)	20 (77%)	17 (59%)	2 (18%)	39 (95%)	6 (46%)	10 (53%)	5 (30%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Member	16 (80%)	16 (80%)	9 (22%)	9 (45%)	-	-	3 (79%)	4 (80%)	18 (86%)	21 (97%)
Not a member	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	33 (78%)	11 (55%)	-	-	11 (21%)	1 (20%)	4 (14%)	1 (3%)
<i>D. Large size</i>										
Member	-	-	5 (19%)	7 (37%)	-	-	-	-	16 (52%)	23 (96%)
Not a member	-	-	21 (81%)	12 (63%)	-	-	-	-	9 (48%)	2 (4%)

*In the case of Finland, the farms are members not individuals so the answers of men are the same.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

rather than individual characteristics are important for membership in farm unions and gender, therefore, does not play a role.

In Sweden, whether or not women are members of farmer's organizations depends on the husband's but not on the wife's general educational level. When husbands have a low educational level, they usually hold a traditional/patriarchal gender role ideology that is not conducive to women farmers' integration in the agricultural occupation. In fact, men with a low level education are not members themselves of farmers' organizations, thus excluding the entire farm enterprise.

Table 2. Men's and women's extent of agricultural training and membership in agricultural cooperatives

Country	Gender		Men's and Women's extent of agricultural training			
			None has agricultural training	Only the husband agricultural training	Both have agricultural training	Only the wife has agricultural training
Finland	Men	Member	33 (69%)	23 (77%)	6 (67%)	9 (69%)
		Not member	15 (31%)	7 (23%)	3 (33%)	4 (31%)
	Women	Member	33 (69%)	23 (77%)	6 (67%)	9 (69%)
		Not member	15 (31%)	7 (23%)	3 (33%)	4 (31%)
France	Men	Member	8 (25%)	10 (42%)	5 (36%)	1 (50%)
		Not member	24 (75%)	14 (58%)	9 (64%)	1 (50%)
	Women	Member	18 (25%)	9 (24%)	5 (19%)	2 (15%)
		Not member	55 (75%)	28 (76%)	22 (81%)	11 (85%)
Greece*	Men	Member				
		Not member				
	Women	Member				
		Not member				
Netherlands	Men	Member	6 (55%)	12 (80%)	5 (42%)	2 (67%)
		Not member	5 (45%)	3 (20%)	7 (58%)	1 (33%)
	Women	Member	-	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	1 (25%)
		Not member	12 (100%)	15 (80%)	12 (80%)	3 (75%)
Sweden**	Men	Member	34 (96%)	16 (90%)	13 (65%)	7 (70%)
		Not member	2 (4%)	2 (10%)	5 (35%)	3 (30%)
	Women	Member	20 (53%)	10 (50%)	13 (61%)	7 (70%)
		Not member	16 (47%)	8 (50%)	5 (39%)	3 (30%)

* In Greece, it is not possible to assess the extent to which husbands and wives have or have not access to agricultural training because the interviewed men and women are not married to each other. Only non-related men and women's access to agricultural training is cross-tabulated with their access to cooperative membership.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates.

It is also noteworthy that in Sweden, when women are actively involved in farm labour and are members of agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, they are not members of the separate Women Farmers' Association. The data both in the

Netherlands and Sweden show that predominantly women who are not active farmers belong to the women's separate farmers' association. It seems, therefore, that separate women farmers' associations are not for active and professionally integrated women and are not conducive to women's integration in the agricultural occupation. On the contrary, they tend to further marginalize women as farmers and to render more difficult their mainstreaming in agriculture. Furthermore, in Greece where some separate women's cooperatives were created, they do not focus on agricultural production but on handicrafts, local spirits (tsipouro) and local sweets, even in regions in which the percentage of women landowners is very high. A recent survey showed that out of 70 women's cooperatives, only one dealt with production namely, the cultivation of flowers (*Description of Women's cooperatives*, 2000).

In France, Finland and Greece, women's land ownership is significantly related to membership in farm unions (syndicats) and in agricultural cooperatives⁴⁴ (Table 4). In the other two countries, the pattern of land ownership (whether land is owned by men or women or jointly) is not significantly related to women's membership in agricultural cooperatives.

Only in Greece, and Finland women's extent of involvement in farm labour is significantly related to their access to cooperative membership.⁴⁵ This is due to the fact that a significant involvement of women in farm work establishes their image as active farmers in the local community. In the other countries, women's active participation in farm labour is not related to whether or not they are cooperative members (Table 5). Furthermore, in Greece when the husband is a full-time farmer, the extent of the wife's involvement in agricultural labour has no effect on her chances to become a cooperative member. Only when the husband is pluri-active, her working 100 days or more in the farm significantly improve her chances for

⁴⁴ All chi squares are significant.

⁴⁵ For Greece, the chi-square = 10.1999, $p < 0.01$ and for Finland, chi-square = 16.1695, $p < 0.001$. In Finland, however, only women who work 200 or more days per year in the farm are significantly more often cooperative members than women who work fewer days.

Table 3. Membership in farm unions by farm size and gender (1)

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden***	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Member	12 (50%)	6 (46%)	6 (26%)	2 (33%)	-	-	10 (10%)	30 (75%)	5 (33%)	9 (58%)
Not a member	12 (50%)	7 (54%)	17 (74%)	4 (67%)	-	-	86 (90%)	10 (25%)	11 (67%)	7 (42%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>					-	-				
Member	35 (62%)	25 (86%)	9 (17%)	12 (46%)	-	-	7 (17%)	14 (100%)	12 (59%)	12 (58%)
Not a member	21 (38%)	4 (14%)	44 (83%)	13 (50%)	-	-	35 (83%)	-	8 (42%)	8 (42%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>					-	-				
Member	16 (80%)	8 (100%)	12 (28%)	6 (30%)	-	-	2 (13%)	5 (100%)	22 (79%)	26 (93%)
Not a member	4 (20%)	-	30 (72%)	14 (70%)	-	-	14 (88%)	-	6 (21%)	2 (7%)
<i>D. Large size</i>					-	-				
Member	-	-	6 (23%)	6 (32%)	-	-	-	-	20 (100%)	20 (100%)
Not a member	-	-	20 (77%)	11 (58%)	-	-	-	-	-	-

* In France, they are the syndicates

** In Greece farm unions are either defunct or only formally functioning

(1) When the percentages do not add to 100%, the remaining percentages are those who do not know or are indecisive.

*** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 4. Land ownership by women's membership in agricultural cooperatives

Land ownership	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Members	Not members	Members	Not members	Members	Not members	Members	Not members	Members	Not members
Women own all the land	7 (88%)	1 (12%)	12 (32%)	25 (68%)	63 (74%)	22 (26%)	1 (9%)	5 (4%)	5 (57%)	2 (43%)
Men and women own jointly or by the land	38 (75%)	13 (25%)	15 (21%)	55 (79%)	13 (34%)	25 (66%)	9 (82%)	76 (58%)	13 (38%)	18 (62%)
Men own all or most of the land	23 (66%)	12 (34%)	13 (17%)	62 (83%)	26(40%)	39 (60%)	1 (9%)	44 (34%)	27 (64%)	11 (36%)
They only rent land	-	-	12 (30%)	28 (70%)	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	-	5 (4%)	4 (55%)	2 (45%)

* Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 5. Women's extent of farm work and membership in agricultural cooperatives (women's answers)

Extent of farm work (in work days)	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Less than 75 days	8 (44%)	10 (56%)	2 (13%)*	13 (87%)*	27 (40%)	40 (60%)	3 (8% %)	33 (92%)	1 (100%)	-
75 – 140 days	-	-			31 (55%)	25 (45%)	1 (4%)	24 (96%)	18 (55%)	13 (45%)
150 – 180 days	4 (27%)	11 (73%)	4 (21%)	15 (79%)	21 (68%)	10 (32%)	1 (4%)	26 (96%)	3 (27%0	5 (73%)
200 or more days	59 (88%)	8 (12%)	28 (24%)	87 (76%)	28 (74%)	10 (26%)	7 (21%)	46 (79%)	30 (61%)	16 (39%)

* In France, this group of women corresponds to those working less than 140 days on the farm.

cooperative membership than when she works less than 100 days (chi-square = 7,1762, $p < 0.01$). Also, the more a wife participates in agricultural labour, the greater the probability that she participates in cooperative meetings. When the extent of women's farm employment is examined in connection with farm size, smallholder women who work more than 140 days in the farm are significantly more often cooperative members than those who work less (chi-square = 14.7667, $P < 0.001$). The majority (three- fourths) of women in larger farms, however, are members only when they work more than 220 days a year on the farm.

In general, women's attendance in cooperative meetings is limited. Despite this, Greek women members who are integrated in agriculture significantly more often than excluded women attend cooperative meetings (chi-square = 14,0571, $p < 0.001$). The majority (78%) of women who participate 'some times' in cooperative meetings are integrated in agriculture. It seems that Greek women's cooperative membership can be considered as the most important component of institutional integration in the agricultural occupation. It is also important to note that women who are cooperative members are significantly more often recognized by their husbands as farmers than non-members (chi-square = 7,8402, $p < 0.01$).

In all countries except Finland, the majority of men and women believe that agricultural cooperatives support the interests only of larger farmers and are not supportive of smallholders. Only in Finland, at all farm sizes women farmers significantly less often than men farmers think that agricultural cooperatives are supportive of smallholders (chi-square=8.5236, $p < 0.01$) and in Greece smallholder women hold a more negative opinion of cooperatives than smallholder men (but the difference is not statistically significant)(Table 6).

Since agricultural protests are usually organized by agricultural cooperatives and farm unions and women have less access to such membership, it is not surprising to find that in France, the Netherlands and Greece⁴⁶, significantly more men than

⁴⁶ France and Greece represent two countries in which agricultural protests have been frequent in the last few years.

Table 6. Attitudes toward agricultural cooperatives by farm size and gender (if they think that they support smallholders)

Attitudes towards farm unions	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Women	Men*	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men***
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Positive	2 (15%)	5 (36%)	7 (32%)	2 (33%)	76 (46%)	47 (66%)	38 (49%)	18 (50%)	5 (74%)	
Negative	11 (85%)	3 (21%)	11 (50%)	4 (67%)	66 (40%)	24 (34%)	39 (51%)	18 (50%)	2 (26%)	
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Positive	20 (46%)	17 (63%)	19 (36%)	12 (48%)	8 (33%)	5 (50%)	17 (61%)	4 (31%)	5 (71%)	
Negative	24 (54%)	6 (22%)	29 (55%)	13 (52%)	13 (54%)	5 (50%)	11 (39%)	9 (69%)	2 (29%)	
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Positive	5 (39%)	5 (56%)	16 (39%)	6 (30%)	-	-	9 (64%)	2 (50%)	16 (84%)	
Negative	8 (61%)	4 (44%)	21 (51%)	14 (70%)	-	-	5 (36%)	2 (50%)	3 (16%)	
<i>D. Large size</i>										
Positive	-	-	11 (42%)	6 (32%)	-	-	-	-	8 (85%)	
Negative	-	-	12 (46%)	11 (58%)	-	-	-	-	1 (15%)	

* When the percentages do not add to 100%, the remaining percentages are those who do not know or are indecisive.

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

*** The question was not asked from men.

Table 7. Men's and women's participation in agricultural protests by farm size

Farm size	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Yes	2 (14%)	-	3 (50%)	4 (18%)	38 (49%)	34 (20%)	12 (36%)	15 (16%)	(18%)	(38%)
No	12 (86%)	24 (100%)	3 (50%)	18 (82%)	39 (51%)	134(80%)	21 (64%)	76 (84%)	(82%)	(63%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Yes	3 (11%)	4 (7%)	14 (54%)	9 (18%)	7 (58%)	7 (27%)	3 (43%)	11 (29%)	(26%)	(20%)
No	24 (89%)	52 (93%)	12 (46%)	40 (82%)	5 (42%)	19 (73%)	5 (57%)	27 (71%)	(74%)	(80%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Yes	1 (11%)	3 (15%)	12 (60%)	10 (25%)	-	-	2 (67%)	5 (31%)	-	-
No	9 (89%)	20 (85%)	8 (40%)	30 (75%)	-	-	1 (33%)	11 (69%)	-	-
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Yes	-		10 (53%)	6 (21%)	-	-	-	-	(87%)	(32%)
No	-		9 (47%)	20 (79%)	-	-	-	-	(13%)	(68%)

women participate in agricultural protests⁴⁷ (Table 7). Similarly in Sweden, fewer women than men participate in agricultural protests but the majority of women (89%) think that farmers ought to protest more against political decisions about agriculture in Sweden and the EU. Women, however, who are integrated in the agricultural occupation at the institutional level significantly more often than others participate in agricultural protests. In the Netherlands, women who participate in farmers' protests are more intensively involved in farm work, are of agricultural origin and have followed agricultural education more often than women who do not participate. Only in Finland, there is no difference between men's and women's participation in agricultural protests that are infrequent and not so important as in France and Greece.

b. Women Smallholders' Access to Agricultural Training

At the national level, women's access to agricultural training differs considerably among the countries studied. In Finland, 44 per cent of the degrees in agriculture, horticulture, forestry and fishing are granted to women. In the project sample, about half of the interviewed Finnish men and women have had some agricultural training. Furthermore, young women are better educated than older women: 30 per cent of women over 40 and 62 per cent of women under 40 have received agricultural training. Of all courses attended by women, 38 per cent are related to animal husbandry, while the next most popular courses are related to computing and bookkeeping. When women were asked if they would like to have more agricultural training, one-third of them and two-fifths of men answered that they do not need training. The men and women who want further training, report needing training in computer-based accounting that will assist them to cope with the increased EU bureaucracy.

In France, women constitute 44 per cent of students in all types of agricultural education. In private institutions, that provide mostly short courses, 51 per cent of the students are women but in public institutions only one-third are women. Women, however, tend to predominantly take home economics rather than technical agricultural courses. Furthermore, at the national level, despite the fact that women have better general education than men, the higher the level of agricultural education

⁴⁷ The chi-square for France is 24.2245, $p < 0.001$, for the Netherlands is 5.3059, $p < 0.05$ and for Greece is 23.4948, $p < 0.001$.

and the longer the duration of this education the fewer the women. In the sample of the interviewed French men and women, twice as many men as women (66.3 per cent of men and 36,7 per cent of women) received agricultural training. Again the higher the level of received agricultural education, the greater the gap between men and women.

In Greece, there are no national data, only data collected in the four prefectures selected by the project. In the five-year period of 1993-1997, 29.5 % of trainees in 'technical' agricultural courses were women, their numbers having increased during the last two years. More than half (57%) of women farmers, however, received home economics rather than agricultural courses and there is still segregation of training by gender⁴⁸. Besides home economics, women farmers are mostly relegated to agro-tourism and beekeeping. In the island of Evia, for example, in bee-keeping courses, one-sixth of the trainees and in agro-tourism, three-fourths of the trainees were women, despite the fact that commercial bee-keeping is mainly undertaken by men and agro-tourism is still little developed. Furthermore, women's attendance of agricultural training is seriously inhibited when the courses are offered in the provincial capital rather than in village communities, since it is very difficult for women to relinquish their household and child care responsibilities for 20-25 days (the usual duration of the courses). Finally, in the sample of interviewed women, only 12 per cent of them had received some agricultural training but 80 per cent of all the women want to receive agricultural training.

In Greece there is, furthermore, an age and education bias. The age bias is responsible for the fact that agricultural training is primarily available for young people under 30 years old, in a country in which the large majority of men and women farmers are over 40 years old and have never received agricultural training. Detailed data available from Lesvos show that not counting the young women trained under the 'Young Farmers' programme, 63% of trained women smallholders were below 30 and only 20% of the women over 40 received such training. Furthermore, despite the fact that the majority of all Greek rural women and 68% of the interviewed women farmers have only primary school education, only half of the women who

⁴⁸ Another study of 1459 women who received agricultural training in 1997 shows that the majority of women received training in the following areas: 40.7% of them received home economics courses; 16.7% 'technical' agricultural training; 14.4% food technology courses; and 23.2% agro-tourism (Githarakou *et al.*, 2000).

received agricultural training have this educational level (Table 8). While, on the other hand, only less than one-third (31.5%) of the sampled women have more than primary school education, they are over-represented among trained women (they are half of the trained women). Women, therefore, with higher than primary school education have twice as much chance to be selected for agricultural training than women with only primary school education. Thus, the more educated the women are, the more likely it is that they are selected for agricultural training. The educational level of adult women in rural areas is, however, very low while younger women have a higher level of education. Only 9.8% of woman active in agriculture have completed secondary education. It seems, therefore, that the majority of adult women smallholders are excluded from access to agricultural training due to a combined age and education bias. The same biases operate for men but the impact is less accentuated.

Table 8. Greek Women's access to agricultural training by level of education

Wife's level of education	Has obtained agricultural training	With no agricultural training	Total
Illiterate	-	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Primary	12 (9%)	128 (91%)	140 (100.0%)
Secondary	9 (15%)	52 (85%)	61 (100%)
Post-secondary	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Total	24 (12%)	182 (88%)	63 (100%)

In the Netherlands, statistics for 1998-99, show a balanced participation of men and women at the pre-vocational and senior vocational as well as at the university level. Women, however, select different courses and specialisations than men. At the pre-vocational level, women are over-represented in flower arranging and animal care courses and under-represented in cattle breeding, plant breeding, forestry and irrigation (Kools, 1997). In vocational agricultural college, most women are found in animal management and teaching and very few in plant breeding and general agriculture. Similarly at the university level, women dominate in "household and consumers' science" and form a minority in "agricultural science." Furthermore, in part-time vocational colleges, women constitute about one-fourth of the students. Finally, farming women's organizations offer courses for farmwomen that include training in farm diversification.

