A HISTORY OF RURAL WOMEN AND THE INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSFER OF THE FAMILY FARM

DIANE McKENZIE
Bachelor of Arts, University of Lethbridge 2016

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

CULTURAL, SOCIAL and POLITICAL THOUGHT

Department of History
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

A HISTORY OF RURAL WOMEN AND THE INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSFER OF THE FAMILY FARM

DIANE McKENZIE

Date of defence: August 16, 2021

Dr. C. Williams Thesis Supervisor	Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. H. MacDonald Thesis Examination Committee Member	Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. S. Lenon Thesis Examination Committee Member	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Dr. K. Alexander Chair, Thesis Examination Committee	Associate Professor	Ph.D.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my sister. Thank you for listening.

ABSTRACT

The main argument advanced in my research is threefold: (1) to address the impact of gender and gendered participation in family farm business to expose women's invisibilities and exclusions from full participation in rural family business, (2) to further knowledge of the position of women in the generational transfer of family business assets, particularly land; and 3) to more fully understand how gender inequalities operate through emotional responses of love and to gauge the impact of gender inequalities across three generations of farm women. A potential benefit of my research is to identify Western Canadian social historical structures and processes that produce and re-produce gender norms detrimental to equity and emancipation for all women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have seriously pondered if I would reach this point, to stand in front of you, in the pursuit of a Master of Arts, but here I am. Several years ago, Dr. MacDonald told me I was a "finisher" and I have used her comment to assure and reassure myself. I told my children to use a letter of recommendation Dr. MacDonald wrote for me as my eulogy, it was that good! Her master stroke in academic encouragement is true in the fact that - if nothing else, I am resolute. Both to my benefit and detriment. That said, this interesting journey was not possible without the additional determination of my full committee and others, and I am forever in all your debt for the opportunities you afforded me and the time you invested in educating me in the broadest sense.

Dr. Lenon, thank you for your influence, encouragement, and direction. Dr. Williams, your resolve to introduce women and gender studies and women's history to the masses has been and is inspirational. I continue to hope I too will leave my mark by sharing perspectives based on historical developmental fact and will continue to search for opportunities to encourage a rise in consciousness, particularly for the female farmers I currently know and those I hope to meet. You taught me ways to stand taller and more firmly on my ground (literally and figuratively). While taking one of the hundreds of Pinterest 'breaks' I took while I wrote and rewrote - an anonymous quote made me chuckle, while also ringing true. *"If standing up for ourselves means burning bridges, I have matches. We ride at dawn!"* Thank you, Dr. Williams for your tenacity.

My sister Carol, also an academic teaching wizard and friend, thank you so, so much for your time and support. Thank you to the others who have also had my back,

listened to my troubles, shared my interests, supported, taught, included and encouraged me. You know who you are.

I conducted 21 interviews with women who farm in Western Canada. The interview process was delightful. I am indebted to these women as well, who had me in their homes, gave me their time, and graciously answered my questions. There is a beauty in sharing histories with women whose souls feel familiar. And share we did. 603 pages of transcribed sharing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Historical inquiry takes the long view, and as historians retrieve and reveal the past, there comes fresh understandings with a rise in consciousness for those who are interested. That the history of women has suffered neglect has meant women have been denied information about their personal histories and the pasts of other women. “History can teach us….” may sound cliché, yet for me taking a longer historical view of women's farming history in Western Canada has informed my past, my present, and my future. This approach has changed and broadened how I understand myself as a farmer and as a woman.

In the broadest of terms, women are tied together throughout history as women and while dramatic changes in circumstance have occurred, some of the underpinnings of women’s conditions remain disconcertingly entrenched; conditions such as oppression and inequality. The Grimke sisters are credited with what could be understood as the beginning of the American "women's movement", the struggle against oppression and the aim toward equal treatment for women and girls, beginning in the 19th century (Jones, 2018). Their anti-slavery assertions were publicly denounced and their publications burned. Resolute, the Grimke sisters then aspired to take on women's rights issues as well and continued throughout their lives to work for human equality, inspiring others. One of the most recognizable quotes pertaining to women’s equality came from Sarah Grimke: “But I ask no favors for my sex. I surrender not our claim to equality. All I ask of our brethren is that they will take their feet from off our necks, and permit us to stand upright on that ground which God designed us to occupy” (Jones, 2018, p. 1554).

We can recognize injustice through empathy and the visceral "gut" feelings telling us something about the human condition is not right, acting as our moral compass. Some are moved to "do something" about unfairness, prejudice, inequalities, biases they have witnessed, felt, recognized as unjust, oppressive and discriminatory. While coming from a place of extreme privilege and limited by a narrow view, I can recognize and am empathic towards the sentiments Sarah Grimke expressed of "feet from off our necks." While this notion and feeling was familiar and floated in my brain and in my life for decades, I only came to a further conscious understanding through defining for myself aspects of women's history through feminist inquiry.

My personal questions about gender inequalities and the transfer of those gender norms between generations related to my specific circumstance of being a woman who farms. To consider further the positions women and girls occupy in Western Canadian contemporary family farms and how they fare in the intergenerational transfer of family farms, I aimed to conduct a feminist oral history research study. My initial research question was: *How does the reproduction of current gender norms impede women's participation in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm?*

Historically, family farms in Western Canada have been predominately owned and operated by men and those conditions continue to be entrenched, formed and re-formed within the existing societal patriarchal structures where women and girls are disadvantaged. I have felt the restrictions to stand as a woman who farms believing in equality while simultaneously not understanding a propensity for systemic compliance or the prevalent and overarching obstacles for women who farm and obstacles shared with other women. Nor did I appreciate a feminist cause, accepting instead some of the

disparaging representations of women who asked for or expected equal treatment, who asked for too much. As time passed and my feminist understandings grew, I was surprised to learn I had been asking feminist questions all along.

Coming to a Personal, and Feminist, Understanding of Women's History

Simon de Beauvoir's book, *The Second Sex* (1949), refuted biological essentialism and conceptualized the cultural/social construction of gender with her now famous phrase, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Beauvoir (1949) proposed socialization, not biology, determined social and cultural gender norms specific to what society/cultures expect them to do. In 1963, noted feminist historian Gerda Lerner taught what is considered the first women in history college course *ever* offered in the global north. Lerner (1997) recognized the history of women and girls had gone largely unrecorded and her career was devoted to making women's history and its significance known, particularly to other women. Both a grassroots feminist undertaking to teach and record women's neglected history and a rudimentary nature vs. nurture debate had begun.

In a different world, at about the time the first women in history course was being offered by Dr. Lerner, I was a young girl growing up - my history just beginning - on a family farm in Southern Alberta. Naïve and unaware, my siblings and I were attending classes in a very traditional agrarian school and learned the gendered norms specific to young farm girls and young farm boys that had been taught to many generations of farmers before us. Farm women and girls do this, farm men and boys do that. One example of a long-standing agricultural cultural tradition, taught implicitly and explicitly and still relevant in the contemporary business of agriculture, is the cultural norm for

boys and men to succeed their fathers in ownership of the family farm, particularly in the instance of land. The cultural norm for girls is to leave the farm. In my own case, I left my foundation farm and married a farmer and our paternal side of the family farm has welcomed the fifth generation (two boys), to potentially work the land in our small community that was worked by their father, grandfather, and two generations prior to them. While the intergenerational transfer of the family farm business or inheritance is often deliberated in the agricultural community and more egalitarian approaches are being considered, girls and women are most often excluded as primary land owners and primary family farm operators. Farm succession planning has become an industry within the agriculture industry, with many books written and professional careers and businesses developed that intend to guide family farmers through a generational transfer. All the while, the writing, research and professionals have included little recognition or study of the underlying social systems, social mechanisms and governance in family farms, making it difficult to institute change psychologically or politically. In addition, Wiebe (1995) noted that the generalized awareness of equality concerns in women's agricultural groups in the '80s and '90s seemed to have "created for farm women the impression or belief that they have achieved equal partnership on the farm" (p. 149). At the end of the day, girls are rarely considered future farmers and often relegated to finding a place in agriculture on the taken-for-granted sidelines of the family farm, or off of it completely. They move into supporting industries, such as research, teaching, political roles, or corporate agriculture, or choose teaching or nursing as a career wagering a farm and gainful employment in a rural area.

In the case of contemporary farming and ranching, where women continue to be on the periphery of family business and land ownership, and where women and girls are commonly assigned to supportive rather than decision-making roles, the reproduction of generational, systemic, and gendered normative barriers for women are most evident. The exclusion of daughters from family farm businesses is more common than not, and is accompanied by cultural conditioning that they are not entitled to the farm and furthermore that their role is as "harmony makers" (not to disturb a stable situation) rather than "harmony breakers", and thus if they do wish to farm, they are to find their own family farm through a husband (Wang, 2010). Girls are considered less than 5% of the time as potential candidates for carrying on the family farm (Vera & Dean, 2005). This is not to say that women are not farmers.