The Dutch data clearly show an imbalance in agricultural knowledge and experience between men and women. In nearly two-thirds (62%) of the farms men are more educated in agricultural matters than their wives; men attend twice as often as women agricultural courses; and most men (96%) grew up in a farm and were involved in agriculture since their early childhood, while 43% of women enter farming only after their marriage.

In Sweden, there are no gender disaggregated national data regarding agricultural training. The survey data show that smallholder men have received agricultural training less often than men in medium-sized farms, the trend being less pronounced for women. In Finland, the findings are similar women smallholders' access to agricultural training is not significantly different from that of men and at all farm sizes (Table 9).

In France and Greece, on the other hand, significantly fewer women than men have access to agricultural training, this difference being less accentuated among smallholders. Finally, in the Netherlands women's significantly lesser access to agricultural training than men holds true for all farmers, regardless of farm size. It seems, therefore, that with the exception of the Nordic countries, the lack of agricultural training constitutes an important indicator of women's exclusion from the agricultural profession, particularly of women smallholders. In the other three countries, acceptance of women as trainees for 'technical' agricultural subjects represents their recognition as farmers and the agricultural training they receive helps increase their competence as farmers and their self-confidence to actively participate in agricultural decision-making and agriculture-related meetings.

c. Women's access to agricultural information and advice

In France, about an equal number of men and women smallholders and medium-size farmers have contacts with agricultural advisors while among larger⁴⁹ farmers significantly more men than women have such contacts (chi-square = 7.474, $p < 0.01$) (table 10). In Greece, on the other hand, women farmers, regardless of farm size, have significantly less often contacts with agricultural advisors than men farmers.

⁴⁹ Larger farmers in this context include medium-size (b) farmers and larger farmers.

Table 9. Men's and women's access to agricultural training and farm size

Access to Agricultural Training	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Smallest Size</i>										
Have received agricultural training	9 (64%)	14 (58%)	2 (33%)	5 (22%)	12 (15%)	19 (11%)	25 (60%)	25 (28%)	4 (24%)	6 (27%)
Have not received agricultural training	5 (36%)	10 (42%)	4 (67%)	18 (78%)	66 (85%)	159 (89%)	17 (40%)	65 (72%)	11 (76%)	10 (73%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Have received agricultural training	15 (44%)	23 (41%)	21 (81%)	14 (27%)	5 (42%)	5 (18%)	12 (86%)	13 (34%)	7 (43%)	7 (46%)
Have not received agricultural training	12 (56%)	33 (59%)	5 (19%)	38 (73%)	7 (58%)	23 (82%)	2 (14%)	25 (66%)	13 (57%)	13 (54%)
<i>C. Medium Size (b)</i>										
Have received agricultural training	7 (88%)	12 (60%)	12 (63%)	15 (36%)	-	-	4 (80%)	7 (44%)	4 (51%)	4 (23%)
Have not received agricultural training	2 (22%)	8 (40%)	7 (37%)	27 (64%)	-	-	1 (20%)	9 (56%)	22 (49%)	24 (77%)
<i>D. Large Size</i>										
Have received agricultural training	-	-	18 (95%)	12 (46%)	-	-	-	-	8 (29%)	8 (30%)
Have not received agricultural training	-	-	1 (5%)	14 (54%)	-	-	-	-	22 (71%)	12 (70%)

* Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot directly computed from frequencies.

Table 10. Contacts with agricultural advisors/extension workers by farm size and respondent's gender

Attitudes towards national agricultural policies	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men*	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Yes	11 (100%)	24 (100%)	3 (50%)	12 (52%)	26 (37%)	42 (25%)		46 (49%)	-	9 (65%)
No	-	-	3 (50%)	11 (48%)	44 (63%)	129 (75%)		48 (51%)	-	4 (35%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Yes	24 (100%)	56 (100%)	15 (58%)	27 (51%)	9 (75%)	5 (19%)		27 (68%)	-	13 (50%)
No	-	-	11 (42%)	26 (49%)	3 (25%)	22 (81%)		13 (32%)	-	7 (50%)
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Yes	8 (100%)	20 (100%)	15 (75%)	20 (48%)	-	-		10 (71%)	-	13 (74%)
No	-	-	5 (25%)	22 (52%)	-	-		4 (29%)	-	6 (26%)
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Yes			15 (79%)	14 (54%)	-	-		-	-	11 (43%)
No			4 (21%)	12 (46%)	-	-		-	-	14 (57%)

*In the Netherlands, the question was not asked from men.

**Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Similarly, Dutch smallholder women significantly less often than women in medium-size and larger farms have contacts with commercial ⁵⁰ and with paid government sponsored agricultural advisors and significantly more often than women in medium-size and larger farms have no contact with any type of agricultural advisor.

Furthermore, only 2% of women consider contacts with extension agents their task or a shared responsibility of husband and wife and none of the men considers their wife as responsible for this task. Also nearly half of the women (40%) and men (50%) consider men as the only decision-maker regarding the use of extension. Integrated women, however, more often than excluded women share the decision with their husbands. Finally, Dutch women report having experienced exclusion from discussions with extension agents who negate them in conversations, want to discuss only with the men and show little respect for women's knowledge and experience.

The situation is very different in the Nordic countries. In Sweden, in the majority of farm households the woman makes contact with agricultural advisors either alone (14%) or together with her husband (58%) and only in 39% of the households the husband alone makes these contacts. Similarly in Finland, the majority of women either alone (27%) or together with their husband (40%) are responsible for making contacts with an agricultural advisor and only in 33% of the cases the husband alone is responsible.

d. Women farmers' representation in official agricultural statistics

In Finland, agricultural statistics are based on the data of the Farm Register maintained by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and published by *Statistics Finland*. In the Farm Register, a farmer is defined as a person who owns a farm alone or as a partner and whose work input in numbers of hours on the farm is the greatest (Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 1993, 1997a and 1997b; Central Statistical Office of Finland, 1997a and 1997b). The information in the register is based on people's own estimates. If both spouses are co-owners of the farm and work equally on the farm, they decide themselves who is the main farmer. Families, usually, define the man as the farmer. This can be seen in the gender-differentiated statistics of the agricultural census, according to which 74% of farmers in active farms are men (National Board of Agriculture, 1992). Gender differentiated

⁵⁰ Commercial services being attached to the purchase of agricultural inputs.

statistics on farm work, however, demonstrate that women's role in agriculture (including women as spouses) is central. Out of the women in the core group, when farmers and spouses are included, 44% of them work regularly and full-time in agriculture (National Board of Agriculture, 1992).

The interviewed Finnish men and women were asked to explain on what grounds they had defined the man as the main farmer. In the Finnish sample, 24% of the women are main farmers and 76% are "spouses", even though in practice many of the "spouses" are full-time farmers and their work input in agriculture is often greater or equal to that of their husbands. The reason for defining men as the main farmers is men's more frequent ownership of the farm, especially if they owned the farm before marriage. When, however, the couple purchases the farm from outsiders, often the definition of the main farmer is based on who has the main responsibility for farm work. However, from the point of view of Finnish authorities, it is not relevant who is the main farmer. In case both spouses are working in agriculture, they are both considered as farmers by tax authorities, banks and the farmers' pension system. Using the term "spouse" in the statistics, however, for a person who in fact is a full-time farmer is misleading and it excludes many full-time women farmers from being counted in official statistics.

Similarly in the Netherlands, women's labour contributions in new farm activities like agro-tourism remain invisible in official statistics, because only the formal position of women and the extent of farm labour is presented in these statistics. Also the only distinction made in non-farm income generating activities is the one between farming as a "primary occupation" or as "secondary occupation." This classification, however, is linked to the work of the farm head, which in most cases is the husband. When the farm head spends more than 50% of his working time outside the farm, the farm is classified as part-time (that is one with farming as a secondary occupation), no matter what is the extent of the wife's labour-input (CBS, 1999). The situation is similar in Greece.

A2. Subjective Indicators

a. Women's beliefs regarding their recognition as farmers by the local community

This indicator was used only in the Greek research. The data show that women who work 100 or more days per year in the farm significantly more often than women who work less believe that they are recognized as farmers by the local community (e.g. the president and secretary of the village and other local representatives) (chi-square = 3.8529, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, women who work equally or more than their husbands in the farm significantly more often than women who work less than their husbands report being recognized as farmers by the local community (chi-square = 4.2553, $p < 0.05$). Also women who believe that women are less competent as farmers than men less often than those who believe that women are more competent report being recognized as farmers by the local community but the difference is not statistically significant. Furthermore, according to women's reports, there is a high degree of agreement between recognition as farmers by their husband and recognition as farmers by the local community (89%).

In the Netherlands, there are also data concerning women's perception of recognition as farmers by the farming community: the majority of women do not feel integrated in the farming community and report having experienced discrimination as women. They attribute this exclusion to the male domination of the farming community and the strong attachment to a traditional gender ideology. They feel that women are denied access because they are not 'one of the boys'.

B. Women's Integration at the Farm Level

B1. Objective Indicators

a. Women's Participation in Farm Labour

The hypothesis #7 concerning the positive relationship between men's pluri-activity and women's involvement in farm work is supported by the data collected in all five countries. In France, when the husband is pluri-active women work significantly more often more than their husband than when he is a full-time farmer (chi-square = 8.0140, $p < 0.01$), while they significantly more often work as much or less than their husband when he is a full-time farmer. The same holds true for the other countries, except that in the Netherlands where the wife works more often less

than the husband when he is a full-time farmer than when he is pluri-active but is not clear that the wife works more than the husband when he is pluri-active, especially among smallholders. This is due to the fact that because the traditional model of farming predominates in that even pluri-active farmers, especially among smallholders, are not willing to give up the farmer status, they organize and mechanize the farm work so that they are able to perform it before and after their non-farm work. Because of this, women are not necessarily more involved in farm work when their husband is pluri-active than when he is full-time farmer.

. In Finland, when the husband is pluri-active 70% of the women are integrated but when he is full-time farmer only 48% of women are integrated, the difference in the extent of integration indicating the differential involvement of women in farm work. Similarly in Sweden, when the husband is pluri-active women make more often significant farm work contributions and are integrated in the agricultural occupation than when he is full-time farmer.

In Greece, in the farm population of women respondents, 21% of the pluri-active men work only less than 30 days a year in the farm, having in fact entirely left farm work to their wives; another 18% work 30-70 days performing very few tasks, when it is necessary; and another 11% work 75-90 days per year in the farm enterprise. In half of the farm households, therefore, it is the wife who is the main active farmer and the husband has transferred legally the farmer status to them. Overall, in this farm population women work significantly more often than their husbands when the husband is pluri-active than when he is full-time farmer (chi-square = 5.1248, $p < 0.05$). In the farm population of men respondents, on the other hand, very few (7%) pluri-active husbands leave all farm work to their wife and only 21% of husbands work less than 90 days per year in the farm. It seems that in this population even pluri-active husbands do not give up the active farmer role and continue to make important contributions to farm work.

In France, the only agricultural tasks that women report being performed by them alone or jointly with their husbands are: taking care of livestock (mentioned by 64 per cent), marketing of agricultural production (mentioned by 57 per cent) and purchase of supplies (mentioned by 63 per cent). About one-third of women also report that they actively participate in planting and ploughing. Their husbands, however, do not agree. They report that practically all tasks are performed primarily by men and only

in the case of taking care of livestock and processing of products for the market, they are performed jointly by men and women.

It seems, however, that agricultural training plays an important role in French women's participation in farm labour. Those with agricultural training more often than women without such training undertake "male" farm tasks such as the maintenance of farm buildings, ploughing and fertilizing (but not using tractors and other agricultural machinery) and are entirely responsible for the farm activities they undertake, rather than working as their husbands' assistants.

In the Netherlands, only general farm assistance and work in the garden are 'female' tasks primarily performed by women, while machinery work, harvesting and sale preparation are tasks jointly performed by men and women. 'Female' tasks involve low quality work requiring little training and experience, implying a small risk of failure and allowing for little autonomy in work. Women, however, who are integrated in the agricultural occupation significantly more often than excluded women perform by themselves or jointly with their husbands more farm tasks, including "male" tasks such as general care of cattle and crops, specific care of cattle and cultivation, care of young cattle, milking, marketing and cleaning stables.

The Dutch data show quite clearly the important difference between integrated and excluded women's participation in farm labour. Excluded women assist their husbands whenever is needed in a variety of agricultural and non-agricultural tasks, replace him when necessary and have some specific tasks of their own under his guidance. Integrated women, on the other hand, cooperate with their husband as equal partners, sharing all the work equally or having an autonomous field of their own. Integrated women, therefore, are involved in a considerable share of the "male" farm work, while this is not true for excluded women. In addition, integrated women are also responsible for "female" farm tasks. Among smallholders, despite the fact that men are pluri-active more often than in larger farms, women are not more often integrated at the farm level than in larger farms as it could expected. This is most probably due to husbands' lower level of education among smallholders and to their more traditional/patriarchal values that do not allow them to delegate farm work and management to their wives.

In Greece, the examination of the gender division of labor shows that according to women's answers, 7 out of 11 individual agricultural tasks are primarily performed

by men (husbands and other male relatives); two tasks, taking care of livestock and digging, are most often performed by women; and two tasks, crop collection and spreading fertilizer, are most often performed by both men and women (Table 11). The ‘male’ tasks include: ploughing and planting (usually performed with tractors), pruning, product sale, sprinkling pesticides, and hiring workers. Irrigation is less markedly a ‘male’ agricultural task. According to men’s answers, only crop collection is a predominantly woman’s task while taking care of livestock is less of an exclusively male task in comparison with the other tasks (Table 12).

Table 11. Gendered Division of Agricultural Labour in Greece (women’s answers)

Agricultural tasks	Who performs it		
	Man	Woman	Both
Ploughing	75 (94%)	1 (1%)	4 (5%)
Planting	25 (74%)	3 (9%)	6 (18%)
Digging	35 (26%)	55 (41%)	43 (32%)
Irrigation	62 (46%)	24 (18%)	49 (36%)
Spreading fertilizers	55 (35%)	34 (21%)	70 (44%)
Pruning	70 (68%)	10 (10%)	23 (22%)
Crop collection	6 (4%)	60 (36%)	101 (61%)
Product sale	63 (55%)	16 (14%)	35 (31%)
Sprinkling pesticides	84 (71%)	15 (13%)	19 (16%)
Hiring workers	56 (67%)	12 (14%)	16 (19%)
Taking care of livestock	14 (100%)	69 (55%)	51 (35%)

As was also true for Dutch women, Greek women who are integrated in agriculture tend more often than excluded women to perform ‘male’ tasks. This trend is significant for the tasks of irrigation and the spreading of fertilizer (Table 13). The same trend holds true for the agricultural tasks of pruning, product sale and the sprinkling of pesticides, which instead of being performed by both men and women, are more often performed by women alone, but the small frequencies in the case of the excluded women make it difficult to test statistical significance. The pattern, however, seems to be clear: women’s integration in the agricultural profession entails

the break down of gender barriers in agricultural work. Furthermore, women's agricultural labour contributions are related to their beliefs regarding women's competence as farmers and as farm managers. Women who believe that women are better farmers and farm managers than men significantly more often than those who believe that women are less competent farmers than men shoulder most of the agricultural labour of the farm enterprise. Furthermore, when the extent to which having received agricultural training increases women's self-confidence in agriculture was examined, we find that women who have received agricultural training significantly more often than women who have not received such training undertake the spreading of fertilizers, usually a 'male' task. It seems, therefore, that integrated women perform 'male' tasks partly because they are more self-confident having received agricultural training and are viewed as competent farmers and partly because being recognized as farmers, they have to share more or less equally the farm labour with their husbands.

Table 12. Gendered Division of Agricultural Labour in Greece (men's answers)

Agricultural tasks	Who performs it		
	Man	Woman	Both
Ploughing	48 (94%)	-	3 (6%)
Planting	30 (86%)	-	5 (14%)
Digging	34 (76%)	2 (4%)	9 (20%)
Irrigation	35 (65%)	-	19 (35%)
Spreading fertilizers	70 (88%)	-	10 (13%)
Pruning	52 (93%)	-	4 (7%)
Crop collection	13 (20%)	3 (5%)	50 (76%)
Product sale	60 (80%)	1 (1%)	14 (19%)
Sprinkling pesticides	63 (94%)	-	4 (6%)
Hiring workers	32 (91%)	-	3 (9%)
Taking care of livestock	32 (52%)	10 (16%)	20 (32%)

In Finland, the husband performs most agricultural tasks: fodder production turning the soil and sowing, threshing, harvesting, machine maintenance and repair, and forestry. Tasks, on the other hand, performed by women include milking and taking care of cattle and other animals, while the feeding of dairy cattle and accounting are shared between men and women. In this way, the division of farm labour has not changed since the 80's (Siiskonen, 1990). The only change is the fact that accounting as a part of farm management is now more of a shared task. It seems that filling of the forms for subsidies, essential for the survival of Finnish farms, is not a job only for men.

Table 13. Gendered agricultural division of labour by women's integration/exclusion from the agricultural occupation in Greece (women's answers)

Agricultural tasks	Integrated			Excluded		
	Man	Woman	Both	Man	Woman	Both
Ploughing	33(87%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	37(100%)	-	-
Planting	12 (71%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)	12(80%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Digging	22 (30%)	32 (43%)	20 (27%)	10 (20%)	18 37%)	21 (43%)
Irrigation	24 (38%)	15 (23%)	25 (39%)	33 (55%)	5 (8%)	22 (37%)
Spreading fertilizers	26 (29%)	22 (25%)	41 (46%)	24 (43%)	6 (11%)	26 (46%)
Pruning	45 (69%)	8 (12%)	12 (19%)	21 (63%)	1 (3%)	11 (33%)
Crop collection	3 (3%)	37 (39%)	56 (58%)	2 (15%)	19 (32,)	38 (64%)
Product sale	29 (58%)	8 (16%)	13 (26%)	31 (57%)	3 (6%)	20 (37%)
Sprinkling pesticides	45 (71%)	9 (14%)	9 (14%)	33 (72%)	3 (6%)	10 (22%)
Hiring workers	34 (74%)	6 (13%)	6 (13%)	21 (62%)	4 (12%)	9 (27%)
Taking care of livestock	9 (15%)	39 (65%)	27 (36%)	7 (8%)	34 (57%)	21 (35%)

In Sweden, when women are integrated in the agricultural occupation at the institutional level (by being members of the agricultural cooperatives and/or the farm unions), they more often perform 'male' agricultural tasks than when the husband only is a member of the agricultural cooperative or when neither of them is a member. Women's exclusion from membership in agricultural cooperatives indicates a traditional farm household associated with the man's low level of education, the woman's lack of agricultural training and overall lesser involvement in farm work as well as a male land ownership structure.

It seems that in all countries, women who are integrated in the agricultural occupation not only shoulder more of the farm labour than excluded

women but they also undertake 'male' farm tasks. The meaning of women's integration in the agricultural occupation entails, therefore, a more equal division of agricultural labour, including 'male' tasks. Integrated women are equal partners with their husband (when they do not replace them altogether) and have autonomy regarding the tasks they undertake.

b. Women's participation in the decision making of the farm enterprise

In all countries, according to men and women's reports, farm size is not related to women's active participation in agricultural decision-making (Table 14). In Greece, all women (at all farm sizes) significantly more often than men report that they are active in agricultural decision-making (chi-square = 34,9162, $p < 0.001$), while in France the tendency is similar but not statistically significant. In the Greek case, however, this significant difference does not imply a disagreement between husbands and wives. Instead, it reflects attitudinal differences between the two farm populations sampled, the farm population of men respondents with traditional values who believe that women are not competent farmers and relegate them to being depending farm assistants and the other of women respondents, many of whom are active farmers and integrated in the agricultural occupation.

In France and the Netherlands, according to men's and women's reports, agricultural training plays a significant role in allowing women to play an active role in farm decision making (Table 15). In Finland, Sweden and Greece, on the other hand, there is no relationship reported between women having received agricultural training and being active in agricultural decision-making.

Women's ownership of the land is also an important factor for women's integration at the farm level (Table 16). In Finland and France, women who own all the land or jointly with their husbands significantly more often than women whose husbands own all or most of the land actively participate in the decision making of the farm⁵¹. In Sweden, Greece and the Netherlands, on other hand, there is no significant

⁵¹ For Finland, the chi-square = 10.1686, $p < 0.001$ and for France, chi -square = 11.9074, $p < 0.001$.

Table 14. Women's extent of participation in agricultural decision-making by farm size and respondent's gender

	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Smallest Size</i>										
Women active	11 (85%)	22 (92%)	3 (50%)	15 (65%)	13 (17%)	103 (58%)	20 (50%)	52 (59%)	-	13 (75%)
Women not active	2 (15%)	2 (8%)	3 (50%)	8 (35%)	62 (83%)	75 (42%)	20 (50%)	36 (41%)	-	3 (25%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Women active	22 (96%)	48 (86%)	12 (46%)	25 (47%)	3 (25%)	12 (44%)	8 (62%)	23 (64%)	-	11 (58%)
Women not active	1 (4%)	8 (14%)	14 (54%)	28 (53%)	9 (75%)	15 (56%)	5 (38%)	13 (36%)	-	9 (42%)
<i>C. Medium Size (b)</i>										
Women active	4 (80%)	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	20 (48%)	-	-	2 (40%)	9 (56%)	-	15 (76%)
Women not active	1 (20%)	5 (25%)	15 (75%)	22 (52%)	-	-	3 (60%)	7 (44%)	-	7 (24%)
<i>D. Large Size</i>										
Women active	-	-	8 (42%)	11 (42%)	-	-	-	-	-	18 (73%)
Women not active	-	-	11 (58%)	15 (58%)	-	-	-	-	-	8 (27%)

* Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 15. Men's and women's extent of agricultural training and women's active participation in agricultural decision making*

Agricultural. training and extent of active participation	Finland		France		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
<i>A. None has agricultural training</i>								
Active participation	42(87%)	18 86%)	39 (53%)	13(39%)	5 (38%)	5 (38%)	27 (71%)	-
Not active participation	6(13%)	3 (14%)	34 (47%)	20(61%)	8 (62%)	8 (62%)	10 (29%)	-
<i>B. Only the husband has agricultural training</i>								
Active participation	25(83%)	13 87%)	12 (32%)	7 (30%)	7 (44%)	7 (39%)	11 (63%)	-
Not active participation	5(17%)	2 (13%)	25 (68%)	16(70%)	9 (56%)	11 61%)	7 (37%)	-
<i>C. Both have agricultural training</i>								
Active participation	6 (67%)	5 (63%)	13 (48%)	8 (57%)	10 (67%)	12(80%)	12 (60%)	-
Not active participation	3(33%)	3 (38%)	14 (52%)	6 (43%)	5 (33%)	3 (20%)	6 (40%)	-
<i>D. Only the wife has agricultural training</i>								
Active participation	12(92%)	5 (83%)	11 (85%)	-	3 (100%)	3(100%)	7 (77%)	-
Not active participation	1(8%)	1 (17%)	2 (15%)	2(100%)	-		3 (23%)	-

* Greece is omitted from this table because it is not possible to assess the extent to which husbands and wives have or have not access to agricultural training since the interviewed men and women are not married to each other. Only separately men's and women's access to agricultural training can be cross-tabulated with their active participation in agricultural decision-making .

*** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

Table 16. Land Ownership by Women's Active Participation in Agricultural Decision-Making (Women's responses)

Land ownership	Finland	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>1. Wife owns all the land</i>					
Women active	7 (87%)	21 (57%)	38 (42%)	5 (100%)	26 (62%)*
Women not active	1 (13%)	16 (43%)	51 (57%)	-	12 (38%)
<i>2. Land is jointly or hand-and-half owned</i>					
Women active	49 (96%)	41 (59%)	14 (34%)	51 (61%)	*
Women not active	2 (4%)	29 (41%)	27 (66%)	33 (39%)	
<i>3. Land is wholly or mostly owned by the husband</i>					
Women active	25 (71%)	24 (32%)	26 (45%)	19 (54%)	30 (69%)
Women not active	10 (29%)	51 (68%)	33 (56%)	16 (46%)	15 (31%)

*In Sweden, wives landowners and co-owners with the husband were added together. Also percentages are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

relationship between pattern of land ownership and women's participation in agricultural decision-making⁵². relationship between pattern of land ownership and women's participation in agricultural decision-making⁵³.

In Greece and Finland, women's extent of farm work is significantly related to their participation in farm decision-making. Furthermore, in Greece when the wife works more than her husband in the farm enterprise, she makes more farm decisions than her husband. Otherwise, when the husband works more than his wife, she is able to actively participate in farm decision-making only if she is the landowner. The findings are similar in Finland: women's active participation in farm decision-making is significantly related to their farm work contributions and to their greater farm labour inputs in relation to their husbands. However in Finland, the difference in the numbers of women involved in farm decision-making is relatively small according to whether or not they actively participate in farm labour: 92% of women actively participating in farm work, participate in farm decision-making, while 72% of those who do not work in the farm actively participate in farm decision-making. This is most probably due to the fact that Finnish women have a better general education than their husbands and that the gender egalitarian ideology entitles them to actively participate in farm management.

As was true for the division of farm labour, integrated women share with their husbands farm decision making in many decisions that are made only by men when the women are excluded. Thus in the Netherlands, the 'male' decisions of hiring of personnel, sale of cattle, sale of sheep, marketing and contacting extension agents become shared decisions when the women are integrated. Similarly in France, integrated women are more often involved in 'male' decisions (such as, those concerning the purchase of inputs, the use of insecticides, the choice of crops, the marketing of the production) than excluded women.

As was true for the other countries, also in Greece integrated women make alone or with their husbands the 'male' agricultural decisions of 'purchase of inputs' and the 'sale/purchase of livestock' significantly more often than excluded women

⁵² In the Netherlands, however, all women who own all the land are active in farm decision-making, while when the husband owns all the land only 54% of them are active.

⁵³ In the Netherlands, however, all women who own all the land are active in farm decision-making, while when the husband owns all the land only 54% of them are active.

(chi-square = 3.8808, $p < 0.05$) as well as all other agricultural decisions (chi-square = 4.9638, $p < 0.05$), except the one relating to loans.

c. Women's access to agricultural income

This indicator has been used only in Finland where full-time women farmers are supposed to receive half of the agricultural income, this official division of the income used for taxation purposes. In fact, 73% of all women farmers who are supposed to be full-time farmers receive half of the agricultural income. Factors that determine whether or not women farmers will receive half of this income are: whether or not they receive child care allowance, whether or not they work as much as their husband in the farm and whether or not they own all or part of the land. When there are children less than three years old in the family and the women receive child care allowances, only 58% of the women receive half of the agricultural income, while when there are no such young children, 85% of the women do so. When women work more than their husbands in the farm, 91% of them receive half of the income; when they work as much as their husband, 72% of them receive half of the income; and when they work less, 61% of them do so. Finally, when women own all or part of the land, 91% of them receive half of the agricultural income, while when they do not own any land, 70% of them do so.

Beyond the official division of agricultural income for taxation purposes, Finnish women farmers do not seem to have considerable financial independence. Only 4 women report that they do not have any money of their own because the husband controls all agricultural income, while 27% of the women are able to use money independently without discussing first with their husbands.

B2. Subjective Indicators

a. Women's recognition as farmers by their husbands

In Finland, 86% of the women believe that they are recognized as farmers by their husband, this percentage varying according to whether or not they actively participate in agricultural work: 95% of women who actively participate in farm work, believe that they are recognized and 69% of those who not participate. Furthermore, women report being recognized as farmers by their husbands significantly less often among

Table 17. Whether or not women are recognized as farmers by their husbands by farm size and respondent's gender

	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small Size</i>										
Recognized	-	16 (70%)	5 (83%)	19 (90%)	47 (66%)	132 (79%)	24 (60%)	58 (71%)	-	5 (49%)
Not Recognized	-	7 (30%)	1 (17%)	2 (10%)	24 (34%)	35 (21%)	16 (40%)	24 (29%)	-	8 (51%)
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Recognized	-	49 (88%)	25 (96%)	39 (75%)	4 (50%)	20 (74%)	10 (77%)	27 (75%)	-	7 (36%)
Not Recognized	-	7 (13%)	1 (4%)	13 (25%)	4 (50%)	7 (26%)	3 (23%)	9 (25%)	-	9 (64%)
<i>C. Medium Size (b)</i>										
Recognized	-	20 (100%)	19 (95%)	36 (90%)	-	-	3 (60%)	6 (55%)	-	10 (61%)
Not Recognized	-	-	1 (5%)	4 (10%)	-	-	2 (40%)	5 (45%)	-	9 (39%)
<i>D. Large Size</i>										
Recognized	-	-	14 (74%)	21 (88%)	-	-	-	-	-	14 (53%)
Not Recognized	-	-	5 (26%)	3 (12%)	-	-	-	-	-	9 (47%)

** Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

smallholders than among relatively larger farmers (chi-square=6.5508, $p < 0.01$) (Table 17). Finnish husbands also report that they recognize their wife as a farmer according to whether or not she participates actively in agricultural work and whether or not she receives childcare allowances and other social benefits but are not influenced by gender role stereotypes concerning women's competence as farmers. In fact, recognition of women as farmers in Finland is substantively demonstrated by the husband's willingness to share agricultural income, according to the official norm. In the other countries, there is no relationship between farm size and husbands' recognition of wives as farmers.

In France, the large majority (90%) of women report feeling recognized as farmers by their husbands because it is their occupation; because they have their own responsibilities in the farm enterprise; because he asks for their advice; or because they share the income. Their husbands agree, with them since 83% of them report that they recognize their wives as farmers. The very high percentage of recognition reported by women and men indicates that such recognition is not necessarily a good indicator of women's integration in the agricultural occupation, even at the farm level. It seems that even women, whose farm participation is occasional assistance under husband's supervision, may be recognized as farmers. It must be noted, however, that agricultural training helps women being recognized as farmers: few (13%) women with agricultural training report not being recognized by their husbands but 87% of women with only general education report not being recognized.

In Greece, 79% of the women report being recognized by their husbands as farmers while 65% of the men report that they recognize their wives as farmers. While in Greece, farm size and beliefs regarding women's competence as farmers are not related to whether or not women are recognized as farmers, women's active participation in farm work is. Women who work 100 days or more per year in the farm significantly more often than those working fewer days report being recognized by their husbands as farmers (chi-square = 18.1942, $p < 0.001$). The tendency is similar for men respondents but the difference is not statistically significant.

Furthermore in Greece, husbands' pluri-activity and the accompanying women's greater extent of active participation in farm work are critical factors for the recognition of wives as farmers. When the husband is pluri-active, the degree of wives' involvement in farm work determines whether or not she will be recognized as

a farmer. The data show that when husbands are pluri-active and women work more than or as much as their husbands, they are significantly more often recognized by their husbands as farmers than when they work less than the husbands.⁵⁴

In the case of Greek men respondents, all those who work more than their wives (whether they are pluri-active or full-time farmers) do not recognize their wives as farmers. Only five men respondents report that their wives work as much or more than themselves and four out of five of them recognize their wives as farmers.

It must be repeated that the reported difference, between Greek men and women in the frequency of women's recognition as farmers by the husbands, is due to the sampling of two distinct farm populations, with different gender role ideologies and men's extent of involvement in agriculture. Also women's roles in agriculture are very different in the two farm populations: in the farm population of men respondents, wives are primarily unpaid, occasional farm assistants, while in the farm population of women respondents, a little less than half of the wives play an important role in the management of the farm enterprise. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that in the farm population of women respondents, the wife is significantly more often recognized by the husband as a farmer than in the farm population of men respondents (chi-square = 5,2433, $p < 0.05$).

Wife's pluri-activity also plays an important role in determining Greek wives' chances of being recognized as farmers by their husbands. Men respondents report that they significantly more often recognize their wives as farmers when they do not have a non-farm employment than when they have such an employment (chi-square = 4,3525, $p < 0.5$). The tendency is the same in the reports of women respondents but the difference does not reach significance. As could be expected, men respondents much more often than the husbands of women respondents do not recognize pluri-active women as farmers (79% versus 50%).

Furthermore, in Greece, there is no perfect correspondence between whether or not the husband recognizes his wife as a farmer and the extent to which she is integrated or excluded from the farmer occupation. Also the relationship between women's recognition as farmers at the community level and their recognition as farmers by their husband is not perfect. When it is perceived that women are formally

⁵⁴ The chi-square. = 9.496, $p < 0.01$ when wives work more than the husband and chi-square = 5.1928, $p < 0.5$ when they work as much as their husband.

recognized as farmers at the community level, in both farm populations sampled they are also overwhelmingly (in 88% of the cases) recognized as farmers by their husbands. When, however, it is perceived that women are not recognized as farmers at the community level, chances for recognition by the husbands are not very good, especially according to men's responses: only 44% of them are recognized by husbands. In the farm population of women respondents, however, 70% of the women perceive that they are recognized by their husband as farmers, even when report lacking formal recognition at the community level. These women may be integrated at the farm level in terms of farm work and farm management but not at the institutional level, because the husband does not wish to publicly loose the farmer status and relegates the wife at the 'invisible-excluded' status, probably the worse types of exclusion.

In the Netherlands, about one-third of women feel certain and another one-third feel that they are respected to some extent by their husbands as a knowledgeable farmer. They feel that they deserve respect because they are substantially involved in farm work, take part in decision-making and have enough experience and knowledge about farming. Those who do not feel respected as farmers point to their absence from farm work and management and their lack of knowledge and experience. Within the couples, the perceived and actual respect of women as farmers generally matches: 9% of the men evaluate women's knowledge and skill regarding farming as excellent and 54% as sufficient. The most important factor related to women's recognition by husbands as knowledgeable farmers is their having received agricultural training.

C. Correlates of Women's Integration/Exclusion

Having defined women's integration in the agricultural occupation at the farm level as women's active participation in the decision-making of the farm enterprise and at the institutional level, their membership in farmers' organizations, we turn now to examine the rates of women's integration in different countries and the factors that enhance or diminish women's chances for such integration.