Prospects of disruption in the production and reproduction of gender norms passed from generation to generation or the disturbance of the status quo within an age-old hierarchical structured system is a decidedly emotionally-charged event, to both the detriment and benefit of the women who farm (including me) and the family farm. For example, if a daughter is preferred to inherit a full estate of farm land and legacy over a son, it is not generally thought of as "natural." What is considered natural is for girls and women who farm to not rock the boat, to keep the waters still, and to row the boat of support systems making the transition to a male operator smooth.

Maintaining still waters within a family and a family farm requires an inordinate amount of emotional and social labor provided by women and girls. The free and invisible work women do to keep track of life, when taken together, keeps families together and by extension a proper society (Manne, 2018); not to mention the work

women and girls do to keep a proper business together, as in the case of a family farm. The mostly invisible, unacknowledged work women do also encompasses the emotionally riddled efforts to facilitate the passing on of the family farm love and legacy to the next generation. The emotional and social labour goes far beyond the already heavy-lifting of productive, reproductive and domestic service labour also done by women and girls (Manne, 2018). Feminine-coded affective responses like love, caring, giving and other emotionality constitutes emotional and social labor not often considered or *even regarded as valuable* in understanding who is privileged in the legacy of family farm life and family farm ownership, nor how emotionality attends to direct and binding implications for all family members. To go beyond traditional caring and giving also can take women out of their gendered comfort zone, where standing up for change or insisting on a broader view of family dynamics does not "feel" important, loving, giving, or caring *enough*. This love and other feminine affective responses, and the labour they entail, are made invisible while ruminating at the very centre of decisions about everyone's future.

How 'Advanced' Are We?

Women and girls have always been farmers but largely their roles as such have not been formally (or otherwise) recognized. Deep-seated patriarchal structures held firmly in place within the agricultural industry continue to determine less advantageous positions and the undermining of women and girls (Wiebe, 1995). Wiebe (1995) also described an over-arching sense within her community of farm women that gender issues had, for the most part, been overcome. Regularly, I hear this same sentiment. She added how language and representations of farmers can "submerge" women as the male

connotation of farmer, so embedded; women seldom appropriate it (Wiebe, 1995). Women and girls are left "without a trace" of their farming contributions.

An opportunity for official and statistical recognition of women who farm in Canada came through a change in the *Census of Agriculture* implemented in 1991 when additional spaces for "farm operator" were added. The statistical markers of women's presence were useful yet revealed little about the actual situation for women who farm. Nor do statistics reveal concerns about the gendered inheritance or transfer of ownership of farmland in a traditionally generational family business. Family farm intergenerational transfer is a complex, multi-generational consideration where traditionally women and girls are not the main benefactors thereby do not become the primary owner/operator of the family farm.

I would suggest it does go without saying; ensuring long term access to land through ownership or a rental/lease/purchase agreement precedes becoming an owner/operator of a family farm. In Canada the number of women farm operators, tabulated in 1991 was 25.7 percent. Reported statistically marginally over one quarter of the total of Canadian farmers, this number rose to 27.4 percent in 2011 to 28.7 percent in 2016. 77,970 women were listed in the *Census of Agriculture* (2016) as farm operators. While these numbers have been and are currently lauded within the industry as an advancement of women in agriculture there is much less recognition or analysis of the nearly 26% of women who first identified themselves as farm operators when given an opportunity in 1991. The needle movement in 30 years is almost indiscernible. More importantly, Wiebe (1995) noted how the family farm discourse created these realities of women's involvement in the rural setting and the profound effect even the politics of the

Canadian Census had on rural farm women. By underreporting rural women's labour in the official census count until the contemporary era beginning as recently as 1991 and, by framing questions about women's work as farmers awkwardly and imprecisely, the census counters made it difficult for women to respond adequately to the census questions about women's active positions on the farm.

While the tracking of the gendered ownership of farmland is vaguely quantified by the Census of Agriculture, the 2016 census data does demonstrate gender inequity in farm land usage: only 7.2% of farms in Canada have female primary operators while 60.1% identify male primary operators. Central to my research is my assertion that women hold a disadvantaged place as farmers; women lack charge over the land they farm and the livestock they care for. This qualitative research showed that, when asked, only two out of 21 of my interview participants had inherited land their mother had inherited and owned outright. Important to note is both mothers were only children. I also asked participants if they knew of a family farm or ranch where the land specific to the family business had followed a matrilineal inheritance pattern for more than two generations. No one among my 21 participants responded in the affirmative. No one knew of any farm or ranch that had specifically followed a matrilineal inheritance pattern over a farm or ranch's history. That is not to say matrilineal ownership does not occur or exist. Yet, 2017 statistics indicate global female ownership of arable land is less than 20%. Marginalized as farmers, as women, and by inhabiting a statistically small group women are often additionally sidelined simply because of sheer lack of numbers. While actual physical numbers of farm women is diminutive, women and girls are crucial to Canada's production of – *"....agriculture and agri-food industry contributes over $110*

billion annually to Canada's gross domestic product (GDP) – That's more than the national GDP of 2/3 of the world's countries." (Census of Agriculture, 2016), rendering women's importance in Canada and in a global context as undeniable.

In addition to their contribution to the national food production, statistically or otherwise there is little indexed measurement of the immense tangible/intangible qualitative contributions that farm women and girls contribute to the family of farm and their rural communities. Much needed is wider recognition for the relevance of women in family farm, family farm business, and access to farm land. Deeper, much more frequent discussions regarding the gendered inequity of the family farm and the intergenerational transfer of the family farm and a dramatic elevation in understanding of the matrix of a perpetuation of the detrimental institutions of patriarchy. The lack of recognition women and girls receive as farmer and potential land owners is grounded in and reinforced by patriarchal patterns that continue to override meaningful change.

Patriarchy and the Development of Agrarian Society

In this section, I step back to trace the historical emergence of the family farm and emphasize women's positions within a patriarchal design of land ownership shifts. The concept of patriarchy and its institutions, primogeniture, the advent of homesteading "new frontiers", popular discourses of women's roles, and their connections to land and farming are useful in identifying what gendered political and social structures are carried forward compared to what is left behind.

Agricultural Prehistories

Adovasio, Soffer and Page (2007) have re-examined a predominantly masculine-based historical discourse of human history that told of men providing food while women and children sat idly by. Another persistent cultural belief, rooted in history and biological essentialism, lingering in contemporary agriculture is that women and girls have never been physically strong enough to be farmers. Hunter-gatherer societies still depicted in textbooks, academic literature, or in popular media, with women and girls cowering behind shelter as a skin-clad man hunts down large animals with a spear. While challenges to these historical assumptions are surfacing, early agrarian men and boys are predominately portrayed doing the heavy work while women are represented picking seeds up from the ground or tending to children. Yet a more thorough, and less biased, analysis of archaeological and anthropological studies found good evidence it was in all likelihood, women who created many of the important farming tools and began domesticating plants for use in farming (Adovasio, Soffer & Page, 2007). According to Advovasio, Soffer and Page (2007), women developed critical materials for communal food production and capture, continued to broaden plant domestication species, and importantly were central "in the development of language and social life --- in short, in our becoming human" (p. 113).

The development of agriculture, laying the groundwork for the emergence of a family farm, is thought to have arisen in the Middle East during the Neolithic period some 10,000 to12, 000 years ago. Lerner (1986) speculated the increased labor needs of an agrarian society, resulting from increasing production and the accumulation of agricultural excesses, led to the labour of women and children being central to early

agrarian success. She suggested during this pre-history, the exchange of women between tribes reduced warfare, created marriage alliances, and societal benefits where more women produced more children to labour. Men acquired land and women by killing the men and enslaving women of conquered tribes increasing reproductive labour potentials (Lerner, 1986). Anthropologist Mark Dyble (2015) argues too the cultural shifts during the emergence of agriculture and accumulation of resources featured inequalities for women and perpetuated sweeping changes to human social organization. Interestingly, Dyble (2015) also noted that he was the first to come up with this concept of inequities. This period of development in agricultural history, scholars also argue, begot the commodification of women and girls. Tribal and familial groups were practising agriculture together and forms of acquisitions of land continued to emerge. Here, in the beginnings of agriculture, Lerner (1986) speculates were the beginnings of a creation of patriarchy, including systems of land acquirement and ownership designed primarily by men for men.