The comparative data presented in Table 18 show that the highest percentage of integrated women at the farm and at the institutional level is found in Finland and

the second highest in Sweden, while the lowest percentage is found in the Netherlands. The highest percentage of women integrated only at the institutional level ('partly integrated') by being members of farmers' organizations is found in Greece and Sweden and the lowest in France and the Netherlands. This finding is due to different reasons in Greece and Sweden. In Greece, many pluri-active smallholders have legally transferred the farmer status to their wives rendering them the official full-time farmers registered in the Farmers' Register. In this way women are able to replace their husbands as members in agricultural cooperatives but are not necessarily able to be active farmers, when their husbands are not willing to relinquish the farm management to them. In Sweden, gender equality ideologies and policies are responsible for women's considerable membership in farmers' organizations but this integration is not always related to their ability to be active farmers in the family farm. The reason is again husbands' unwillingness to leave the farm management to their wives and in some cases also lack of interest on the part of the wife to shoulder the responsibility. In France and the Netherlands, there is the highest percentage of excluded women as well of women integrated only at the farm level, findings indicating the difficulties encountered in these two countries by women farmers in becoming integrated at the male dominated institutional level, even when they are active in the decision making of the farm enterprise⁵⁵.

Table 18. Frequencies and percentages of women who are integrated, excluded or partly integrated by country

Countries	Integrated	Excluded	Only institutionally integrated	Only integrated at the farm level
Finland	70 (70%)	4 (4%)	13 (13%)	13 (13%)
France	21 (14%)	62 (41%)	13 (9%)	54 (36%)
Greece	55 (28%)	46 (24%)	52 (27%)	41 (21%)
Netherlands	10 (7%)	53 (39%)	2 (2%)	71 (52%)
Sweden	45 (53%)	9 (11%)	23 (27%)	8 (9%)

According to women's reports, the highest level of integration at the farm level⁵⁶ is found in Finland, where 83% of the women are active in the decision making of the farm enterprise and the lowest in France and Greece, where only about

⁵⁵ In view of these countries' highest rate of women integrated at the farm level.

⁵⁶ This percentage is calculated by adding those in the categories of 'integrated' and 'only integrated at the farm level.'

half of the women make agricultural decisions (Sweden and the Netherlands being in-between with 62% and 59% of the women being active).

The data on Table 19 show that in all countries women may be integrated in the agricultural occupation at the institutional level but may be excluded at the farm level. Only in the Netherlands, women who are members of agricultural cooperatives tend to be more often active in the decision making of the farm enterprise than women who are not members. In this country few women are cooperative members and such membership is a significant indication of women's integration. In Finland and Sweden, on the other hand, there are pressures to include women in agricultural cooperatives as members and officers because of widespread egalitarian gender ideologies and policies and, hence, women's membership in farmers' organizations does not necessarily indicate integration at the farm level.

The egalitarian gender ideologies seem to be responsible for the finding in Finland of the lack of relationship between women's extent of farm work contributions and participation in agricultural decision-making. One possible explanation is the fact that the Finnish women have a high educational level and higher than that of their husbands that allows them to participate in agricultural decision-making, even when they do not participate actively in farm work and when they have no agricultural training. Furthermore in Finland, there is no relationship between women's exclusion from agricultural decision-making in the farm enterprise and exclusion from the agricultural occupation at the institutional level. Women who do not actively participate in farm decision-making can to the same degree be members of or hold office at cooperatives and farmers' unions as woman active in farm decision-making; have an equal level of agricultural training; have contacts with agricultural advisors; and have the right to farmers' pension. The meaning of exclusion, therefore, at the farm level has no harsh consequences for exclusion at the institutional level, as is true for Greece, the Netherlands and France.

Finally in Greece, belonging or not to an agricultural cooperative does not necessarily indicate women's integration or exclusion from the agricultural occupation. Women may not belong to an agricultural cooperative because such a cooperative does not exist in the village. Or they may belong to an agricultural cooperative because their pluri-active husband has legally transferred the farmer

Table 19. Women's membership in agricultural cooperatives by women's extent of participation in agricultural decision-making (women's responses)

Cooperative Membership	Finland	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
1. Member					
Women active	71 (86%)	21 (61%)	55 (51%)	10 (83%)	37 (68%)
Women not active	12 (14%)	13 (39%)	52 (49%)	2 (17%)	14 (32%)
2. Not a member					
Women active	14 (83%)	54 (47%)	41 (47%)	71 (57%)	20 (60%)
Women not active	3 (17%)	62 (53%)	46 (53%)	53 (43%)	14 (40%)

status to them but may in fact remain only nominally integrated, because the husband still retains the farm management.

In Greece, it is the lack of individualization of husbands' and wives' incomes in farm households that constitutes a serious exclusionary mechanism for women. When the husband has a full-time non-farm occupation, his non-farm income usually represents more than 50% of the family income. Because in Greece the family income instead of the individual farmer's income is used in determining whether applicants are eligible farmers for EU subsidized agricultural programmes, women farmers applicants with husbands with full-time non-farm employment are rejected on the basis of their husbands' non-farm income. Women experience this type of exclusion almost as a loss of personality as two women eloquently describe:

“I cannot be recognized as a farmer. They consider me as being dependent on my husband's occupation. What role can I play as a farmer?” (Woman 37 years old with a farm of 2.2 ha. in the prefecture of Chania, Crete).

“It seems that I do not have a separate economic and social existence from my husband. I am my husband's appendix. No matter how much I work in the farm, they make me feel like there is no me...” (Woman 30 years old with a farm of 3 ha. in the prefecture of Chania, Crete).

It seems that the research hypothesis no.3 is supported by the data in all countries. Integration at the farm level is not necessarily related to integration at the institutional level. It is, therefore, important to assess the meaning of integration. When women are integrated only at the institutional level, their integration is 'nominal', because they are not able to be active farmers. When, on the other hand, they are integrated only at the farm level, their active farmer role remains invisible, thus constituting the classic form of women's exclusion. The question remains: does 'nominal' integration represent integration or exclusion? Detailed analyses of the Greek data have shown that women integrated only at the institutional level cannot be considered as truly integrated, since their agricultural behavior at the farm level closely resembles excluded women.

Coming now to women's characteristics and behaviors that are related to their integration, we shall examine land ownership patterns and extent of farm labour contributions.

Women's land ownership is significantly related to their integration at both

Table 20. Land ownership by women's integration/exclusion

		Women own all the land	Men and women own jointly or half and half the land	Men own all or most of the land	They only rent land
Finland	Integrated	7 (88%)	43 (84%)	16 (46%)	-
	Excluded	1 (12%)	8 (16%)	17 (49%)	-
	Partly integrated	-	-	2 (6%)	-
France	Integrated	6 (32%)	8 (27%)	7 (17%)	12 (36%)
	Excluded	3 (16%)	6 (20%)	20 (49%)	8 (24%)
	Partly integrated	10 (52%)	16 (53%)	14 (34%)	13 (39%)
Greece	Integrated	54 (65%)	19 (46%)	23 (40%)	7 (54%)
	Excluded	17 (20%)	17 (42%)	25 (61%)	4 (31%)
	Partly integrated	12 (15%)	5 (12%)	10 (17%)	2 (15%)
Netherlands	Integrated	2 (50%)	11 (14%)	5 (15%)	1 (20%)
	Excluded	-	25 (32%)	16 (47%)	2 (40%)
	Partly integrated	2 (50%)	43 (54%)	13 (38%)	2 (40%)
Sweden	Integrated	18 (47%)*	-	26 (58%)	-
	Excluded	5 (13%)	-	3 (7%)	-
	Partly integrated	15 (40%)	-	16 (36%)	-

* In the case of Sweden, this column includes women who own some land

levels, the institutional and the farm level (Table 20). Thus, in Finland, France, the Netherlands and Greece women who own all the land or half of it (or jointly with their husbands) significantly more often than women who do not own any land are integrated at both levels rather than excluded.⁵⁷ In the case of Sweden, on the other hand, there is no relationship between women's land ownership and their integration at both levels. Furthermore, in the case of France and the Netherlands women's land ownership is significantly related to their partial integration at the farm level only.

Women's extent of involvement in farm labour is crucial for their integration in the agricultural occupation and is very much influenced by their husband's non-farm employment status (Table 21). In all countries, when the husband is pluri-active, the wife works significantly more often more than her husband in the farm than when the husband is a full-time farmer⁵⁸. In France, Greece and the Netherlands, women work as much as or less than their husbands significantly more often when their husbands are full-time farmers than when they are pluri-active.

In all countries, women tend to be more often integrated when the husband is pluri-active than when he is a full-time farmer (Table 22). This tendency is, however, significant only in Greece and the Netherlands⁵⁹. When Greek men are full-time farmers (in both farm populations studied), significantly more women are excluded from the agricultural occupation than when the men are pluri-active (chi-square = 6.2369, $p < 0.02$).

The importance of women's participation in farm work to a greater extent than their husbands is shown by the fact that in all countries, except in Sweden, women who work more than their husbands in the farm significantly more often than women

⁵⁷ For Finland, chi-square = 14.8221, $p < 0.05$; for France, 6.6337, $p < 0.05$; and for Greece, 16.2920, $p < 0.001$. In the Netherlands, no woman who owns all the land is excluded and only one who owns the land jointly with her husband.

⁵⁸ The chi-square for Greece = 6.5956, $p < 0.01$, for Finland = 10.3471, $p < 0.001$ and for Sweden = 5.9508, $p < 0.05$. In the case of France and the Netherlands, one frequency is less than 5 so the calculation of a chi-square is not possible but the trends are very clear.

⁵⁹ For Greece the chi-square = 5.8608, $p < 0.05$ and for the Netherlands, chi-square = 12.9412, $p < 0.001$.

Table 21. Men's and women's extent of involvement in farm work by husband's non-farm employment status, farm size and respondent's gender

Relative extent of involvement in farm work	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden*	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women*	Men	Women	Men**
<i>A. Husband pluri-active</i>										
Women work less than their husbands	14 (24%)	8 (30%)	3 (6%)	-	41 (31%)	36 (90%)	33 (43%)		6 (34%)	-
Women work as much as their husbands	18 (31%)	9 (33%)	11 (23%)	3 (30%)	24 (19%)	3 (8%)	13 (17%)		7 (58%)	-
Women work more than their husbands	26 (45%)	10 (37%)	33 (70%)	7 (70%)	66 (50%)	1 (3%)	13 (17%)		2 (8%)	-
<i>B. Husband full-time farmer</i>										
Women work less than their husbands	19 (46%)	10 (43%)	32 (31%)	16 (26%)	11 (48%)	14 (93%)	48 (62%)		48 (73%)	-
Women work as much as their husbands	16 (39%)	13 (57%)	68 (66%)	41 (66%)	8 (35%)	-	26 (33%)		14 (19%)	-
Women work more than their husbands	6 (15%)	-	3 (3%)	5 (8%)	4 (17%)	1 (7%)	-		7 (8%)	-

* Percentages for Sweden are weighted population estimates and cannot be directly computed from frequencies.

**In the Netherlands and Sweden, only women's answers are available. Also in the Netherlands, when the husband is pluri-active, in 17 cases (23%) the relative extent of men and women's farm employment is not known.

who work less than or as much as their husbands are integrated rather than being partly integrated or excluded⁶⁰ (Table 23).

Table 22. Men's and women's off-farm employment by women's Integration/exclusion

<i>Men's and women's non-farm employment</i>	Finland*	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Men only pluri-active</i>					
Integrated	29 (74%)	4 (11%)	15 (46%)	83 (60%)	5 (33%)
Partly integrated	10 (26%)	19 (50%)	13 (39%)	22 (16%)	5 (33%)
Excluded	-	15 (39%)	5 (15%)	34 (24%)	5 (33%)
<i>Women only pluriactive</i>					
Integrated	1 (17 %)	2 (15%)	-	-	-
Partly integrated	3 (50%)	6 (46%)	3 (30%)	-	-
Excluded	2 (33%)	5 (39%)	7 (70%)	2 (100%)	-
<i>Both work off-farm</i>					
Integrated	14 (52%)	-	3 (38%)	9 (32%)	4 (44%)
Partly integrated	8 (30%)	6 (55%)	3 (38%)	4 (14%)	5 (56%)
Excluded	5 (19%)	5 (45%)	2 (25%)	15 (54%)	-
<i>None works off-farm</i>					
Integrated	14 (56%)	12 (18%)	15 (15%)	12 (41%)	37 (60%)
Partly integrated	9 (36%)	33 (51%)	43 (43%)	3 (10%)	21 (34%)
Excluded	2 (8%)	20 (31%)	41 (41%)	14 (48%)	4 (6%)

* In Finland: pluriactivity (including all kinds of non-agricultural income sources)

In all countries besides men's and women's relative extent of participation in agricultural labour, the actual number of days per year spent by women in farm work is also significantly related to their chances for integration⁶¹ (Table 24).

The Greek data provide some refinements in the relationship between women's extent of involvement in farm work, husband's pluri-activity and husband's extent of involvement in farm work. Clearly, women's chances for integration are considerably enhanced when their husbands are pluri-active, when they work more than their husbands in the farm and when they work more than 100 days per year in the farm. If the pluri-active husband continues to work in the farm as much as the wife, her chances for integration are halved. When the husband is a full-time farmer, women have a chance of becoming integrated only if they work more than the husband and her farm work involves 200 or more days per year. It is, however,

⁶⁰ The chi-square for Finland is 7.3263, $p < 0.01$; for Netherlands 5.4201, $p < 0.05$; for France 14.3156, $p < 0.001$; and for Greece 28.1935, $p < 0.001$.

⁶¹ In Greece, the chi-square is 21.604 $p < 0.001$ and in the Netherlands is 7.0230, $p < 0.01$.

Table 23. Men's and Women's Relative Extent of Farm Employment by Women's Integration in the Agricultural Occupation

Relative extent of farm employment	Finland	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Women work more than husbands</i>					
Integrated	25 (78 %)	17 (44%)	54 (77%)	3 (43%)	4 (31%)
Partly integrated	7 (22%)	20 (51%)	12 (17%)	4 (57%)	6 (46%)
Excluded	-	2 (5%)	4 (6%)	-	3 (23%)
<i>They work equally</i>					
Integrated	18 (56 %)	13 (16%)	15 (47%)	5 (16%)	13 (62%)
Partly integrated	12 (38%)	34 (43%)	2 (6%)	16 (52%)	4 (19%)
Excluded	2 (6%)	33 (41%)	15 (47%)	10 (32%)	4 (19%)
<i>Men work more than their wives</i>					
Integrated	15 (46 %)	3 (10%)	16 (28%)	7 (11%)	29 (58%)
Partly integrated	11 (33%)	8 (26%)	9 (16%)	25 (40%)	20 (40%)
Excluded	7 (21%)	20 (65%)	32 (56%)	30 (48%)	1 (2%)

Table 24. Women's extent of farm work by women's integration in the agricultural profession (women's answers)

Extent of farm work (in work days)	Finland	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Less than 75 days*</i>					
Integrated	2 (6%)	-	17 (32%)	3 (9%)	2 (12%)
Partly integrated	7 (21%)	3 (50%)	7 (13%)	11 (34%)	7 (41%)
Excluded	8 (24%)	3 (50%)	30 (56%)	18 (56%)	8 (47%)
<i>75 – 140 days</i>					
Integrated	-	1 (10%)*	33 (57%)	1 (4%)	-
Partly integrated	-	-	11 (19%)	14 (58%)	-
Excluded	-	9 (90%)	14 (24%)	9 (38%)	-
<i>150 – 180 days</i>					
Integrated	10 (67 %)	3 (16%)	22 (67%)	1 (4%)	10 (67%)
Partly integrated	5 (33%)	8 (42%)	5 (15%)	16 (64%)	5 (33%)
Excluded	-	8 (42%)	6 (18%)	8 (32%)	-
<i>200 or more days</i>					
Integrated	46(71 %)	29 (25%)	30 (83%)	12 (27%)	46 (71%)
Partly integrated	18 (28%)	51 (44%)	4 (11%)	23 (52%)	18 (28%)
Excluded	1 (1%)	35 (30%)	2 (6%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)

quite uncommon to find both spouses working nearly full-time in the farm or a wife working more than the husband, since there is nearly full-time work on the farm only for one person. In only 6% of the farm households both spouses work 150 days or

more per year in the farm. Moreover, in the farm population of men respondents, even when husbands are pluri-active, 46% of them work more than 150 days/year in the farm, thus providing women with hardly any opportunity to contribute as much or more farm work than they do. There is, instead, a strong negative correlation between the extent of men' and women's involvement in agricultural work: the more the men retreat, the more active the women become.

Beliefs regarding women's competence as farmers do not seem to be related to women's extent of participation in agricultural decision making, this holding true according to both men's and women's answers (Table 25). Only in the case of Greece, women's answers indicate a significant relationship between their belief that women are more competent than men as farmers and their active involvement in agricultural decision-making (chi-square = 7.1444, $p < 0.01$).

While the recognition of women as farmers by their husbands does not guarantee them integration, in all countries (except Sweden) women who are recognized as farmers by their husband significantly more often than women who are not recognized are integrated or partly integrated (Table 26). Women who are not recognized by their husbands, on the other hand, are significantly more often excluded.⁶² It is noteworthy that in Finland no woman considers herself integrated in agriculture, when her husband does not recognize her as a farmer and only one woman in the Netherlands.

Conclusion and Discussion

The research findings indicate that the following integration-related patterns hold true in all countries:

- (1) Smallholders are significantly less often members of farmers' organizations than larger farmers. They are, therefore, less often integrated in the agricultural occupation at the institutional level.

⁶² The chi-square for Finland is 17.0659, $p < 0.001$; for France 56.0864, $p < 0.001$; for the Netherlands 18.0935, $p < 0.001$; and for Greece, 46.2199, $p < 0.001$.

Table 25. Opinions about women's competence of women as farmers by women's active participation in agricultural decision-making and respondent's gender

Opinions about women's competence	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands**		Sweden	
	Men*	Women*	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>1. Equally competent as men</i>										
Women active	33 (87%)	71 (85%)			6 (20%)	41 (40%)			-	37 (70%)
Women not active	5 (13%)	13 (15%)			24 (80%)	61 (60%)			-	16 (30%)
<i>2. Women less competent than men</i>										
Women active	3 (75%)	6 (75%)			8 (18%)	12 (25%)			-	8 (78%)
Women not active	1 (25%)	2 (25%)			37 (82%)	36 (75%)			-	2 (22%)
<i>3. Women more competent than men</i>										
Women active	2 (67%)	2 (100%)			1 (14%)	22 (53%)			-	8 (51%)
Women not active	1 (33%)	-			6 (86%)	20 (48%)			-	4 (49%)

* Whenever the percentages do not add to 100, this is due to the fact that the remaining respondents answered that they did not know.

**In France and the Netherlands, the question asked was more general: "whether or not there is any difference in quality between men and women farmers", but there was no specification sought as to whether this difference was positive or negative for the women and the answers are not, therefore, comparable with those obtained in the other countries

Table 26. Whether or not women are recognized as farmers by women's integration in the agricultural occupation

	Finland	France	Greece	Netherlands	Sweden
<i>Recognized</i>					
Integrated	63 (74%)	25 (28%)	99 (66%)	16 (20%)	22 (60%)
Partly integrated	21 (25%)	52 (58%)	22 (15%)	45 (57%)	11 (30%)
Excluded	1 (1%)	12 (14%)	30 (20%)	19 (29%)	4 (11%)
<i>Not Recognized</i>					
Integrated	6 (43%)	4 (7%)	4 (10%)	1 (3%)	22 (61%)
Partly integrated	5 (36%)	7 (13%)	6 (15%)	12 (33%)	12 (33%)
Excluded	3 (21%)	43 (80%)	31 (76%)	23 (64%)	2 (6%)

- (2) When women alone or jointly with their husbands own the land, they are significantly more often cooperative members than when the husband alone owns the land. When husbands are pluri-active, wives are significantly more often actively involved in farm work than when husbands are full-time farmers.
- (3) Integrated women who are significantly more active in agricultural decision-making than excluded women also perform 'male' agricultural tasks as well as 'female' tasks.
- (4) Women who are not recognized as farmers by their husband are significantly more often excluded from the agricultural occupation than women who are recognized.

In addition to the above overall similarities, there are also similarities in the research findings regarding women's integration in agriculture in Greece and the Netherlands as well as in France. The similar findings in Greece and the Netherlands include: (a) women smallholders are excluded from institutional integration in agriculture not only because of gender but also because of farm size; and (b) husbands' pluri-activity is positively related to women's integration. Other similarities between the two countries also shared with France, include:

- (a) The importance of agricultural training for women's active participation in agricultural decision-making and for cooperative membership;
- (b) women's lack of training in mainstream 'technical' agricultural subjects;
- (c) the significantly higher incidence of pluri-activity among smallholders;
- (d) the importance of women's land ownership for their integration at both the farm and the institutional level.

These similarities in the three countries are primarily due to the fact that women do not have equal access with men to 'technical' agricultural training and to membership in agricultural organizations and do not undertake a leading role in agriculture, unless the husband has relinquished his farmer role because of pluri-activity. In France and the Netherlands, but not in Greece as we have seen, women are faced with considerable difficulty in becoming integrated at the institutional level. As we have already seen, the highest percentage of excluded women and of women who are active at the farm level but not institutionally integrated are found in these two countries (Table 18).

The similarities between these three countries regarding the correlates of women's integration in the agricultural occupation are of particular interest, in view of some similarities but also some important differences in prevailing social and structural conditions between these three countries. As we have seen in Chapter One, similarities between the three countries are:

- (a) the proportion of pluri-active farmers is one-fourth of all farmers, while in Finland and Sweden is smaller by half;
- (b) the percentage of farms with less than 5 ha. in France and the Netherlands, while much smaller than that in Greece (27.3% and 33% versus 75.1% respectively), it is almost three times larger than that in the Nordic countries (10.5% in Finland and 12.4% in Sweden);
- and (c) food and agriculture products represent a large proportion of the three countries' exports, thus showing a high degree of dependence on agriculture, while in the two Nordic countries, the share of agriculture in their GDP is much smaller and near the EU average.

Significant differences between the three countries, on the other hand, are:

- (a) their overall socio-economic development;
- (a) different gender ideologies and policies implementing gender equality;
- (b) the average size of farms: 38,5 in France, 17,7 in the Netherlands and 4,5 in Greece;
- (c) the much higher percentage of men and women smallholders with agricultural training in the Netherlands and France than in Greece: Dutch men four times and French men twice more often than in Greece and Dutch and French women twice as often as Greek women;
- (d) rural women's much higher general educational level in France and the Netherlands than in Greece;
- (e) the establishment of husband-wife partnerships by farmers in both France and the Netherlands but not in Greece. Of course, these partnerships, which are usually helpful to women's integration because they provide women with an important status in the farm enterprise, are most often undertaken in medium-size and larger farms rather than in smallholder households. And
- (f) rural Greece has recently undergone important social changes as an unintended consequence of the application of CAP. A crucial social change is women smallholders' greater share in land ownership and farm management. This is due

to the fact that, when in 1997 for the first time a Farmers' Register was created, Greek pluri-active men smallholders had to declare whether they were pluri-active or full-time farmers. Because they wished to maintain the full-time farmer status for their farm enterprise and the eligibility for all types of present and future benefits accruing to such status, they legally transferred the land title and/or the farm management to their wives, who were not pluri-active. As a result, in many rural areas and smallholder households, this transfer has significantly enhanced women's chances for integration in the agricultural profession at both the farm and the institutional level.

The trends in Finland and Sweden differ markedly from the other three European countries. Prevailing gender egalitarian ideologies and policies have contributed considerably to women's greater extent of equality in access to agricultural training, membership in farmer's organizations as well as to a more egalitarian division of power in agricultural decision making. Thus, these two countries have the highest percentage of integrated women in the agricultural profession at both levels and the lowest percentage of excluded women, with Finland leading in terms of achievements in women's integration. It is also interesting to note that in Finland, the application of the stricter criterion of a 50-50 distribution of agricultural income between husbands and wives results in a lower percentage of integrated women (58%) that is still slightly higher even than that of Sweden.

In Finland, the power of the prevailing gender egalitarian ideology is shown in the fact that even when women do not make important farm work contributions, in most cases they can actively participate in the agricultural decision-making of the farm enterprise. Furthermore, women who are excluded from farm decision-making are to the same degree as integrated women members of farmers' organizations, participate in their meetings and hold office in them; have an equal level of agricultural training; have as often contacts with an agricultural advisor; and have the right to farmers' pension. In Sweden also, women's integration at the institutional level is not related to their integration at the farm level. In the Nordic countries, therefore, women smallholders' integration tends to be relatively easier than is in the other three countries. In France, Greece and the Netherlands, on the other hand, women smallholders can become integrated at the institutional level, if they have proven their farmer identity by fulfilling at least some of the following conditions: they must make important farm work contributions; actively participate in farm

decision-making; have received agricultural training; and have a formal status in the farm enterprise as owners, farm managers or farm partners.

It must be noted, however, that despite the high rate of women's integration, it cannot be concluded that Swedish and Finnish women have achieved equality with their husbands. The long established gender equality discourse may suppress the direct expression of antithetical feelings and behaviors but, as indicated by existing discrepancies between answers to direct and indirect questions related to the existence of gender equality, the traditional gender role ideology has not entirely vanished.

REFERENCES

- Bock, B. and M. de Lith (1999). *Changes in the position of agrarian women 5 years after Beijing*, The Hague: Lto.
- CBS, *Landbouwtelling 1999 (Agricultural Census 1999)*, The Hague.
- Central Statistical Office of Finland (1997a), Tilastokeskus, SVT, Maa- ja metsätalous (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 1997:1. *Maatalouden yrittäjien tulotilasto (Income Statistics of Agriculture) 1995*. Helsinki.
- Central Statistical Office of Finland (1997b), Tilastokeskus (Statistics Finland), SVT, Maa- ja metsätalous (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 1997:1. *Maatalouden tulo- ja verotustilasto (Statistics of Income and Taxes) 1995*. Helsinki.
- Description of Women's Cooperatives* (2000). Athens: General Secretariat of Equality and PASEGES.
- Githarakou, I *et al.* (2000). "Rural Women's Vocational Training," paper presented at the Fifth Panhellenic Congress on Agricultural Economics in Thessaloniki.
- Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (1993), SVT, *Maa- ja metsätalous (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 1993:6*.
Maatalouslaskenta 1990, osa 6. *Liitannaiselinkeinot, puutarhaviljely, turkistarhaus ja poronhoito (Subsidiary Business, Gardening, Fur Farming and Reindeer Breeding)* Helsinki.
- Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (1997a). SVT, *Maa- ja metsätalous (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 1997:6*.
Maatalarekisteri 1996 (Farm Register 1996). Helsinki.
- Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (1997b). SVT, *Maatalustilastollinen vuosikirja 1996 (The Yearbook of Farm Statistics 1996)*. Helsinki.
- National Board of Agriculture (1992). SVT, Maa- ja metsätalous (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 1992:1. Maatalouslaskenta 1990, osa 1 (Agricultural Census 1990, part 1), *Maatilat (Farms)*. Helsinki.
- Siiskonen, P. (1990). *Emännän ja isännän roolin muutos maatalouden undenaikaistuksessa. Tutkimus maatalon emännän ja isännän muuttuvista rooleista työnjaon avulla tarkasteltuna (Changing Roles of Farm Women and Men in the Modernization of Agriculture)*. Mikkeli: University of Helsinki, Centre for Rural Research, Publication no. 7.

CHAPTER SEVEN: EUROPEAN SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN SMALLHOLDERS' SURVIVAL STRATEGIES

A. Prospects for the future: Economic viability and farm succession

The economic situation of the farm household is reflected in the perceived economic viability of the farm enterprise. In the Netherlands, less than half of the farmers are convinced that their economic position is good and stable enough to allow for future development. A group of nearly the same size believes that there is no future and a small minority is yet uncertain. Those households that worry about their actual financial position are also most uncertain and pessimistic about their chances for further farm development.⁶³ The relation with having debts is ambiguous: those having no debts (who are mostly smallholders) are less optimistic than those who have debts.

Dutch smallholders have significantly less trust in the future than medium-size and larger farmers. While the majority (80 percent) of larger farmers believe that their farms will be developed in the future, only 39 percent of smallholders believe the same. Four times more smallholders than larger farmers, on the other hand, believe that their farm will be maintained as it is and twice as many smallholders as larger farmers believe that they will close down or that the future is uncertain. Overall, farmers who engage in non-farm employment (who are more often smallholders) are more uncertain about the future than those who concentrate on primary or diversified farm production (who are more often larger farmers). Furthermore, Table 1 shows that there is no significant difference between smallholders and larger farmers with regard to their belief as to whether they will continue or abandon farming in the future.

In Finland, more than one-third (39 percent) of the interviewed farmers believe that they will continue farming in the future in the same way, without making any changes.¹ It must be noted that an important reason for which Finnish smallholders may continue farming as the easiest and best alternative, despite financial adversities

⁶³ In the case of women's answers, the differences are statistically significant ($p=0.02$) but not for men although the trend is the same.

Table 1. Men's and women's plans to continue or not farming by farm size

Plan to continue farming	Finland*		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small Size</i>										
Will continue	9 (64%)	15 (63%)	6 (100%)	20 (83%)	64 (89%)	142(86%)	25 (71%)	58 (79%)		
Will abandon	3 (21%)	5 (21%)	-	1 (4%)	6 (8%)	19 (11%)	10 (29%)	15 (20%)		
Will diminish production	-	-	-	3 (13%)	2 (3%)	5 (3%)	-	1 (1%)		
It depends	2 (14%)									
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Will continue	11 (41%)	34 (61%)	24 (82%)	47 (89%)	10 (91%)	26 (96%)	11 (85%)	29 (91%)		
Will abandon	5 (19%)	7 (13%)	2 (8%)	5 (9%)	1 (9%)	-	2 (15%)	3 (9%)		
Will diminish production	-	-	-	1 (2%)	-	1 (4%)	-	-		
It depends	10 (39%)									
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Will continue	5 (56%)	15 (75%)	17 (85%)	38 (90%)	-	-	3 (75%)	13 (93%)		
Will abandon	-	-	3 (15%)	2 (5%)	-	-	1 (25%)	1 (7%)		
Will diminish production	-	-	-	2 (5%)	-	-	-	-		
It depends	4 (44%)									
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Will continue	-		19 (100%)	26 (100%)	-	-	-	-		
Will abandon	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		
Will diminish production	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		

* It depends on the level of income and the level of subsidies.

**The question was not asked in Sweden.

is that social security can provide them with a supplementary income that allows them to live and work in the farm, even when the agricultural income is low (Sireni, 1994). Another one-fourth of the farmers report that the future of the farm depends entirely on the income level and the level of subsidies, while less than one-fourth will continue farming with some changes; and 17 percent will either close down or reduce production.

In Greece, Tables 2 and 3 show that more women than men respondents report that they will continue farming and twice as many men as women respondents report that they will continue because they have no choice, they have no other better occupational prospect. Only a small minority of farmers in both populations report that they will abandon farming. It is also important to note that in the farm population of women respondents⁶⁴, in 53% of the farm households that report that they will definitely abandon farming or if they find another job, the husbands are pluri-active farmers who have not transferred the farmer status to their wives. On the other hand, only in 12% of the farm enterprises in which the pluri-active husband transferred the farmer status to the wife, women respondents have the same negative farming plans for the future. These findings underline the fact that pluri-active men who do not transfer the farmer status to their wife opt for a poor survival strategy. The only other category of pluri-active smallholders with negative farming plans is the one of farmers who rent the land they cultivate.

Overall the Greek data suggest that the farm population of women respondents seems to be more attached to farming than the farm population of men respondents despite the fact that the latter are more often full-time farmers. Possibly for many women the fact that their involvement in farming has been recognized and they are integrated in the agricultural occupation, provides them with enthusiasm to continue despite encountered difficulties.

Tables 2 and 3 also show important regional differences. In the island of Lesbos, all farmers in both farm populations sampled state that they will continue farming and no one that he/she will abandon farming, while 22% of women and 17% of men respondents in Karditsa plan to abandon farming, most of them (83%) if they find

⁶⁴. The answers of men respondents cannot be similarly analyzed because there are so few cases of pluri-active husbands that have transferred the farmer status to their wife that a comparison is not feasible.

another job⁶⁵. This finding in the prefecture of Karditsa (where most farmers are cotton growers) reflects farmers' dissatisfaction with the state of smallholder agriculture, probably at least partly because about two-thirds of them have taken agricultural loans and 44% of them have not been able to repay them. Since, however, the chances of finding another job are not good, most probably few of them will in fact abandon farming. The prefectures of Evia and Chania are situated between the two extremes represented by Lesvos and Karditsa. It must also be noted, however, that farmers with more than 4.5 ha. in Karditsa and Evia report that they will continue farming much more often than smallholders.

Table 2. Whether or not Smallholders will Continue Farming by Prefecture (Farm Population of Women Respondents)

Future Farming Plans	Karditsa	Evia	Chania	Lesvos	Total
Will continue	11 (27%)	32 (74%)	32 (70%)	43 (84%)	118 (65%)
Will continue, no choice, there is nothing better	18 (44%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)	8 (16%)	34 (19%)
Will continue as long as there are subsidies	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	-	5 (3%)
If I find another job I will abandon	8 (20%)	2 (5%)	5 (11%)	-	15 (8%)
I will abandon	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	-	5 (3%)
I will continue but will reduce intensity	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	-	4 (2%)
Total	40(100%)	43(100)	46(100%)	51(100%)	181(100%)

It must also be noted that in Greece there seems to have been considerable intergenerational farm continuity between men farmers and their parents since the mother of more than 90% of them was also a farmer and in one-third of the cases, their sister is also a farmer (with no differentiation by men's age, education and farm size).