During the Middle Ages the predominantly agrarian European economies were based on the power of land control or ownership (Bertocchi, 2006). Later still, European bourgeois revolutions motivated nobility to embrace primogeniture, the idea of first born, particularly men or boys in the feudal system, being the benefactor of the whole of real estate with it being passed generationally to them. Whether as a right, law, or custom, this tool was used to keep large expanses of land and the political power attached to the land, intact (Bertocchi, 2006). Another belief included in the economic growth of the colonial Americas and upheld by the laws and culture of primogeniture was that the partitioning of land could weaken the economic viability of agrarian business, a belief

that continues to exist to this day. Owning large tracts of land continued to provide political power and wealth, primarily for men.

Later still in 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in *Democracy in America* describing his impressions of American equality and individualism and suggested the inheritance law of primogeniture were not applicable in the case of homesteading the Western frontier, the West was a place of opportunity for all (as cited in Bertocchi, 2006). And while American women were able to and were successful homesteading (in complicated ways), unlike their Canadian counterparts, who only gained the right to homestead long after the majority of the land had been claimed. The Western Canadian discourse surrounding homesteading and opening the West was primarily about he and not she.

Ensuring there would indeed be opportunity for some Canadians and fearing the United States may attempt to claim the frontier that is now Western Canada, the Canadian government enacted the Dominion Lands Act, a federal law intended to encourage the settlement of land that would become the western provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The Dominion Lands Act mirrored the 1862 United States Homestead Act and received royal assent on 14 April 1872. For a $10 administration fee, any male (except members of First Nation Tribes) 21 years of age (later 18 years of age) could file for a claim of one hundred and sixty acres. A condition of full ownership, "proving up the land" included cultivating a minimum of forty acres and building a house within 3 years of a claim (Carter, 2009). While provisions were included in the Lands Act for women to become landowners, applications were limited to only women who were widowed or divorced and additionally could prove they supported dependants. If a widow

or divorcée did find the courage and where-with-all to submit an application to homestead, it was exceedingly uncommon for the women to be granted the right. As late as 1910, 38 years after the Lands Act was instated, our Interior Minister suggested in the House of Commons if women wanted to homestead in the North-West, that women should first find a man (Carter, 2009).

The historical record of this time of homesteading in the United States also continued to point to men "as the primary actors" in the development of farming and ranching in the West (Lindgren, 1996). As historian Walter Prescott Webb explained it was the homesteading men alone who felt "zest to the life, adventure in the air, freedom from restraint; men developed a hardihood which made them insensible to hardship and lack of refinements" (Webb, 1931, as cited in Lindgren, 1996). Women and girls have been portrayed in the historical literature on farming, as reluctant, fearful, lonely and distrustful of land. Holding a familiar tone, Lindgren (1991) reported common and persistent misconceptions about women's abilities, hopes, and strengths (physical and otherwise) in relationship to homesteading in North Dakota in the 19th century. Although, Lindgren's (1991) search of cancellation of claims indicated that, in contrast to popular lore, "28% of all men and 24% of women in Sheridan County, and 29% of men and 32% of women in McIntosh County, failed to obtain the land they had applied for…person to person women, often cast as secondary figures in homesteading discourse were no less or more capable than men at the task of homesteading land." Sheryll Patterson-Black's (1976) ground-breaking research on homesteading women on the Great Plains frontier used land office records to determine the rate of success of women to "prove up" their claims. She found that 42.4 percent of female homestead entrants received title in

comparison to 37 percent of the men disproving historical notions of women's inability to farm (Patterson-Black, 1976). Lindgren (1996) also noted the outdated gender role stereotypes she encountered during her homesteading research; including a question commonly asked - did women "really homestead?" This was perhaps best exemplified over generations of homesteading women's *own* family members "forgetting" if grandmother/great grandmother had indeed homesteaded! Time and culture has largely relinquished female homesteaders land to masculine perspectives.

In Canada, women were limited in land acquisition by only being allowed to apply for a homestead if able to prove themselves the head of the household and not surprisingly, the politics of doing so proved to be a markedly difficult task (McCallum, 1993). A complete abolishment of dower rights in 1886 through the *Territories Real Property Act* also left women homesteaders or partners in landownership without any legal right to the land they worked (McCallum, 1993). Later, the subsequent property case of Irene Murdoch emerged through the Canadian legal system in the 1960's and 1970's, resulting in injustice as Murdoch lost her appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada "for half the ranch property she and her estranged husband had accumulated during their 25 years of marriage" (Murdoch v. Murdoch, 1973). Murdoch was denied any legal right to the ranching business she had toiled for nor were her contributions to family finances acknowledged. Machum (2015) says the injustices served - more than halfway through the 20th century - were enough to inspire and galvanize women and men to change property laws, prompting them to act and organize for social change through rural and urban activism.

Agriculture research has broadened across disciplines and included new views and aspects of the history of agriculture and women's real participation in farming from its "roots." Yet presently, the patriarchal rhetoric and realities of farming simultaneously include historical patterns of land ownership, stereotypical gender types, and gendered work assumptions that have, and continue to perpetuate inequality.

Chapter Two: Methodology and Research Design

Why Study Women as Farmers?

Understanding why I have accepted the habitually disregarded history of women and girls, the generational compliance with gendered social and cultural norms including women's acceptance of intergenerational male dominated transfer of the family farm, and the systems that support the patriarchal status quo has been an incremental process for me. While long conscious of inequalities that exist for myself and other women and girls at a certain level, I have been encouraged by educators, peers, new learning opportunities, and inspired to look further. More than five decades after the scholar Gerda Lerner taught what is thought to be the very first college course on women's history; as a mature student I enrolled in Women's History 2800 in 2015 at the University of Lethbridge in Southern Alberta. The content of this course and others marked a rise in consciousness for me increasing a more meaningful understanding of gender inequality and how this applied to my own circumstances. This process of consciousness raising has meant being skeptical of prevailing thinking and to trust and be courageous in my own thought. And, it implies a commitment to be fearless (Lerner, 1986). Lerner, in 1986, asked women to reach further than their grasp and to examine the historical processes of the construction of oppressive institutions. She asked women to journey without fear to imagine a different future. I have become more critically conscious of gender norms – in my life and in the lives of others – I am hopeful this raised awareness is positively productive for me, others, and the women who participated in my research on the intergenerational transfer of the family farm.

Understanding the gendered difference in prospects available to women and girls and the social systems reproducing the practices that uphold male privilege, has felt revolutionary for me. Through this personal process, I realized I wanted to document the felt and practical, and individual, experiences of other farm women. I wanted to record women's personal histories, *their* own account of their participation in agriculture in Western Canada and to hear the histories of the women and men who preceded them on their family farm.

Women I interviewed shared beautifully deep and meaningful connections and full histories about the business of farming, the farmland and the family of "farm". Women spoke of business traditions, family traditions, love of the land, and ideals of legacy; these are meaningful work and family values that are both purposeful and practical for families who farm or ranch. Researching the intergenerational transfer of the family farm is important to me as a scholar, as a farmer, and as a woman. A better understanding of gender, and gender inequity in the intergenerational transfer of family farms could result in development of more sound education in support of igniting what I hope would be egalitarian change among my peers in the contemporary/future agricultural community. As Lerner and other feminist scholarship have shown, the reproduction of gender norms has a long history. Gender inequity remains. Further understanding of this history provides increased knowledge on how gender inequity is constructed and maintained in family farm businesses and offers the critical insights to expose how those norms are transferred intergenerationally. A main assumption I hold is that traditional gender norms are, in most instances, embedded in the practice of the intergenerational transfer of the family farm and if left undisturbed are consistently

informed by a patriarchal inheritance and property rights systems and tradition. Accordingly, women in family farm businesses are hindered.

The evolution of my research project was difficult for me, as I navigated my own ongoing feminist education, broadening both my understandings of women's participation in family farming and my keen interest in exposing patriarchal structures. In the process of inquiry related to gendered norms and the intergenerational transfer of the family farm I have questioned my loyalty to family, to the family farm, and to the women I interviewed. The generosity and openness of the interviews with the women who I admire, aspire to, am grateful for, and value opened an area of analysis I had not previously considered fully or appreciated the significant relevance of until reading the interview transcripts. I became increasingly conscious of how being a female participant/member of a family and family farm in Western Canada can be and is a privilege, while on the other hand also be precarious for women and girls, placing them at a disadvantage. Further, I had to acknowledge each individual situation as different and not all women and girls who farm are disadvantaged exclusively or equally.

I did this research to hear other women's experiences of being family farmers, to trouble my own thinking, to take a broader view of women, girls, and their participation in family farm from a feminist perspective. While creating discomfort, I did this research to expose the reproduction of gendered logics and inequalities within the structures of intergenerational family farming, and to inspire as Lerner suggested to women "to reach further than our grasp", to make things better. When we can see and understand the systems we are contained by, it is then we can imagine a different future.

Research Questions

The central question propelling my research was: *How does the reproduction of current gender norms impede women's participation in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm?* The qualitative evidence provided by interviews with 21 women across three generations addresses some keys to understanding how gender norms are upheld. The historical development narratives the women shared about family farms included the histories of male-dominated control over property and inheritance systems. Also, because so many participants spoke of love; love of their land, love of a family farm lifestyle and love for the ideals of legacy, a secondary question arose: what does love have to do with it? What does love have to do with women, girls and the intergenerational transfer of the family farm? My exploration of these baseline emotional expressions can example how understandings of love, in various forms, create complex emotional ties that can serve to uphold the ways gender inequality is understood and reproduced through the systems of intergenerational farms/ranches.

I also worked to develop a critical understanding of how women's emotional and social labour is regarded or misrepresented in broader discourses. Through an analysis of a media representation, I demonstrate how discourse creates meaning for family farms and illustrate the impact of rural discourse on the empowerment, and disempowerment, of women. In the following sections, I review the concepts and methodologies I drew upon in determining my approach to data collection and analysis, before outlining in greater detail the final design of the project.

Defining Terms and Concepts

Family Farm

Family farms and farmers, while sharing broad similarities, are truly independent and unique business practices. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations suggest there are many working definitions of a family farm (Garner & Campos, 2014). Most often included in the definition is the idea that all family members provide the labor and the management for the farm (Garner & Campos, 2014). Garner and Campos further argue that the family farm reaches further than size, production and location and in most cases to, "… capture ecological, social, cultural and environmental objectives and therefore has close ties to the local culture and the rural community" (2014, p. iii).

The Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) defines a farmer as someone who claims income derived from some type of farming activity whereas the Statistic Canada Farm Census defines a farm or agricultural operation as:

> … an agricultural operation that produces at least one of the following products intended for sale: crops (hay, field crops, tree fruits or nuts, berries or grapes, vegetables, seed); livestock (cattle, pigs, sheep, horses, game animals, other livestock); poultry (hens, chickens, turkeys, chicks, game birds, other poultry); animal products (milk or cream, eggs, wool, furs, meat); or other agricultural products (Christmas trees, greenhouse or nursery products, mushrooms, sod, honey, maple syrup products (Census of Agriculture, 2016).

In compliance with the CRA, to be considered a full-time farmer, farm income is compared with off-farm income and must exceed off-farm income for the "farmer" to be eligible to claim farm losses against income. In other words, a possibility for profitability must be demonstrated to be considered a farm business.

For the purposes of this research, the term "family farm" represents the food producing variations of farm businesses of the women I interviewed. In many instances, the production by women on these family farms ranged from strictly tilled field crop production to cattle production only (ranch). Several participants also employed others in various roles on their farms. However, for the most part, family members manage the farming activities and contribute the majority of the labor. Some interviewees would not self-identify as farmers, but rather as ranchers – this shift in definition was employed particularly when farm production includes beef cattle only. Many of the participants' families who produced both field crops and livestock commonly identified their operations as "mixed" farms.

In 2016 Statistics Canada reported that 1.7% of the Canadian population was comprised of farmers indicating that less than a third of the full farming populations were women. The US Census of Agriculture (2012) described 14% of female farmers as primary operators whereas Canada's 2016 Census of Agriculture reported women as primary operators on 7.2% of farms. Marginalized statistically in these public records as farmers, women are often sidelined simply because of sheer lack of numbers. Moreover, farm women are often silent in the rural and public discourse. My analysis of the qualitative oral history interviews, the primary sources on which this research depends, strives to disrupt that silence.

Legacy

In literature, legacy is used to describe a material inheritance, or as a term to identify a privileged entrance into a particular institution. As exampled by the women in this study, a legacy can also be a multi-dimensional construct fraught with practical

business realities of family farming and deeply felt personal and intergenerational emotional intricacies. Affective responses to legacy ranging from love to hatred were described.

While legacy encompasses incredible breadth and depth of meanings and interpretations, a review of contemporary literature pertaining to the legacy of the intergenerational transfer of family farms brought me back to the circumstance of women and the historical gendered expectations for both men and women and how they appear to have travelled through time extending to current conditions in family farms and family farm legacies. Presumed roles and responsibilities assigned to, and practised by, women and girls in family farming while changing, are deeply embedded throughout the cohorts and reflected in the multiple dimensions of legacies. Predominately the legacy stories were grandfather, father, son and brother stories of inheriting the family farm or gaining access to family land. Variation on land legacies emerged in each cohort, particularly if a grandmother, mother or daughter had inherited or gained access to her own foundation family's farmland. These variations, a daughter gaining access or ownership to foundational farmland, or a realization that opportunities for learning to be a farmer are limited for girls for example, can make a new mark on each generation that then begins its own journey through time and age cohorts.

Methodology

Feminist Oral History.

In an effort to counter the prevailing negligence of women's history, feminist historians such as Joan Sangster among many others incorporated oral histories as a source of new memories and interpretations (Sangster, 2015). Feminist scholars address

the absence or disregard of women's experience in historical record to argue women's perspective and knowledge was lost to a masculine based history. Oral histories have been popular with feminist researchers because it is a method that clears space for the less heard, or unheard, to have a voice and be accounted for historically. Oral history research is used to discuss social structures that are seen as oppressive and used to deconstruct the support systems of the social structures. Historically, as in the instance of mid-19th century industrialization, and other institutionalized realms, separate spheres were created whereby women spatially existed independent from men and this phenomenon of gender segregation created a parallel history that went unrecorded and, resultantly, went missing from the written historical record. Lerner (1997) highlighted the impact of this loss:

> Selective memory on the part of the men who recorded and interpreted human history has had a devastating impact on women. Women are everywhere and have always been at least half of humankind. It is inconceivable that their actions and thoughts were inconsequential in the shaping of historical events, yet women have been presented as though they had no history worth recording (p. 205).

While oral histories are rich, full, and in flux, qualitative researchers, like oral historians, need to also examine how their own baggage is filled with assumptions and preconceptions. Oral historians are expected to acknowledge how these conditions affect research decisions. Oral history theories ask the practitioner to recognize how their research method decisions are mixed with ontological political agendas, and to appreciate that they are not the subject of the study themselves (Pillow, 2003). This challenges oral historians to recognize every individual's story produced through the interview process as an important interpretation of history.

Early in my learning about the practise of oral history I was struck by a quote from *Women's Words: The Feminist Practise of Oral History* edited by oral historians Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai (1991). I have quoted Sherna Berger Gluck in some of my academic papers from this edited collection. She said,

> "Women's oral history is a feminist encounter, even if the interviewee is not herself a feminist. It is the creation of a new type of material on women; it is the validation of women's experiences; it is the communication among women of different generations; it is the discovery of our own roots and the development of a continuity that has been denied us in traditional historical accounts."

It is a hopeful passage about the potential power of an oral history interview. I aspired to meet those meaningful goals of validation, communication and discovery of and for the women I interviewed. Recently, in an article reflecting on her forty years as an oral historian Gluck (2013) referenced her "feminist encounter" statement and questioned what the interviewee and interviewer really gained from the experience of an oral history interview. Gluck (2013) re-examined her enthusiasm from the early 1970's when the lofty goals of feminist oral historians were to uncover hidden histories, empower women and energize the women's liberation movement. She also talked about concerns that have developed and continue to do so in the realm of oral history about objectivity, appropriation vs empowerment, and sharing authority. Other considerations include what we chose to disclose, what parts of the interviews we chose to analyze and publish; asking who has the power (Gluck, 2013)? I have considered these common concepts/dilemmas discussed in oral history literature and that other oral historians have encounter during their projects, particularly in the case of this research, the personally disclosed expressions of love.

Daphne Patai (1994) who said “At present, in my view, we are spending too much time wading in the morass of our own positioning’s” also asked an open question wondering if all the positioning and self-reflexivity results in better research and notes that no matter how long we talk about it, we cannot escape ourselves. As an insider, a woman who farms, I certainly could not escape myself in this research. I strived to honour what the women shared with me and I aimed to “Find voice, make sense. What else can we do?” (High, 2013).