In France, Table 1 shows that the large majority of men and women report that they will continue farming and there is no difference between smallholders and larger

⁶⁵ In the farm population of women respondents, these differentials are to a considerable extent due to the significant regional differentials in women's integration in the agricultural occupation: 89% of the women are integrated in Lesvos and 45% in Karditsa.

farmers. The only noteworthy trend is that all of the largest farmers report that they will continue farming.⁶⁶

Table 3. Whether or not Smallholders will Continue Farming by Prefecture (Farm Population of Men Respondents)

Future Farming Plans	Karditsa	Evia	Chania	Lesvos	Total
Will continue	6 (33%)	4 (29%)	8 (31%)	14 (64%)	32 (40%)
Will continue, no choice, there is nothing better	6 (33%)	6 (43%)	8 (31%)	8 (36%)	28 (35%)
Will continue as long as there are subsidies	3 (17%)	1 (7%)	2 (8%)	-	6 (8%)
If I find another job I will abandon	2 (11%)	-	-	-	2 (3%)
I will abandon	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	3 (12%)	-	5 (6%)
I will continue but it will reduce intensity	-	2 (14%)	5 (19%)	-	7 (9%)
Total	18(100.0)	14(100.0)	26(100%)	22(100%)	80(101%)

With regard to farm succession, in the Netherlands a little more than one-third of the interviewed men and women do not want their children to succeed them in farming. Their reasons: working in agriculture generates lower income than other types of wage employment; there is always uncertainty about how high the income will be; and farming will get even harder in the future and less enjoyable because of increasing regulations. Also Dutch men and women smallholders are significantly less often optimistic about farm succession than larger farmers (Table 4), but the difference reaches statistical significance only in the case of women (chi-square = 4.7956, $p < 0.05$).

In the case of France, smallholders significantly less often than larger farmers believe that there will be farm succession by their children (chi-square = 5.5960, $p < 0.05$). Also in the larger farms, women significantly more often than men are optimistic about farm succession (chi-square = 4.8003, $p < 0.05$), while among smallholders there is no difference. Finnish smallholder men are less often optimistic than smallholder women and larger farmers, the frequencies, however, are small

⁶⁶ The question regarding farmers' plans to continue or not farming was not asked in Sweden.

Table 4. Chances for farm succession by farm size and respondent's gender

Chances for farm succession	Finland		France		Greece		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>A. Small farm size</i>										
Yes	-	5 (46%)	2 (33%)	4 (39%)	27 (41%)	39 (15%)	3 (12%)	8 (15%)	-	13 (100%)
No	2 (29%)	4 (36%)	3 (50%)	6 (26%)	35 (53%)	92 (57%)	6 (23%)	32 (59%)	-	-
Uncertain	5 (71%)	2 (18%)	1 (17%)	4 (17%)	-	-	17 (65%)	14 (26%)	-	-
As supplementary occupation	-	-			4 (6%)	31 (19%)	-	-	-	-
<i>B. Medium size (a)</i>										
Yes	5 (33%)	6 (20%)	8 (31%)	26 (49%)	2 (40%)	13 (50%)	3 (33%)	7 (32%)	-	10 (55%)
No	5 (33%)	6 (20%)	14 (54%)	17 (32%)	3 (60%)	7 (27%)	3 (33%)	9 (41%)	-	9 (45%)
Uncertain	5 (33%)	18 (60%)	4 (15%)	5 (10%)	-	-	3 (33%)	6 (27%)	-	-
As supplementary occupation	-	-			-	6 (23%)	-	-		-
<i>C. Medium size (b)</i>										
Yes	1 (25%)	4 (31%)	9 (45%)	18 (43%)	-	-	1 (33%)	4 (33%)	-	11 (67%)
No	-	2 (15%)	11 (55%)	14 (33%)	-	-	1 (33%)	4 (33%)	-	9 (33%)
Uncertain	3 (75%)	7 (54%)	-	8 (19%)	-	-	1 (33%)	4 (33%)	-	-
<i>D. Larger size</i>										
Yes	-	-	8 (42%)	18 (72%)	-	-	-	-	-	14 (69%)
No	-	-	10 (53%)	4 (16%)	-	-	-	-	-	6 (31%)
Uncertain	-	-	1 (5%)	2 (8%)	-	-	-	-	-	-

because most of the interviewed couples have small children and the significance of the trends cannot be concluded with certainty.

In Greece, on the other hand, there is no difference between men and women's projections for farm succession. This lack of difference is mainly due to the fact that women significantly more often than men believe that farm succession will take place as a supplementary occupation while men, especially smallholder men, are more optimistic than women but most probably more unrealistic about farm succession. The reality for Greek smallholders is that in most cases farming is a supplementary occupation. However, Greek men respondents, most of who are full-time farmers, do not seem to like to envisage this alternative for their children.

In Sweden, there is an opposite trend. Children are more interested in taking over small rather than larger farms. In fact the larger is the farm the less likely that the children will succeed their parents as farmers. Most probably, the reason for this is that a small farm may be run as a part time farm together with another job, while a larger farm needs a professional, educated full-time farmer. Also children from large farms are more likely to get a good education that will give them better job opportunities outside farming.

In general, many young people are not eager to become farmers but they are not on the other hand willing to altogether abandon rural living and some aspects of farming. In Sweden, for example, according to recent demographic figures the exodus from the countryside is at present at a peak and they are the young who leave. When Swedish women farmers on dairy farms in the forested region of Smaland answered positively that their children would like to take over the farm, they specified that they would like their children to take over the forests but not the cattle. They feel that the care of the cattle requires too much work and they think that their children are not willing to invest their time in cattle breeding. This means that young people will take a non-farm job and manage the forest in their spare time, eventually only during holidays, possibly living the rest of the year in town. In such a scenario, the farming land will either be rented out or planted with trees to increase the forest land.

Also in the Netherlands, among small farm households, the tradition of succeeding the family enterprise seems sometimes to get replaced with a new tradition, the continuance of the family's living place. These men and women hope that their children will at least go on living in the countryside and in the family home.

A similar trend is found in Finland and in Greece, in the latter the hope that the children will take care of the olive trees as a continuation of a family tradition.⁶⁷ Since the care of olive trees is not intensive, many men and women farmers continue their farming as a supplementary income-generating activity. As a Greek woman farmer characteristically says:

Under present conditions, there is no motivation to go on farming. I will still take care of the olive trees but that is all. I cannot survive from agriculture [Woman, 29 years old, in Evia with a farm of 3 ha.].

Regarding the gender of the succeeding child, the available data indicate that in France, they are primarily sons who inherit the land. Only 17 per cent of the interviewed women had inherited land from their parents, while 35 per cent of their husbands had inherited land. Also in 16 per cent of the cases parents indicate that a son will succeed in the farm enterprise and only in 2,7 percent of the cases a daughter.

Similarly in the Netherlands, girls rarely succeed their parents as farmers, but there are some indications of improved access to succession. In the 90's, the number of daughters that work regularly in the farm increased by 43%, but still in 1998 they account for 3% of the total regular labour force in agriculture while sons account for 8%. Sons are still more often involved in farm work than daughters and they spend more time on farm work per week. In 1997 more than two-third (68%) of cooperating sons worked on the farm nearly full-time (more than 30 hours/week) compared to only 14% of the daughters (CBS, 1998). The majority of women (65%) and men (87%) expect that one of their sons will continue the farm; only 18% of women and 13% of men expect a daughter to succeed; and another 18% of the women perceive either one, son or daughter as possible.

In Finland, farm succession is a complicated issue involving the purchase of the land from parents by means of a considerable agricultural loan. Because of this, it is far less common that a daughter succeeds farming parents, but she may do so more often in partnership with her husband. Furthermore, the interviewed Finnish farmers could not always give definite succession answers because their children are very young. Of those who answered, one-fourth of men and women report that one of their

⁶⁷ In Finland, smallholders can consider continuing farming since as the best alternative since social security can provide them with a supplementary income that allows them to live and work in their farm, even when their agricultural income is low (Sireni, 1994).

children will succeed them and somewhat more than one-fourth (28-29%) that no child will succeed them. Furthermore, 9% of women and 21% of men believe that their children will succeed their farm enterprise as a secondary occupation.

In Greece, on the other hand, there is more gender equality regarding land inheritance, especially in some regions. Overall, more than half (50%) of the respondents plan to distribute the land equally to their children; 29% of them will give it only to their sons (and the house or money to the girls); and 16% will give it to only to their daughters. It is notable that more men than women respondents report that the farm land will be given preferentially to daughters. Of course, it must be noted that both men and women respondents more often report that the land will be given to daughters when they have no sons: 58% of women and 70% of men respondents will give the land to daughters when they have no sons and only 17% of women and 27% of men respondents will do the same when they have sons. These findings, in the context of a very low Greek rural fertility rate, indicate that daughters have a good chance of succeeding their parents as farmers.

There is also considerable regional variation: In the island of Lesbos, significantly more often than in the other three prefectures, in both sampled farm populations farmers plan to give the farmland only to daughters. When these answers were examined in relation to the existence or not of sons in the family, we find that the answers are significantly differentiated. When there is no son in the family, practically all men and women (100% and 93% respectively) respondents report that they will give the land to the daughter(s), while when there is a son, still half of the men and one-third of the women report that they will do so. In the other regions, the willingness to make a daughter the successor are lesser. When there is a son, only 20% of the men and 57% of the women in Karditsa and half of the men and no woman in Evia plan to give the land to the daughter(s). When there is no son in the family, the willingness to give land to a daughter is the least in Karditsa, only 6% of men respondents and in Evia, where only 3% of women respondents accept a daughter as successor. Hence, the trend of farm succession by daughters in Lesbos is twice as significant as in the other prefectures indicating that in this region farm

succession has become de-differentiated in terms of gender, thus maximizing flexibility and adaptability to change⁶⁸. The importance of daughters' inheriting the land is underlined by the very low fertility in rural areas and the possibility of a son's lack of interest in farming. Hence, the exclusion of daughters from land inheritance can often signify the lack of a successor.

In conclusion, it seems that farm succession is often problematic, especially among smallholders mainly because: (a) young people, particularly young women do not want to become farmers, an occupation they perceive as tiring, constraining and without a future; (b) in some countries and regions, prevailing gender role stereotypes prevent daughters from succeeding their parents because they are not considered as potentially competent farmers; and (c) existing inheritance regulations render succession very expensive, as is true in Finland.

Overall, it seems that despite the existence of exclusionary policies and mechanisms discriminating against smallholders, they do not necessarily lead to the extinction of smallholders. Despite smallholders' pessimism regarding succession by their children (except in Sweden where they are more optimistic than larger farmers), the majority of them are not willing to abandon farming and have developed important survival strategies. The fact that they less often than larger farmers take agricultural loans and do not expand considerably their farm enterprise, leaves them less vulnerable to economic downturns than larger farmers with loans. Smallholders can also develop special niche markets for their products, thus avoiding direct competition with larger farmers and they are much more often pluri-active, supplementing their agricultural income with non-farm income. Furthermore, when the husband is pluri-active, the full-time involvement of women in farm labour and farm management, represents a survival strategy leading both to the improvement of the position of women in farming and the farm enterprise's greater economic security.

B. Survival Strategies and options

Strategy is a central concept encompassing a number of practices aiming to the conservation and continuation of the farm enterprise. The strategy itself as well as the practices devised by farmers may be rational within the context of the farm enterprise.

⁶⁸ It is not surprising that in Lesvos farm succession has become gender de-differentiated, since in this region the percent of integrated women is the highest (89%).

They deal, however, not only with economic issues but also with the social and psychological well being of individuals. On the one hand, farmers make economic calculations on the basis of the local and national market and the EU context. The market context includes agricultural produce prices, the value of land, and the conditions of the agricultural product market. On the other hand, local social conditions such as the strength of the gender stratification system and prevailing gender role stereotypes create different expectations for male and female behaviour, with direct and indirect consequences for men's and women's roles in agriculture and in the farm enterprise as well as for the very survival of the farm enterprise. Moreover, the local social context may tip the balance toward a non-rational decision from an economic point of view, partly because the farmer cannot tolerate to deviate socially or economically and partly because he (she) may want to fulfil his (her) own expectations.

In all countries, it is clear that the farm survival of small farm enterprises is no longer necessarily or solely dependent on the husband's labour and management contributions. Thus, it is no longer possible to conceptualize farm survival as a family strategy. It is necessary to individualize strategies into men and women's strategies, while always keeping family cohesion and farm enterprise continuity as common denominators. Both husband and wife need to flexibly combine their farm and non-farm labor and income contributions, in order to ensure the survival of the farm enterprise. In different European countries, depending on the conditions of the rural labor market for men and women and the profitability of non-agricultural uses of the farm, men and women are more or less active participants in agriculture and in on-farm and non-farm gainful employment. The type of farming system and the ability of small farm enterprises to survive depend on both husbands' and wives flexible and adaptive occupational and labour strategies to changing local and global socioeconomic and agronomic conditions. It seems that gender role flexibility and gender equality safeguard smallholders' survival.

The Greek data suggest that there are two major survival models for smallholdings. The one seems to be less flexible and less adaptive, since it follows the traditional patterns of farm functioning in terms of a strict gender division of labour, coincidence of farm ownership and farm management and general lack of adaptation to constantly changing socioeconomic conditions. In this traditional model, the husband is

full-time farmer, landowner and primarily responsible for most agricultural labour and management decisions. His wife is marginally involved in farm work and agricultural decision-making as the husband's unpaid helper and is excluded from the agricultural occupation and frequently from non-farm employment as well. Furthermore, sustainability as measured by farm succession is lowest in areas in which, gender role stereotypes do not allow daughters to inherit the farm enterprise.

The second more flexible survival model adapts to ongoing policy and socio-economic conditions, by adopting new patterns of farm functioning, especially with respect to gender division of agricultural labour and farm management. These new patterns include smallholder farm enterprises in which the husband is predominantly pluri-active and the wife is the active farmer in terms of labour and management contributions. In order to secure farm enterprise survival, they adapt to CAP regulations by making the concession of formally transferring the farmer status to their wives. In most cases, the wife owns all or most of the land or is legally the farm manager and is integrated in the agricultural occupation.

In the Greek farm population of women respondents, more than half of the men are able to accept change and to use in an efficient way the human resources of their household. They are able to transcend gender role stereotypes and to transfer not only nominally but substantively the farmer status/role to their wife. In this way, the survival of the small farm enterprise is undertaken with the help of both the husband's and the wife's labour and income contributions in and outside agriculture. In the farm population of men respondents, on the other hand, practically all men still cling to the old model of farm survival, entirely based on the husband's agricultural labour and income. Even when they have to undertake non-farm employment, they still remain responsible for most of the agricultural labour and decision-making, while their wives are relegated to a marginal role, thus wasting valuable human resources. Finally, even in the extreme case, in which their non-farm employment does not allow them to undertake most of the farm labour and management and the wife shoulders both, they are not willing to let the wife become recognized as the farmer by the agricultural organizations and the local community⁶⁹. The fact that the two different farm populations were encountered in all villages sampled, suggests that the lack of flexibility and acceptance of needed changes

⁶⁹ These women are the 'invisible excluded' women experiencing probably the most cruel type of exclusion.

observed in the farm population of men respondents is not due to idiosyncratic local conditions but rather to a type of masculine self-concept that is threatened by and, therefore, precludes such changes.

In Sweden, the data indicate the existence of the traditional model among smallholders, when men with a low level education, and apparently with patriarchal values, maintain a traditional division of labour in farm work as well as in housework and child care and withdraw the farm enterprise from farmers' organizations. In this model, women are marginalized and excluded from agriculture. There is also a more modern and flexible gender de-differentiated model among smallholders corresponding to the similar Greek model, in which husbands are pluri-active, the women, whether pluri-active or not, are active in farm labour and management and both spouses are members of farmers' organizations.

In the Netherlands, among smallholders both models have been documented, the traditional and the more flexible gender-differentiated survival strategy. In the predominant traditional model, pluri-active husbands who want to maintain the farmer status as a 'male' status, reorganize and mechanize farm work in such a way that they are able to perform it before and after their non-farm work. In this way, wives remain excluded in the marginal assistant role in agriculture. In the more flexible gender-differentiated survival strategy, the daily farm work and responsibility is delegated to the wife as a partner, thus allowing her to become integrated in the agricultural occupation.

In addition to different strategic models, some smallholders adopt alternative production lines and niche markets that allow them to not compete directly with larger farmers, thus ensuring better chances for survival. Organic farming represents the most important such alternative production line.

Although in the Greek research, organic farming did not seem to represent a promising alternative production line for smallholders (or for larger farmers) in the sampled populations, national data show that in 2000 the average size of certified organic farms was 4 ha. (Sgouros, 2001). It seems, therefore, that two years after the collection of the Greek data, a considerable number of smallholders have converted to organic farming, the growth rate of which has been extremely high in 2000 and 2001. Up to now organic farming has concentrated mostly (63%) on the cultivation of olive trees and the production of organic olive oil, but it has increasingly spread over to fruits and vegetables. Also recently urban markets for organic products have multiplied and

have gained popularity.

In Finland, there are fewer alternative survival strategies available to smallholders than in the wealthy core areas of Europe. The majority of Finnish farms are based on primary production with standard produce (milk, meat and arable crops for the food industry), usually for bulk buyers and middlemen. Alternatives like the production of clean, quality foodstuffs as well as the 'nature and tradition tourism' have less of a chance to succeed because of the country's remoteness and small population. It can be expected, therefore, that the number of farms practicing standard production will diminish and those that remain will expand and intensify their production (Oksa, 1996).

Organic farming, however, is an example of alternative production line that has made a breakthrough: the number of farms practicing organic farming has increased significantly during the 1990's (Mononen, 1990). The success of this alternative as a survival strategy is, however, hindered by Finland's remote location and from the fact that a population of five million does not necessarily include an adequate number of environmentally conscious or quality conscious consumers. Also there are no established marketing channels and ways to act for other than the standard production (Oksa, 1996).

After Finland's membership in the European Union, organic and conventional farming have approached each other in terms of profitability. Although harvests are smaller in organic farming, production costs tend to be lower, subsidies higher per hectare and prices of products are usually higher. Thus, an increasing number of farmers became interested in organic farming as a serious option leading to the improvement of farming profitability (Mononen, 1998). This is clearly seen in the number of organic farms that has doubled from 1995 to 1998. Organic farming is not, however, particularly typical of small farms. Their average size is currently approximately 25 hectares, that is, larger than the average Finnish farm of 20 hectares. Those among the interviewed smallholders who do not practice organic farming claim that organic farming is not profitable on small farms. Smallholders, on the other hand, who actually do practice organic farming are in most cases satisfied with their choice and do not see small acreage as an obstacle.

Finally, the data collected in Finland show that three-fourths of the farms in the sample practice only basic agriculture, producing milk, meat, crops or fodder,

while 11 percent practice both basic agriculture and some specialized agriculture, including organic production or small-scale processing of farm produce; and 14 percent practice only specialized agriculture, producing berries or vegetables or produce honey. Also 42 percent of the interviewed Finnish men and women farmers are interested at least in principle in converting to organic farming. The reasons they give for their interest are higher prices of the products, higher subsidies and the environmental friendliness of the production. Furthermore, crop farmers are significantly more interested in organic farming than dairy farmers. Dairy farmers do not consider organic farming as a relevant option because in the prevailing agricultural policies support to organic farming is limited to crop production and because there is only a very limited number of processing units and marketing channels for organic milk.

Moreover, in about one-third of the Finnish farms there is some type of non-agricultural entrepreneurial activity as a part of a survival strategy, the most common activity being machine contracting (in forestry work, snow ploughing, baling, etc.) typically employing only men.

In Sweden, organic farming also seems to be an alternative strategy for farm survival. The aim of the official Swedish agricultural policy was by the year 2000 to have 10 percent of the arable land converted to organic farming. In 1999, this aim was more than fulfilled with as much as 11 percent of the total acreage of arable land in organic farming. The positive attitude toward organic farming is also mirrored in the study. Half of the interviewed women (52 percent) say that they are interested in converting to organic farming and 16.8 percent have already converted fully or partly to organic farming.

Another important niche for women smallholders seems to be developing in Sweden: horse breeding. This is an increasingly important agricultural sector within Swedish agriculture and it is largely female dominated. According to the director of the National Swedish Horse Breeders' Union, in terms of profitability it is presently the fifth most important agricultural sector and is expected to soon become the third most important one.

In France, organic farming does not seem to represent an important alternative as a survival strategy for smallholders. The majority of women report not being interested in converting to organic farming, because they think that it requires a lot of

work and considerable investment, while marketing is not satisfactory. Thus, only 8 percent of the interviewed women report practicing organic farming. Also French women's non-farm employment does not constitute an important component of survival strategies: only 8,7 percent of women have such employment. On-farm activities, on the other hand, represent an important component of the survival strategy of one-third of women, this activity consisting of primarily selling of farm produce on the site of the farm and less often farm tourism.

In the Netherlands, smallholders' difficulties, in competing with larger farmers on the same products, are probably to some extent more accentuated than in the other countries. A solution found by smallholders is the production for niche-markets, which are unattractive or inaccessible to larger farmers. These may be either local markets or markets for very specific products. The research indicates however that some of these markets are threatened by recent regulations, which are (directly or indirectly) promoting further scale-enlargement. Because of their generic character, new regulations can (unintentionally) destroy the basis of those markets, as can be clearly noticed within the intensive animal husbandry sector. Also on the global market, it becomes more and more difficult for smallholders to even get access to the production chain, because of the uneven increase of production and transaction costs for smallholders compared to bigger producers.

Organic farming has been considered by quite a few Dutch women and men, but is seldom perceived as a realistic option for the present, except by those already engaged in environment-friendly production methods (who are not more than 9 per cent of smallholders). High quality-production, combined with niche marketing and sometimes environment-friendly production methods is an option often chosen by small horticultural farms. This type of production does not necessarily entail organic farming but instead the cultivation of difficult species, the cultivation of which needs extra care and attention.

Furthermore, Dutch smallholders predominantly rely on non-farm employment in combination with primary production as a survival strategy, while larger farmers engage in non-agricultural activities on the farm in order to supplement agricultural income. Agricultural income is the most important income source of large and medium-size farms, while his (and less often her) non-farm employment is the most important income source of small farms. The income from non-farm work

permits to stabilise the total family income and to prevent financial worries. As a consequence smallholders are less vulnerable to income losses from primary production than medium and big farms. Furthermore, smallholders also derive income from renting milk quota, renting of land or buildings as well as from social benefits, mainly disability schemes.

It seems that in all countries, the most widespread and important survival strategy for smallholders is men's non-farm employment. Women's non-farm employment is less frequent and in the case of France, also women's on-farm income generating activities. The adoption of organic farming as a survival strategy is at present widespread only in Finland and Sweden but is also growing fast in Greece. Gender de-differentiation in farm work, farm management and farm succession seems to be the most flexible and adaptive strategy for small farm survival.

REFERENCES

- Mononen, T. (1998). "Kahdenlaista toimintaa luomutuotannon puolesta" (Two Strategies in Organic Farming). *Maaseudun Uusi Aika (New Rural Policy)* 1/98.
- Oksa, J. (1996). "Rasimaen nelja tulevaisuutta. Euroopan pohjoisen mmatalouskylan Vaihtoedot (Four Prespects in Rasimaki. Options for an Agricultural Village in the European North)". In: *Kylalaiset, kansalaiset. Tulkintoja Sivakasta ja Rasimaesta (Villagers. Citizens. Interpretations of Sivakka and Rasimaki.)* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto, Karjalan tutkimuslaitos julkaisuja (University of Joensuu, Publications of the Karelian Institute), No 114.
- Sgouros, Spiros, 2001. "The Scope for Organic Agriculture in Greece and the Prospects for International Cooperation," paper presented at the Conference on "The Restructuring of the Greek Oil Industry with Target the British Market," organized by the Greek-British Chamber of Commerce, Athens, 6 of April.

CHAPTER EIGHT: EUROPEAN-WIDE AND COUNTRY-SPECIFIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Theoretical Conclusions

The research hypotheses #1, 2 and 3 are supported by the data collected in the five countries. In most cases, official national agriculture-related data are not disaggregated by farm size and gender so that smallholders' and women farmers' exclusion cannot be easily proven. Smallholders become discouraged from the lack of support they receive from farmers' organizations and tend to exclude themselves, thus reinforcing and aggravating their isolation and marginalization. Also in the case of Greece, it was shown that smallholders have little or no contact with agriculturists resulting from both the agriculturists' neglect of smallholders and smallholders' unease with agriculturists, because of significant educational differences and limited means for buying inputs.

Hypothesis #4 is not supported by the data. Men smallholders do not express more often negative feelings than women indicating alienation from agricultural institutions. Hypothesis #5, on the other hand, is supported by the data: flexible survival strategies that utilize men's and women's farm labour, farm management and non-farm income contributions are positively related to smallholders' farm succession and sustainability.

These findings indicate that: (a) a needed important policy is the desegregation of all agriculture-related data by farm size and gender in order to uncover the extent of exclusion of all smallholders and especially of women smallholders; and (b) farmers' organizations play an important exclusionary role.

Coming now to the hypotheses related to women's integration in the agricultural occupation, the findings indicate that women farmers are subjected to two different sets of exclusionary dynamics, one based on the small farm size and the other on their being women. With respect to factors that increase or decrease women's chances for integration, hypothesis #6 is not supported. The existence or lack of non-farm employment opportunities for women are not related to their chances for integration in the agricultural occupation. What is more important is the existence of non-farm employment opportunities for men, since the husband's full-time non-farm employment is positively related to the wife's integration in the agricultural occupation (hypothesis # 7). The findings indicate that when the husband is pluri-

active, the wife works more in the farm than when the husband is full-time farmer and the more she works in the farm the better are her chances for integration (hypothesis #8). Furthermore, women can improve their chances for integration, by receiving agricultural training (hypothesis #9).

It seems, therefore, that women smallholders can improve their chances for integration in the agricultural occupation by making important farm work contributions, especially if these contributions are greater than those of the husband, and by receiving agricultural training. Of course, it cannot be said that these actions are completely up to the women. They may not be able to make important farm work contributions, because the husband is full-time farmer and may not want his wife to work in the farm, since he does not think that she is competent in performing these tasks. Also women may not be able to receive agricultural training, although they wish to do so, because there are few opportunities for such training for adult women, as is the case in Greece.

The data also show that there are a number of factors, that influence women's chances for integration, that are completely out of their hands. Such factors are: the extent to which traditional/patriarchal values still prevail in rural areas, as is true even in the Nordic countries of Sweden and Finland, and make difficult or impossible women's integration in the agricultural occupation at the farm and/or at the institutional level (hypothesis #10). Also whether or not the individualization of family members and of their roles in and contributions to the farm enterprise is accepted by the society impinges on women smallholders' chances for integration, whether they like it or not. The data show that indeed the impact of the lack of individualization is negative for women's integration (hypothesis #11). Finally, the data indicate that women's formal farm status as landowners, farm partners or farm managers is positively related to their integration (hypothesis #12), but whether or not women have such a status does not depend only from them. Their early interest in farming could help them become landowners, if there are no interested brothers and their parents feel that a woman can be a successor and a competent farmer. Also in countries in which there are no legal farm partnerships, women are not able to take up this option. Finally, the formal farm status of farm manager largely depends upon the husband's willingness to delegate farm management to his wife, even when he holds a full-time non-farm employment. The husband's willingness is in turn determined by

the extent to which he holds traditional/patriarchal values, whether or not he thinks that women can be competent farmers as well as the extent to which the farmer status is central in his self-concept.

Finally the data support hypotheses #13 and 14. Membership in mainstream agricultural organizations is the most important indicator of women's institutional integration in the agricultural occupation. Integration, however, at this level is not necessarily related to integration at the farm level. Integration, therefore, only at the institutional level cannot be considered as constituting women's integration in the agricultural occupation, since they are not able to be active farmers. The example of Sweden is instructive. Some women are members of mainstream agricultural organizations as a result of these organizations' affirmative action recruitment, but this membership does not necessarily assist them to achieve equality as farmers at the farm household level. In all countries, a different set of causes and mechanisms lead to women's exclusion from agriculture. At the institutional level, macro-economic forces and value sets are powerful, while at the farm level, men's and women's socio-psychological characteristics as well as familial and societal factors influence women's chances of being active farmers. Women's integration requires, therefore, integration at both levels.

What can be concluded about rural women's greater degree of integration in the agricultural occupation in the Nordic countries? Part of it is due to the fact that all women have to work, the status of housewife having become almost unacceptable, women do not have the option to not work. The existence and implementation of gender equality ideologies certainly helps boost women farmers' position in the agricultural occupation, particularly at the institutional level. It cannot be claimed, however, that gender equality has been reached at the farm household level. The case of Greece, on the other hand, shows that sometimes European policies imposed externally can bring about very significant unintended social changes, in the absence of a women's movement or a strong egalitarian ideology.

B. Policy Implications of Research Findings

Agenda 2000 that has made agriculture one of several dimensions of European rural development has not in this way lessened its importance. Instead, on the contrary, it has made it possible for a much larger number of different types of farm

enterprises to be included, especially in Southern and Eastern European countries. This can take place because the recognition that agriculture is not necessarily the sole or the most important economic activity of all adult members of farm households and farm enterprises, helps broaden the range of rural people covered by rural development policies. Pluri-active farmers, for example, who have been excluded from CAP, because they are not full-time farmers can no longer be excluded from European rural development policies. The research finding of the presented studies show that at present only large farmers can afford to primarily rely on agricultural income. Smallholders who primarily rely on agriculture income, face an uncertain future and a threatened survival. According to the rural development policies, however, even part-time involvement in agriculture would be sufficient, as far as this involvement would be combined with the implementation of the production of organic and high quality food and/or environment-sensitive measures.

Furthermore, the broadening of the scope of European common policies from strictly agricultural to rural development ones makes it easier to include and to effectively implement the new requirements of respect for and conservation of ecological, aesthetic and architectural landscapes- biodiversity, leisure, good quality and healthy food. The broader rubric of rural development allows rural inhabitants to deal with crucial issues such as desertification, the decline of rural schools and village services, transport and roads as well as the quality of life in rural areas. Gradually, villages are being transformed into towns offering its inhabitants many of the advantages of cities.

Although the number of small farms and the per cent of the population employed in the agricultural sector have been diminishing in all European countries, this does not signify that agriculture is no longer an important occupation or not important for the success of rural development in Europe. Furthermore, this seems to apply for both smallholders and larger farmers.

The data presented in this book show that under the present CAP, smallholders are subjected to social and occupational exclusion and that women smallholders are often subjected to double exclusion from the agricultural occupation because of the size of their farm and their gender. The statistics show that rural unemployment is higher than urban unemployment, especially for women and even more for young women.

A basic condition of the successful implementation of rural development policies in Europe is the individualization of men's and women's roles in the farming system, that is in agricultural, on-farm and non-farm employment. Such individualization is particularly crucial in the case of small farms and has a long way to go before it is realized, particularly in Southern Europe and the Netherlands.

The extent of gender role flexibility that allows spouses to interchange agricultural and management roles is crucial for the sustainability of the farm enterprise. Farm enterprises in which husbands become pluri-active and are able to transfer farm management to their wives have greater financial security and better chances for survival.

Despite the fact that Greece has the highest percentage in EU of women involved in farm work (44%), even recent analyses of the profile of the Greek farmers do not analyze farm enterprises as being composed of two adults (husbands and wives) with differential involvement in agriculture (Kassimis, *et al.*, 2000). A small farm enterprise, that needs the full-time work involvement of only one person, may have a full-time work and management commitment on the part of one spouse (often the wife) and a very limited one on the part of the other (the pluri-active husband); or a part-time and complementary commitment of both spouses. The small farm enterprise is, therefore, clearly a full-time farm enterprise, although prevailing gender role ideologies do not allow its recognition as such, because family members' roles and contributions are not individualized.

Even when the extent of farming is reduced, some form of agriculture remains in the core of the activities and constitutes the justification for the continuation of the link with rural living and with the concern over the rural environment. If the core activity of some type of farming (or forestry) completely disappears, the rural house becomes a holiday house and most often the inhabitants begin to exhibit the indifferent behavior of tourists.

At the same time, there are antithetical orientations of existing rural development and agricultural policies. On the one hand, there is increasing pressure for farmers to become more modern and more competitive, implying more technical and management training, the modernization of the entire farm enterprise and higher cost for the preparation and presentation of products in the local and international market. These requirements can be more easily met by large farmers who can absorb

higher production and marketing costs and who already have a satisfactory level of technical and management training. Smaller farm enterprises, abounding in Southern Europe but also in Ireland and Finland, will need intensive training and/or special measures in order to enable them to survive. The crucial question is: are the governments and/or the EU willing to bear the cost for assisting the smaller farm enterprises or it will be the survival of the fittest? In some cases, the private sector undertakes to bear the cost by in fact successfully establishing contract farming with smallholders. Examples of such contract farming has been found, for example, in Greek villages with producers of extra virgin olive oil that is marketed in England.

On the other hand, a variety of on-farm enterprises and non-farm activities are encouraged in the rural areas in order to supplement the agricultural income and help retain young people in rural areas. The active and successful involvement, however, in on-farm enterprises and non-farm activities requires a more or less full-time commitment that may interfere with systematic and competitive farming and marketing. In most cases, these two seemingly antithetical orientations will create significant options for men and women, in some countries particular options being preferred by women and others by men, hopefully without any option being sex-typed for men or women.

In the UK, the examination of the impact of rural development measures on different types of farms showed that small farms would gain more than larger farms (Agenda 2000). This is most probably due to the fact that small farms have a lot to gain from needed additional training, more and better opportunities for non-farm income and more effective product marketing. Farmers with larger landholdings usually have already had more agricultural training, better access to agricultural information and advice and better marketing opportunities than smallholders. They, therefore, have to loose from reduction in production-linked subsidies and may not be able or interested in becoming pluri-active.

In Greece, the high cost of employment and the set of structural conditions do not favour the creation of large numbers of new jobs in industry. Since the perspectives for a considerable increase of the rhythm of economic growth in the near future are grim, it is necessary to take the necessary measures that will help rural people remain occupied in the agricultural sector in order not to swell the ranks of the urban unemployed (Mergos and Papageorgiou, 1997).

The critical question to be asked is: what kind of agriculture does Europe want and need in the first decade of this millennium? How this image of agriculture is made compatible with significant social objectives such as social cohesion, elimination of social exclusion and poverty, reduction of unemployment, gender equality of opportunities and sustainable development?