Gender as a Category of Analysis

Social construction of the self, becoming who we are in different social contexts has a history, as does the milieu of emotional legacies passed from generation to generation on a family farm. While the differences between men and women's emotions are well documented, how we conceptualize these differences is considered much less in spite of cultural assessments of emotion being implicated in perpetuating gendered inequalities (Shields, 2002). It is important to consider the collective histories of women to better understand how, in the case of this regional study, women in agriculture have come to understand themselves, their roles, and their parameters of participation on a farm or ranch. We can better appreciate present-day circumstance and the reactive emotions of the women and others close to them by seeking information about how historically opportunities, values or cultural norms were presented to women girls on family farms and ranches and how shared (or not shared) beliefs about affective responses are understood.

Women and girls have been sidelined in recorded agricultural history and what they experienced largely left unrecorded; their participation in family farm ownership

often relegated to an odd one-off folktale. This neglect has influenced emergent gender roles and deemed appropriate behaviors expressed in "values, customs, law, and social roles" (Lerner, 1986). The idea that men do 'this' and women do 'that', still evident in contemporary agriculture, is part of the cultural construct and explanatory system as related to and expressed in leading metaphors where women and girls are often excluded from both *creation of* and the *materialization of* (Lerner,1986). Lerner (1986) also suggested more than anything we should be conscious of the changes of women and their positions, the assigned roles they perform, over time and recognize the significance of the meaning of that position. Asking if women are interpreting their own role. In spite of a broader historical disregard of women in agriculture, I remain mindful of not homogenizing women who farm into a stereotypical generalized femininity or considering them or their positions as static over time.

Historian Sheila McManus (2000) in her review of gender constructions and conceptions of femininity of White, educated, English-speaking women who settled in southern Alberta during the period 1905 through 1929 states, "These women brought with them conceptions of femininity, of what it meant to be a "women" that were generally very like those of the places they had left behind" (p. 123). McManus (2000) contends the married, White and English-speaking women bent on maintaining their definition of womanhood in the homesteading environment were advantaged by being at the "top of the racial and ethnic hierarchies" (p. 124) as perceived in rural Alberta. Bringing order to dirt, clothes, food, animals and people in one space, these women aspired to create a home and reinforce a familiar type heterosexual femininity, bolstered through time and repetition with the collective energy of women "maintaining

appropriate standards of feminine appearance and behaviour" (McManus, 2000, p. 127). Farm women were admired and approved of by others for displays of certain characteristics, characteristics valued in the conceptions of femininity held by the White, English-speaking women (and men) including determination, courage, perseverance and a steely refusal to complain about or surrender to adverse conditions (McManus, 2000).

Historian Catherine Cavanaugh (1997) in "*No Place for a Woman": Engendering Western Canadian Settlement* shows how a Victorian era gender ideology and settlement discourse provided a conceptual framework upholding the "Order of Pioneers" excluding women from property ownership and involvement in politics. Although women gathered and campaigned to extend women's property rights in the European colonization and settlement of the West eventually procuring small gains in property laws and rights to their children, a gendered ideology that excluded women was central to the construction of the "West" (Cavanaugh, 1997).

Romantic Ideals

There has been some criticism of the earlier feminist study approaches as being spatially deterministic. This approach led to broad generalization of idyllic rurality and the co-construction of rural womanhood. However, on the other hand, an appreciation has been generated/created for how "… ideas of rural society and community lie at the heart of understandings of rural gender" (p. 109) and are central to understanding the differences that space makes and how potent cultural ideals are sustained (Hughes, 1997 as cited in Little, 2015). Other research has emerged examining rural women's association with feminism. The history of agrarian women's political activism and studies of rural gender identities focused on performance and social constructions of masculinity

and femininity including an exploration of discursive practises that contribute to stereotypical assessments of the rural space, rural women, and men (Little, 2015). Ideas of what womanly characteristics are praised and prized in historical concepts of femininity, as discussed by McManus (2000), were repeated. As Little (2015) says men (for example, male participants in dating schemes: *The Farmer Wants a Wife, Desperately Seeking Sheila and Muddy Matches*) in search of a farm wife held "Expectations of a particular kind of femininity [that] are especially clearly articulated with men expressing the importance of "qualities" such as loyalty, tolerance, practicality, and kindness in search for an ideal farmer's wife" (p. 116). Little (2015) thinks rural studies are benefitting from the increased questioning of rural ideals and an interrogation of the granted agrarian assumptions that have prevailed in the past, moving away from rural idyll hegemonic discourses and considering broader concepts of rural life and rural masculinity and femininity.

Little and Panelli (2003) also state that research of the rural in Western countries has advanced away from "…conceptualising rurality as 'container' for the creation, performance and contestation of gender roles to seeing the rural as integral to the actual construction of gender identities and the way they are performed and negotiated" (p. 281). More consideration is now given to the "inner workings" of rural space or community and, as Little and Panelli (2003) say, early research in rural studies ignored gender within the broader category of rural community thus creating a starting point for feminist critiques of agriculture and rural community. Little and Panelli (2003) note that feminist approaches in other geographical areas have been mindful of the diversity of gendered experiences and reiterate the importance of recognizing diversity in the space

and avoiding blanket assumptions about geography, performance, identity, and social construction within that space. While there are dangers in using a broad brush stroke to define rural men and women, the differences of rural space experienced, and the line between spaces (including environmental, cultural, historical concepts of nature and in this case affective attachments) and within spaces, would reflect on gendered rural ideals. Differences in those ideals have been perpetuated over time, space, and by the actions, inactions and decisions rural woman consider.

Agricultural historian Sandra Schackel (2011) writes rural women into history using oral histories she collected from farming and ranching women in the American West. While recognizing the tendency to romanticize the rural environment of the "family farm," Schackel (2011) then did rely somewhat on romantic notions and fantasy. Schackel (2011) frequently mentioned interviewees speaking of their farms as wonderful places to raise children, working closely with nature, their spouse and family juxtaposed with the "hard" life farmers and ranchers experience and the "new" practises in agriculture, taking the place of the 'good old days'. Schackel's (2011) stories speak to a historical era of rural women's experiences but those experiences, the values taught and expectations are for women to maintain. Schackel's (2011) women's stories illustrated how they consistently subsumed their own ambitions, left college to marry, shadowed their husbands from location to location and followed traditional rural masculine and feminine roles.

Age as a Category of Analysis

As my research shows, analyzing the stories from different age cohorts of women demonstrates how history impresses itself, with the intersection of race, class, ethnicity

and gender, on one individual at a time over time (Elder & Gield, 2009). The existential journey to understand ourselves and those around us includes consideration and contemplation of not only social change, but how the conceptualization of the life course includes interdependency, historical time, human agency and timing of life (Elder & Gield, 2009).

As Field and Syrett state, historical research lacks scholarship on age, particularly how age itself is constructed. They argue for "all scholars of age-defined groups of people to critically examine the way that age markers themselves have been constructed historically, and refracted though the lenses of gender, race, class, and sexuality" (Elder & Gield, 2009). They call on historians to consider and encompass the complexities of human experience while also bearing in mind and analysing the multitude of factors at the nexus of age inquiry such as gender, sex, class, ethnicity, geography and history. Meanings that may have been ascribed to a certain age at one point in history may change for some and not for others over time. Experiences are individual as well as collective, a legacy of social norms per se.

Age correlates with social norms – "those shared beliefs about what actions and attributions bring respect and approval from oneself and others" (Elder & Gield, 2009). Often unchanging or changing slowly, opinions, concepts and meanings attached to age are assumed to be true and, therefore, categories of age are useful tools employed to do research. Research that does not understand age as a fluid category may repeat historically accepted standardized norms and assumptions of age in method and analysis of data. Being critically reflective of age as a shifting category becomes important to the researcher's increasing awareness and receptivity to recognizing normative standards,

assumptions, and possible differences. I examined pre-conceived notions, assumptions and values for myself as the researcher and in the responses of the women participants; troubling the default normative standards, popular discourses, and shared heartfelt beliefs held which may hinder women's and girl's full participation in family farming.

In my research the shared beliefs expressed within and between each age cohort reflected prevalent "family farm" discourse, standard norms and assumptions where many shared beliefs remained undaunted/unquestioned. Also indicated was the perpetuation of traditional gendered performance such as the predominately male inheritance practices, recorded histories primarily about men's actions or inactions, and where women and girl's physical work and care work contributions are mostly disregarded. Opportunities to learn farming, limited by gendered expectations, were also evident. Shared beliefs, actions, gaining of respect and approval; these social norms were reflected within the conversations with the participants. Yet, to example norm and disruption to the norm, Cecilie (congruent with traditional norms) described herself as on the outside of her husband's family farm inheritance decision making, she was "just" Duncan's wife, while at the same time she gave her full participation to including her daughter in the family farm from an early age and considered her daughter a legitimate future farmer and land owner and also engaged in open inheritance conversations with her non-farming son. This demonstrates one way that both comfortable sameness and disruptions are carried through time and history, and impressed upon us, as if time travelling on age cohorts.

Methods

A Note on Limitations

As a descendant of Canadian settlers I realize I am a beneficiary of Western Canada colonization and, as a researcher, I am committed to recognize all aspects of my privilege. While my research attends to the often overlooked participation of women in the transfer of the family farm and the historical development of agriculture in Canada's Prairie Provinces my focus on primarily White settler women's experiences and perspectives is admittedly limited. This research project does not address Indigenous dis-possession of land by nation builders or colonizers nor do I address racial inequality in agriculture.

Recruitment, Participant Selection, and the Interview Process

I conducted individual oral history interviews with 19 women and interviewed 2 women together (at their request) who were actively working on family farms in Western Canada across three Prairie Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. My goal was to gather information about individual and intergenerational histories and knowledge of family farm business succession planning and the intergenerational transfer of the family farm. Interviewing women across a range of three age cohorts from age 22 to 77 years, allowed me to examine changes and similarities between the cohorts. The age ranges for the cohorts were the women's age at the time of interview. Cohort 1 constitutes seven women participants in their 60's and 70's ranging from 64 years to 77 years of age. Cohort 2 constitutes seven women participants in their 40's and 50's ranging from 46 years to 59 years of age. Cohort 3 constitutes seven women in their 20's and 30's ranging from 22 years to 37 years of age.

The recruiting of participants started by formally announcing my intentions at the Southern Alberta Grazing School for Women held in Elkwater, Alberta in July of 2016. Held annually the SAGSW is an opportunity for women to meet, be together uninterrupted, to learn and discuss range health, grazing principals and practice of land stewardship. Recruitment of additional participants snowballed from there. I also interviewed women I knew through farming in Warner, Alberta over the last nearly 40 years, including five mother and daughters who were interviewed separately.

All individuals excepting the one group of 2 interviews were conducted and recorded from December 17, 2017 to September 26, 2018. Most of these conversations took place around the participants' family farm kitchen tables. One interview was conducted in a research office at the University of Lethbridge. The interviews ranged in length from 45 minutes to an hour and a half and were recorded on two devices. Each interview left me enriched and impressed with each woman's sentiments (opinions, feelings, views, ideas, and attitudes). After transcribing the interviews, I read through printed transcription of each interview and made note of the sections where the women were commenting on topics or themes, I considered relevant to my research question. The richness and the quantity of a data required I isolate a particular theme for this thesis. The theme I selected was the re-occurring references to love.

Interview Question Design

The interview questions were developed over a period of 6 months to address the central research question: *How does the reproduction of current gender norms impede women's participation in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm?* A copy of the interview questions is in Appendix 1.

Prior to interviewing each individual, I sent a copy of my questions to each of the interview participants in advance. I considered my questions were such that had I been the one asked, I would want time to ponder the interview questions for a time to contemplate a more developed and thoughtful response. Most of the interview participants had read the questions before I arrived to conduct the interviews. Some participants prepared notes or had written out their complete responses to my questions and read the written copy to me. I considered how having time to "think" about an answer to a question may equate to some appeasing/rationalizations or minimization of the women's positions in more sensitive topics. On the other hand, given an opportunity of time to expand or ponder an answer to my questions was valuable. This, I feel, is what happened in the majority of cases as they resulted in a deeper or broader answer. Some women told me that certain questions had been more difficult to answer or that some questions posed they had never been asked, thought about, or had to articulate. Others answered more on the fly.

I was acquainted with some participants. Some I was meeting face to face for the first time. Occupying the same space as a woman who farms, it was easy for me to start the interviews. Prior to the formal interview, like farmers do, we talked about the road conditions, weather in general, crop and cattle conditions, and family. I hope they all felt as comfortable as I did as we went through the interview process. Although each participant was very much an individual, providing distinct answers and explanations to my questions, some distinguishable common themes emerged holding the same spirit in their responses to my questions. Overarching ideals about farming and the family farm were evident. As a farmer I shared similar thoughts of the pressures to run a family and a

family business together. Nonetheless, there was little negativity expressed despite the complexity of business and relationships with family members.

I designed the interview questions to cover the broad aspects of historical and contemporary gendered participation in the family farm. Questions revolved around personal histories; their understandings of land and land ownership; the gendered divisions of labour on their farm; and a request from me for them to share memories and emotional experiences of women as daughters, mothers and grandmothers on a family farm.

I also asked about the personal monetary gains for women and girls in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm wondering how the power and knowledge contained in rural discourse and other social practices that I imagined might perpetuate gendered norms in the family farm. I asked if they thought they were treated fairly and equally in the transfer of their family farms. As noted above, my intention for the design of the questions for these 21 interview subjects was to analyze what changes and/or consistencies existed among the individual participants, but across each of the generations, pertaining to their participation on a family farm.

I asked if they considered themselves feminists.

Discourse Analysis and my Interview Process

Considering discourse as historical with discursive practices as holding threads of history is useful to demonstrate intergenerational historical traditions and the changing effects over time, over generations, for women, men and children in family farm practices. Discourse also matters in understanding who we are and how we have come to understand the world. Discourse can be thought of as a social practise. Particular

phenomena including gendered subjectivities can be historically, socially and discursively constructed, produced and reproduced through popular discourse (Hall, 1996). Discourse contributes to the constitution of all those dimensions of social structure which directly or indirectly shape and constrain it: its own norms and conventions, as well as the relations, identities and institutions which lie behind them. Discourse is a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting, and constructing the world in meaning (Foucault, 1995).

Fairclough (1992) contends that power relations arise out of language influenced by, or interchangeable with ideologies, and that discursive practise is constitutive through reconstituting meaning, but also capable of constituting new meanings and new knowledge. Fairclough (1992) also suggests that discursive practise is conformist and creative in its influence in reproducing aspects of society as it stands, and adds that when creative, contributions can contribute to transforming society.

Hall (1996) places emphasis on the "history" of discourse stating that discursive practices are not closed systems, but that there are traces of prior discourse rooted in more recent manifestations. Through analysis of iterative discursive practises constituted and performed in family farms over time, over history, the structures and practices that are both detrimental to and enhance family farms are identified and can be challenged, supported and optimized. The discursive can be a powerful keeper of a single dominant discourse as an interpretation of an unmoved, unexamined "foundational truth" that may go continually and consistently unchallenged and researchers can become a support system to the very systems that are seen as oppressed and oppressing (Scott, 1991). Scott (1991) continues by asking if history can exist without a foundation and says that social

organization is held up by and is inseparable from knowledge, so in this sense then, gender cannot be isolated from our knowledge of gender, or from the discursive contexts that define gender differently for each individual.

Lerner (1986) challenges dominant discourses and discursive practises that leave women on the periphery and has asked how women participated in the "construction of the system that subordinates her" (p. 36). Matriarchy and patriarchy as systems of power and knowledge can also be described as "us" and "them" that have operative discourses that empower and dis-empower and continue to be replicated and enforced. Lerner (1986) argues that by exposing women's participation in the patriarchal system, and in turn creating a new consciousness, women can be further emancipated from the dominant power structure. Using discourse as a political or ideological practise assumes particular power relations that are normalized, but it is these points of normalized powers that can be the site of the struggle (Fairclough, 1992).

What Does Love Have To Do With It?

Despite the aforementioned exclusions from land ownership, gendered institutional barriers, and other common systemic misconceptions about how women and girls have participated in agriculture; historically women have been present, as fully formed humans, living, breathing, working, procreating, and as my research indicates, being farmers who love their farms. Fortunately, historical accounts (Herbert, 2017; Lindgren, 1996; Moyles, 2018) of women farmers, women's emotional attachment to the land, and the ideals of legacy have emerged from personal interviews, letters, and diaries of generations of women connected to land.

Interviewing women and reading documentations of women homesteading in North Dakota, Lindgren (1996) reported that the women "left no doubt" about the affective attachment to the land. Describing it as an attachment going past a sentimentality felt for land Lindgren defined it as "…an intense and enduring bond to the soil"; adding similar expressions of commitment toward the women's land was evident in many of Lindgren (1996) case study files as well. In one instance of Lindgren's (1996) research, a homesteader's daughter recalled her mother had always used the word "land" reverentially and remembered her mother's connection to land saying "…her heart was always in the Mouse River Valley" (pg. 206) and explaining how every summer she would return to the homestead. The daughter recounted when her father had died her mother returned to North Dakota and lived out her days in the valley where her heart had remained.