B1. Policy Recommendations Regarding Smallholders

In all countries, the research provides many indications of the different ways by which agricultural policy formally or informally is excluding smallholders. This occurs either by creating obstacles for small farmers or by limiting their access to governmental support. Often this may happen unintentionally by not taking into account the size-specific effects of general measures. This demonstrates the invisibility of smallholders and their inability to lobby for their interests and reaffirms their feeling of being forgotten and unwanted. If governments want to safeguard the existence of small farms, it is extremely important that the following policy measures are adapted:

1. A very important change is a change of *subsidy regulations*: access to subsidies must no longer depend on farm-size, neither directly nor indirectly. Furthermore, the involvement in non-farm work must not be an obstacle to having access to agricultural subsidies. According to this principle, the organisation of compensatory payments or schemes accompanying policy changes should be evaluated and eventually adapted⁷⁰.
2. Concerning the restriction of agricultural production because of environmental or food safety reasons, *additional measures* should be taken to prevent disproportionately harsh effects on smallholders. Adaptations or additions to general measures are also needed with regard to obligatory investments: either smallholders must be granted specific subsidies or more appropriate solutions must be sought. Regarding environmental damages, it may be possible to guarantee the same effect in a simpler and cheaper way than the one now imposed on all farms irrespective of size. The same refers to adaptations

⁷⁰ In the case of the Netherlands, a recommendation is also made that smallholders should be encouraged to make more use of the existing emergency regulations, available for assisting farmers in financially difficult times.

of production methods aiming to safeguard animal welfare or food quality. Solutions found so far seem to be tailored primarily to larger farmers. Often these solutions are inaccessible or not feasible for small farms. It is therefore important for the government to encourage more research on alternative, 'small-scale' solutions.

3. The research in all countries demonstrates that smallholders have specific strengths that enable them to survive. One of their strengths is the creation of niche-markets, such as biological agriculture. There is, however, evidence that these specific markets may be endangered by governmental regulations. It is, therefore, important to protect these niche markets and support smallholders' networks, because they do not only sustain smallholders' survival but they also promote the coming into existence of a more quality-oriented and often more environment friendly style of farming.
4. In order to counteract the feeling of desertion by national governments on the part of smallholders, it is not sufficient to undertake the above mentioned supportive measures. It is also important that governmental support of smallholders be publicly declared and emphasized. Such image building and public relations make, of course, sense only if national governments are decidedly willing to support smallholders survive. In view of high rural and urban unemployment rates in all countries, it is not to the interest of national governments to increase men and women's unemployment rates by neglecting smallholders and by endangering their survival. There are some indications that the declaration of support by the European union as expressed in the new rural development scheme, is heard, understood and appreciated by smallholders and has resulted in a somewhat firmer belief in the trustworthiness of the European Union compared to that of the national government. But until now national governments make little use of the opportunities the European Union offers to support small farmers.
5. In general, it could be said that it is important to take smallholders' existence into account more seriously and in a more positive way when implementing new agricultural and rural development policy schemes. Men and women smallholders need to be actively involved in agricultural and rural development planning. Because of their specific style of farming, many

smallholders are perfectly capable of complying with the new demands regarding environmental effects, animal welfare and food safety and could contribute to the protection of bio-diversity, nature and the quality of life in the countryside. Instead of putting up more obstacles for smallholders, governments could make more use of the specific strengths of smallholders.

6. Because agricultural institutions tend to be dominated by larger farmers who may not be willing to look after smallholders' interests, it may be necessary for smallholders to become organized into a group with a distinct identity within existing cooperatives or in separate smallholders' cooperatives⁷¹. Their organization in one of the above ways would better ensure the visibility of their interests and demands and their ability to place political pressure for the satisfaction of their demands. In Greece, the new cooperative law, and the increasing pressures to transform agricultural cooperatives into business undertakings, renders the establishment of separate smallholders' organizations mandatory for their very survival. Otherwise, their marginalization will be complete and unavoidable.

The idea of Dutch smallholders to start a separate smallholders' agricultural cooperative may be a very important one. As agricultural cooperatives increasingly become more business-like (as it has already happened in Finland) even in Greece⁷², the only possible solution for smallholders is the establishment of their own cooperatives. Otherwise, they will not be able to undertake the needed actions in order to counteract the big business orientation that they cannot follow on equal terms.

⁷¹ The Dutch report includes the following recommendation that would be difficult to apply for countries in which cooperatives are already run as businesses (Finland) or are about to begin to be run as businesses (Greece):

Agricultural cooperatives and farm unions need to reconsider and analyze their policies in order to assess the extent to which they intentionally or unintentionally treat large farmers preferentially. Furthermore, it is necessary to develop a specific list of smallholders' interests to be defended in negotiations with the government. Regarding the voting of board members, it is important to take care that smallholders are well represented in boards and commissions in order to safeguard that smallholders' specific interests are taken into account when union policy is developed. Finally, the establishment of a separate smallholders committee could be considered. More specifically, in the Netherlands, agricultural cooperatives need to reconsider their preferential treatment of large farmers, who are granted quantum discounts and extra payments because of their size. The same applies to those cooperatives that impose higher costs on smallholders because of the small size of their delivered produce.

B2. Indicators for the Monitoring of Smallholders' Integration/Exclusion

The extent of smallholders' integration and the areas of remaining exclusion need to be monitored on the basis of a number of indicators. A basic requirement for this type of monitoring is the desegregation of all agriculture-related data by farm size and agricultural sector as well as other relevant indicators of the importance of the farm enterprise. This desegregation would apply to the distribution of agricultural loans, contacts with agricultural advisors, membership in different types of agricultural cooperatives and farm unions as well as crop-specific farmers' associations, board membership in agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, agricultural trainees, recipients of different types of EU and national or regional agricultural subsidies as well as the recipients of different types of EU subsidized agricultural programmes. In the latter case, it is important to have the data concerning applicants and approved recipients desegregated by farm size and type of farming enterprise. In addition, as we shall discuss in Section D. of this chapter, gender desegregation is also necessary in all the above type of agricultural statistics.

This type of detailed monitoring should be accompanied with the application of corrective measures, when an indicator shows that smallholders are being excluded in a particular area. Otherwise, the monitoring will be only of academic use.

At present in most countries, statistics regarding the number of farm enterprises by farm size indicate the gradual decrease of the number of smallholders and are used in order to underline the vulnerability and the lack of viability of small farms. But looking upon the same statistics from a different perspective, it is also evident that smallholders are able to survive and to persist as a group of farmers. Information on the specific strength and weaknesses of smallholders, which allow them to survive, is, however, missing.

In order to get a better understanding of the present situation of smallholders, their chance of survival in the future and the factors influencing this process, it is important for national governments and the European Union to have additional indicators at their disposal. These would also allow them to assess whether or not and the extent to which national and European agricultural and rural development policies may also

⁷² In Greece, the new cooperative law and all on going planning clearly point to a rapidly increasing big business orientation that will even further marginalize and in fact all together leave out smallholders.

contribute to the exclusion of smallholders. It would be, therefore, important to also establish and use the following new indicators:

- The number of newly founded farms differentiated by farm-size and sector. This would give insight into the scope and significance of the phenomenon.
- A flow-chart of the growth and decline of single farms, reflecting the actual transfer between size-categories more precisely than the comparison of the aggregate situations at various moments in time.
- The number of emergency measures used to give temporary financial support by farm-size.

Furthermore, the following activities are also recommended: the execution of regular assessment studies, which evaluate the size-specific effects of new laws and regulations; the comparison of the environmental impact of farms of different sizes; and the fine-tuning of regulations to farms of a specific size, a measure that would probably do more justice to small farms and would also increase the efficiency of many regulations.

In addition to the above monitoring, in some countries like the Netherlands, it is important that smallholders with very small farm size are not altogether excluded from official agricultural statistics, as is now the case.

B3. Policy Recommendations Regarding Women Smallholders

In order to support the integration of women in the agricultural profession, the following measures need to be taken by national governments, the European Union and agricultural institutions:

1. The concept of the family farm needs to be reconceptualized. It is no longer appropriate to conceive a sole head of the farm enterprise. In most cases, the one spouse may be the landowner and the other the farm manager. Or both spouses may be joint landowners and farm managers. Men's and women's roles and contributions to the farm enterprise, therefore, need to be individualized for all purposes. In some countries such as Greece, France and the Netherlands, such individuation would bring about radical changes in terms of mode of distribution of agricultural income and of individualized taxation. The use of family income as a criterion for eligibility mainly affects

women farmers whose husbands have a full-time off-farm employment. The application of the principle of individuation would allow such women farmers to become eligible for EU subsidized agricultural programmes⁷³.

2. It is of great importance to clarify the effect of various laws and policies on the position of women at the farm level. Moreover, governments need to take care to guarantee the financial reward of women contributing labour in daily farm operations. Furthermore, often women's contribution to the operation of the farm are not only limited to participation in farm labour. Instead, they also include direct and indirect financial contributions. Especially young women are often financially supporting the farm to a considerable extent by being responsible for household expenses or by allocating money directly to the farm. The legal protection of women's economic rights based on their labour and/or financial contributions to the farm is becoming more and more important, as divorce rates are increasing and the coverage by social security provisions is decreasing, even in Sweden. In case of divorce, many (especially young) women often end up in a very difficult economic situation, because of their poorly protected position in the farm enterprise. Legal safeguards need to be introduced that ensure the rights of women, who for many years have contributed both labour and money to the farm enterprise, and their claims on the farm enterprise owned by the husband.
3. In all countries, the data confirm women's low involvement in the boards and committees of different agricultural institutions such as farm unions and agricultural cooperatives. It is, therefore, important to take special measures to support women's greater extent of representation on these boards as well as different governmental agriculture-related commissions and boards⁷⁴. Such

⁷³ In Greece, it was documented that wives, whose husbands with a full-time off-farm employment, were judged ineligible for EU subsidized agricultural programmes, because it was estimated that, because of the husband's off-farm income, more than half of the family income was derived outside agriculture. The fact that these women were the farm managers and their own income was entirely from agriculture, was not taken into consideration and were instead viewed as economic appendices of their husbands.

⁷⁴ These measures need to be accompanied by other measures such as expanded opportunities for agricultural training for women farmers at all ages in order to encourage their integration at the farm level.

special measures to be adopted can include, among others, target numbers, new voting systems, presentation of women candidates who are smallholders⁷⁵, the organization of meetings at hours compatible with women's household responsibilities and preparation courses for women. Once the number of women representatives is no longer just tokenism, they may be more able to be more effective and to support the interests of women smallholders.

4. The abolition of separate women farmers' organizations since their creation or maintenance does not facilitate women's integration into the agricultural profession. Instead, their existence tends to aggravate women's marginalization and to provide excuses for not mainstreaming them in farmers' organizations as members and in their decision-making bodies.
5. It is important to confront traditional gender specific norms and values still widespread in the agricultural sector. This implies gender sensitising of government and union-officials, but also of extension agents and representatives of co-operatives and agricultural industries. It is important not only to abolish traditional gender-stereotypes but also to promote a more egalitarian image of farmwomen.
6. In order to promote women's entry into farming as farm-heads, women's access to production assets has to be improved. One possibility is to apply positive discrimination of women farmers when land or production quota (e.g. milk quota, tobacco quota, etc.) are redistributed. Another option is to support women's initiatives to start new on-farm activities as this gives them the opportunity to start their own business on already existing farms and in this way to find an alternative entry into the farming occupation.
7. In the Netherlands, the actual utilisation of different legal arrangements available to couples should be promoted by extension activities that would help men and women understand the advantages and disadvantages of these different legal options. Women are particularly poorly informed about possible legal options and the importance of sorting out their legal position. Government regulations should also promote the possibility to change the

⁷⁵ It is important that women smallholders are presented as candidates, because at present women candidates are most often owners of large farms, who predominantly identify with men large farmers.

legal financial arrangements couples originally choose, according to the actual participation of women in the enterprise. At present a number of different legal provisions are often piled on top of each other resulting in a very unclear legal situation and changing of legal arrangements is inhibited by the high costs for legal aid. Many farm women are moreover not aware of their weak legal status and uninformed about the possibilities to improve their position by way of various legal arrangements.

B4. Indicators to Monitor the Integration of Women Smallholders

A basic requirement for this type of monitoring is the desegregation of all agriculture-related data by gender. This desegregation would apply to the distribution of agricultural loans, the contacts of agricultural advisors, membership in different types of agricultural cooperatives and farm unions as well as crop-specific farmers' associations, board membership in agricultural cooperatives and farm unions, selection for agricultural training, the recipients of different types of EU and national or regional agricultural subsidies and the approved recipients of different types of EU subsidized agricultural programmes. In the latter case, it is important to have the data concerning applicants and approved recipients desegregated by gender.

This type of detailed monitoring should be accompanied with the application of corrective measures, when an indicator shows that women are being excluded in a particular area. Otherwise, the monitoring will be only of academic use.

The organization of women farmers' groups with special agricultural interests and activities within the context of the cooperative should be encouraged. These special agricultural interests and activities could include ecological/environmental concerns, biological agriculture, processing of agricultural products with high added value, marketing of produce, etc,

It is no longer conceptually and methodologically appropriate to deal with small farm enterprises as family farms and to highlight only the role of the head of the family, most often the husband. In order to correctly describe smallholder farms, it is now necessary to individualize family members and to take their individual farm roles into consideration. We need to know what are the farm roles of husbands and wives, because it is not correct to consider a farm enterprise as part-time when the husband is pluri-active but the wife is a full-time farmer. The same holds true when the wife is

pluri-active, contributing farm labour and off-farm income, and the husband is a full-time farmer.

Such an individualization of family members' farm roles would help significantly decrease women's exclusion from the agricultural occupation. This would be true in connection with the implementation of the Agenda 2000 regulations and participation in EU subsidized programmes as well as the representation of women as farmers in national agricultural statistics. In all countries, the implementation of such individualization would lead to the systematic gender desegregation of all agricultural statistics and the availability of information about the complete picture of smallholder farm enterprises and the state of agriculture.

Agricultural training must not be directed mainly to young women farmers. This is particularly relevant for Greece, where many women farmers are above 40 years old and their educational level is very low and needs to be upgraded. Furthermore, the system of selection of all trainees needs to be rationalized so as to achieve a balance of trainees in terms of farm size, gender, age and educational characteristics in all types of 'technical' agricultural training and to eliminate class, gender, age and educational biases. At present, still in Greece, France and the Netherlands women are much more numerous in non-technical agricultural training. The same gender balance should be sought in training for on-farm activities such as bee keeping and agro-tourism⁷⁶.

In addition, the issue of the inclusion of home economics in agricultural training has to be seriously addressed. Home economics courses can no longer replace technical agricultural training for women. Under the present system, women who need technical agricultural training are still offered home economics courses that count as agricultural training. In view of the very active farmer role played by an increasingly larger number of women, the inclusion of home economics is dysfunctional. Home economics should no longer belong administratively to the Ministry of Agriculture or to Agricultural Universities and farm training centers.

Finally, agricultural training needs to be practical and informal, presented in a manner that people with elementary education have no trouble to follow it and to take place in villages rather than in provincial capitals, that are inaccessible especially to

⁷⁶ Many of the recommendations pertaining to women's agricultural training are quite pertinent for Eastern European countries.

women smallholders because of their family responsibilities. Also agricultural trainers need to be trained in modern pedagogical techniques for a more effective presentation of the material and a more active involvement of trainees in the learning process.

To get a more complete picture of the position of women in the agricultural sector and of the accessibility of the agricultural profession, we advise to establish additional indicators on the following points:

- The gender-specific distribution of agricultural property (land, machinery, farm buildings etc. but also share-holdings in co-operatives etc.);
- gender segregated data on the request and approval of subsidies and other governmental or EU support;
- the availability of childcare institutions in rural areas of different regions;
- rural men's and women's integration in the non-agricultural labour-market and the nature of labour contracts;
- the composition of farm family's income, differentiating between income from primary production, on-farm diversification and work off the farm and reflecting the relative importance of women's contribution;
- qualitative data regarding the significance of changes in the number of women farm heads and of women members in mainstream farmers' organizations; and
- qualitative data regarding the mechanisms preventing women's entry in mainstream agricultural institutions and inhibiting their functioning when they have entered these institutions as well as regarding the factors that help them overcome male resistance and reluctance to accept them as equals.

References

- Agenda 2000 CAP Reform. A New Direction for Agriculture* (2000). London: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.
- Kassimis, Ch. *et al.* (2000b). *Family Farm Enterprise and Employment in Rural Areas*, Athens: National Center for Social Research, Institute for Urban and Rural Sociology (in Greek).
- Mergos, I. George and Constantinos L. Papageorgiou (1997). *Evolution and Perspectives of the Agricultural Sector*, Athens: A. Stamoulis (in Greek).
- Papageorgiou, Constantine, 2001. "The New Cooperative Law as the Basis for Restructuring and Improving the Market Positioning of Modern Greek Cooperatives," paper presented at the Conference on 'The Restructuring of the Greek Oil Industry with Target the British Market,' organized by the British Chamber of Commerce, Athens, 6 of April.
- Safilidou-Rothschild, Constantina and A.G.Papadopoulos, (2000). "Some Factors Involved in Smallholders' Differential Strategies in Response to CAP," 2000 in: *Proceedings of the 4th European Symposium on European Farming and Rural Systems Research and Extension into the Next Millennium*, Volos, Greece: Association for Farming Systems Research-Extension European Group and University of Thessaly, pp.371-378
- Sireni, M. (1994). "Monitoimisuus: Syrjäseudun maatalouden selviytymiskeino? (Pluriactivity: Survival of Remote Agriculture?)". In: Oksa, J (Ed.), *Syrjäisen maaseudun uudet kerrostumat (New Activities in Remote Rural Areas)*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Publications of the Karelian Institute, No. 110.