In asking the women I interviewed about their life, life's work, their families' histories on family farms and the intergenerational transfer of those farms, I was struck by the consistencies in depth and breadth of emotions acknowledged or visibly displayed. Reactions ranged from nods and expressions of shared understanding of how it feels to be a woman on the family farm to physical responses of tears, inabilities to speak, long sighs and shoulders dropping or rising. These responses represented both comfortable satisfactions including pride, fulfillment, and accomplishment to representations of stress, hard lessons learned, and resignation. In some cases, women shared a deep sadness about aspects of a family farm.

I was particularly moved by the women's personal histories and how their accounts intertwined with many references to love. Sometimes we shared a tearful

moment. Sometimes the conversations were more pragmatic. But all interviews held an emotional sense of deep devotion, as well as a commitment to historical understandings of family farms and ranches. Historical affective understandings shared, and connections between generations of family farmers, became evident through the varied expressions of love. As a researcher, the recurring references to, and emotional experiences of love, raised the following questions: *What does love have to do with it? What does love have to do with women, the family farm, and intergenerational transfer of family farms? How does it "feel" to be a woman who farms? Why do sentiments matter and how do affective responses, like the giving of love, determine current gendered outcomes?* Having considered the reproductive, domestic, and the productive labour women and girls provided to their family farms, the interviews demonstrated an emotional labour, an emotional toll that in a sense, that may only be experienced by women who farm. This love it seems, acted as both a gift and as a detriment.

While historically it is not surprising for women and girls to speak to their love of family members, it was revealing for me as a researcher to hear how many times and in how many ways love was explicitly expressed during the interviews. Within the 21 interview transcriptions I conducted and analyzed the word "love" was spoken, reflected on, declared, or addressed over 150 times across the broad range of interview questions. The women were often overtly emotional in responding to questions about their family farms.

Consistently, across the generational cohorts, women recounted many types of loves; love that entwined and was enmeshed with the histories of their foundation farm, their own new family farms, and family farms of the imagined future. Although I did not

ask the women to explicitly define "love," I interpreted the feelings conveyed as of affection for, in love with, devoted to, holding dear, and adoring. Importantly in the context of the intergenerational transfer of the family farm, there seemed a deep sense of loving steadfastness toward family and toward the longevity of the family farm, the lasting legacies of the women's family farms.

Indeed, during the interview process there were frequent nods, smiles in acknowledgement, or pauses as eyes filled with tears - these emotional understandings, or sentiments, seemed challenging for the women and then me, to verbalize. At times the overwhelmingly stirring mood was palpable particularly as the women worked to describe what it was to experience living, and loving, on a family farm over time, over generations, and over the duration of their family's history. There was also laughter, with comments that it was ridiculous to become so emotional talking about a history with dirt. Of course, the emotions felt were about a lot more than just the dirt, more than just family and the family farm, more than just love.

Listening to women and hearing the many expressions of love, and by analyzing their responses for meaning and affect across the generations of women, interlocking themes of love, of women's emotional histories, and their personal participation within the intergenerational transfer of the family farm became apparent. The processes of investment in, growth, and the commitment to the complexity of "love" as told in the women's stories were inflected with many tones and nuances to describe the multiple dimensions of "loves" for the family farm. I identified three main themes: *love of the land, love of the family farm lifestyle,* and *love and legacy*.

Love and Gender Expectations: Themes for Analysis

Oatley (2004) claims gender is the most intimate culture, informing concepts, actions, and beliefs of a group of people. Historically women spent much of their time with other women; men predominately spent their time with other men (Oakley, 2004). The contemporary generations of women I interviewed validated evidence of present-day interaction with men and boys or offered recollections of those men's actions or influence by regularly including a grandfather, father, father-in-law, brother, or husband in relation to their affective memories, their learning memories on their family farms or ranches. The memories interlaced with fondness, love and caring were signposts to traditional and cultural values and signalled how gender functioned within a framework of attitudes, beliefs, roles, and ideals. Pride in accomplishment and other positive emotions like love and happiness, expressed by the women interviewed, signaled that all was well (Oatley, 2004). On the other hand, emotions can operate paradoxically and often do. As an example, a common cultural belief is that emotions should be controlled, while simultaneously believing bottled up feelings can be harmful. In the case of this research, loves expressed resonated as pure, yet there were often caveats explaining or rationalizing to being careful of what you love, and how family farming is complicated by love. This complexity became apparent when the women spoke of partner choices, working double shifts, or where they placed themselves by choosing to do specific types of family and farm work.

Learning about patriarchal institutions and their function and recognizing the ways I participate within the farm family culture motivated me to talk to other women who farm and record their histories. While women who farm in Western Canada live a

privileged life, we also live with oppression and disregard. We are advantaged and disadvantaged by a misogynist system built through history, social, cultural, and gendered expectations. Considering women's lives and the truths we live can be difficult to see and uncomfortable to accept for both men and women (Chemaly, 2018). Yet, looking to the histories of women who farm clears a path to a better appreciation of "how did we get here" and more importantly, where are we going? By recognizing some of the institutions of patriarchy established through time, I have found these iterations of misogyny cannot be unseen. And these structures and the mechanisms supporting these institutions deserve disruption. History lives in the ways contemporary women and girls are left behind in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm, particularly in the case of male dominated land ownership which research shows is historically well established as are political and social encumbrances still experienced by all women.

What I feel personally but had not considered prior to these interviews is the power of love in regards to family farms and the intergenerational transfer. The 21 women in the generational cohorts I interviewed are the "heart" of this research. They allowed me to hear their felt experiences as farm women, inclusive of their emotional investment, their emotional burden. Understanding how love functions in maintaining, sustaining, and interrupting traditional gender norms within a family farm and how loves co-mingled with other factors like age, the construction of gender, and the representations of the family farm became central to my interest and analysis. The next chapter represents the three themes of love I observed and heard in the interviews: *love of land*, *love of the family farm lifestyle* and *love of legacy*.

Chapter Three

Narrative Interlude – Reflections on Family Farms

Biographical Profiles of Interview Participants by Generational Cohort

In this section, I provide brief biographical profiles of each of the 21 interview participants. For simplicity's sake, I have organized these biographical profiles into cohorts organized by the ages of the participants at the time of the interview, rather than geographic location or any other factor of the women's identities. Beginning with Cohort 1, the biographies are organized from the oldest to the youngest participant.

The purpose of this biographical profiling is to highlight the complex similarities and diversity (livelihood, relation to land; relation to family) across the 21 interview subjects I interviewed. Although the profiles describe only a snippet of an individual's life, I wanted to incorporate these short biographies to emphasize more fully who the women are and to individualize their histories. Rather than resign their fuller profiles to an appendix, I include them in this chapter to honor their indispensable voices, their honesty, generosity, and their marvelous unassuming stories about how they became farmers.

Cohort 1 – Ages 64-77 years

Emma. Emma was born in a two-room house in an area south-west of Milk River, Alberta commonly referred to as the "1-17". This area was homesteaded by and land purchased by predominately Hungarian immigrants. Emma grew up, raised her own family and is now a grandmother still actively involved in her own third generation family farm. An active community member who served as the Reeve of the County of Warner for some time and Emma has made a lifetime of commitments to family and community. As part of their family farm transition, Emma and her husband Robert (Bob)

recently left their farm home near the Sweet Grass Hills and moved to the town of Milk River, Alberta.

Joan. I interviewed Joan in her home near the Sweet Grass Hills in southeastern Alberta. Joan has lived on her ranch for 53 years and works alongside her two sons in their farming operations. Born in Calgary, Joan grew up on a farm near Conrich, Alberta that her paternal grandfather had moved from Oregon to purchase. The property included a boarding house on the coal trail from Carbon to Calgary. The last stop before Calgary, "wagons, and drivers, would stop overnight; and put the horses up, and have a meal, and sleep overnight, and proceed the next day." Joan first attended a country school then finishing her grade 11 and 12 high school education in Calgary. Later Joan received her Bachelor of Science degree, in Mathematics from the University of Calgary. Her husband Darrell, family homesteaded their farm in 1910 coming to the area from the Chatham, Ontario area on the advice of a brother of Darrell's great grandfather who told the family about the land rush. Joan is a life-long community giver. She has volunteered for decades with the Writing On Stone Rodeo Association and is a county councillor. Joan said she didn't think she could be very content in the city and continues to enjoy working the land and cattle. Joan's succession plan is in place for the most part, but like most of the farm women I have met – she is flexible and ready to meet new challenges, should they arise.

Beryl. Beryl's paternal grandfather was a pioneer who came to the Bushy Ridge area west of Cochrane, Alberta in 1887, 18 years before Alberta became a province. He came to the Bushy Ridge area via Ontario and the United States, working for a time at a ranch in British Columbia. Beryl's father met Beryl's mother, Irene Greer shortly after she had begun work as a teacher at the Bushy Ridge School. Irene's family were also

pioneers in the same area arriving in the Millarville, Alberta area in 1882. Beryl married into another Cochrane area pioneer family and lives on her family ranch with a spectacular view of the Canadian Rockies. Growing up, Beryl rode her horse to school in Jumping Pound and later continued her education at the General Hospital training there for three years. Following her education Beryl worked as a nurse at both the General and Foothills Hospital in Calgary, Alberta and later still as a clinic nurse in Cochrane for over 20 years. She has fond memories of working on her Mom and Dad's ranch and considers herself very lucky to live and work and raise a family on the ranch where she continues to live. Beryl said planning for the successful intergenerational transfer of the family farm has been stressful. Beryl and her husband sought advice from a local prominent lawyer and wrote their wills according to his advice, working to ensure the land ownership stays with close family members.

Shanee. A farmer in Southwestern Manitoba Shanee lives in an area settled by largely Belgian immigrants in the early 1900's. Her parents and grandparents were farmers before her and she now farms with her husband and grown son. When Shanee first married she said her and her husband farmed much like their parents had raising cattle, pigs, chickens, and had a huge garden as well as grain farming. As the years passed, they acquired more land and became predominately grains farmers raising wheat, barley, canola, peas, and sunflowers. Shanee is a proud farmer and said "Yes, I am a farmer; I have always loved the land and especially springtime when everything is new and fresh. The sun shining through the east windows in the early morning sunrise, birds singing, a new beginning." Now, as a grandmother Shanee says her role on the farm is simpler but just as rewarding giving her a sense of self-worth, fulfillment and

contentment. The family succession plan is in place but has been challenging Shanee said when one son is an active farmer with family and the other, single and working off farm.

Pat. I met Pat at a grazing school for women held in Cyprus Provincial Park where she volunteered to be interviewed. Pat is an Accredited Land Consultant, Seniors Real Estate Specialist and holds a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Alberta. Pat's was born into the Copithorne family and her grandfather came from Ireland with two brothers in 1882 settling in the Jumping Pound, Alberta area. Her mother and father chose the ranch Pat and her family live on, near the rest of the Copithorne family. The first family transition included two brothers and a sister and Pat said she thought her parents were the fairest she had seen for country people. Pat continued that in this generation and the next, it is more difficult to be "fair" in generational property transfer because of the size of land holdings needed to have a viable farming or ranching operation. As a realtor with her a focus on being farm and ranch sales over a large geographical area, Pat has witnessed many processes of family farm succession - many including the sale of part or the whole family farm to complete the passing of a farm operation generationally.

Glenda. Glenda's family all came to Canada from Norway at different times. She thought on her paternal side of the family her grandpa and grandma and an uncle had all purchased farmland from the Hudson's Bay Company. Her paternal Grandpa Thompson travelled to North America three times before bringing his family and had worked on the Empire State Building in New York on his initial visit to the United States. Her mother's side of the family, the Movolds, homesteaded in Fosston, Minnesota and came to the Warner, Alberta area initially renting land from a woman who lived in Chicago. Glenda

grew up on the family farm east of Warner and remembers many cultural gatherings with other Norwegian families who lived in their community and standing with her family and watching it rain, “the nice rain and how it smelled.” She attended school in Warner and in Lethbridge, Alberta, later married and has made her life in Warner, Alberta. Glenda and her brother recently inherited family land. Although Glenda has never made her living from the land, she is a dedicated and responsible landowner and wishes agriculture business opportunities had been different allowing for her or her own family members to be active farmers on the property owned by previous generations of family on both the maternal and paternal sides.

Edith. Home for Edith is the historic Wine Glass Ranch bordering the city of Cochrane, Alberta. Her maternal great grandfather, Frank Towers, came from England and met his future wife in Fort Winnipeg where she had landed travelling from the Guernsey Islands. Frank filed for a homestead in 1885 and in 1889 registered the Wine Glass brand, still in use today. Edith’s mother, an only child, inherited the ranch from her parents and later passed part of the ranch on to Edith. Edith told me it was not until she was “actually the rancher and had to make the actual decisions” that she had a full appreciation of the physical ranch – the creek, the hills, the native grass, she realises now from a spiritual and healthful point of view – in addition to the practical business of ranching with family. Planning of the transfer of the family ranch has been started and initial actions taken to include Edith’s oldest son and his family in the operations of the Wine Glass Ranch. Calling the process an “interesting dance” Edith strives for family harmony in the process of family farm succession and the transfer of agricultural property.

Cohort 2 – Ages 46-59 years

Cecilie. The youngest member of a family of eight, Cecilie grew up on a family farm in the Fincastle, AB area. Her father passed away as a relatively young man, leaving the family's farm to Cecilie and one of her brothers. She experienced a sizeable amount of family tragedy that in turn related directly to the operation and outcomes for her home family farm. Cecilie attended Lethbridge College and took Recreational Management and a position in her field in Claresholm, AB. Cecilie met her future husband Duncan during her time in Claresholm and they have been farming together in the Granum, AB area for over 35 years. Her paternal grandparents came from England and ran a boarding house in Taber, AB and homesteaded land near Foremost, AB later purchasing land closer to Taber. Her maternal grandparents were Mormon and came to Canada from Bear Lake, Idaho. Her maternal grandfather was a stone mason and an "outstanding teamster", passing those important horsemanship skills onto Cecilie's father. Cecilie said her mother was operating a bed and breakfast before B&Bs were cool. While acknowledging her mother's life of hard labor making a safe place for wayward souls or women who were in abusive relationships, Cec's said her mom was ahead of her time in many ways and it was always "guess who is coming to dinner" growing up in her family's old farmhouse. Cecilie and her own family are politically and socially active and contribute in many ways that are central to the success and advancement of the cattle industry and the people in the industry of agriculture. Succession planning has been a lengthy challenge on the Fleming's farm and includes Cecilie's father-in-law, her daughter and son-in-law, son and of course her partner Duncan.

Carolyn. Carolyn was born in Calgary and was raised on her family's farm near Rosebud, Alberta that celebrated its 100th year in 2009. Her great-uncle, owned a land company that had purchased land from the Canadian Pacific Railway and he had moved to the area with his sister, Carolyn's great-grandmother. Their families grew their land holdings by purchasing land from the land company and by purchasing neighbouring farms. Carolyn's parent family were stock growers, and she met her husband at a cattle event and later moved to the Readymade, Alberta community area just south-east of Lethbridge where she farmed with her husband and his extended family. A few years ago, Carolyn and her husband worked with one of their daughters and her husband to purchase a ranch close to East End, Saskatchewan and moved to East End. This new farm is focused on raising cattle and Hereford breeding stock, the first love of this farm family. Carolyn told me she knew early on in her life her brother was the heir apparent for her home farm and her inheritance would come in a different form. In her family the transferring of land has begun as they work their way through succession planning for their three daughters while still actively working on the new ranch.

Robbie. Robbie (Laura) Hulit Wills farms with her husband and oldest son in an area close to the Sweet Grass Hills in Southern Alberta. Robbie is Emma's oldest daughter who left her home farm for further education but soon returned to teach school and farm with her husband and live near her Mom and Dad, and brother. Her maternal heritage is Hungarian as discussed and the paternal side of the family, the Hulit's arrived in Southern Alberta via Oklahoma and Utah and settled both in the Lucky Strike and Warner, Alberta areas. Robbie's and her husband's son, Robert is now also an active member of Robbie and her husband's family farm. While Robbie was a successful and

popular teacher in the community for seventeen years, Robbie's enthusiasm for farming, love of the land and living the rural life is evident in all she does. She is grateful for the time farming has allowed her to spend with her parents and a community giver, Robbie follows in her family's footprint of community service. Robbie and her husband Darcy have one daughter, two sons, a daughter-in-law and grandson. Robbie's family is currently active in the steps and processes involved in the transfer of the family farm.

Jackie. I interviewed Jackie early in January of 2018 on a very cold but sunny and clear day. Jackie farms near Coronation, and also worked as a nurse in acute care for twenty-two years and later moved to a position in public health nursing. Recently retired from her nursing career in 2016 Jackie told me she thought if she waited too long to retire from nursing, "I'll be too old to be out there on the horse, doing the things I like to do …." Born in a small community called Galahad, Jackie was raised on a yours, mine and ours farm family near Brownfield, Alberta. Jackie's home ranch, the Rodvang Farm, participates in a sustainable beef program (verified beef cattle operation) and good stewardship of the land is central to ranch management. Jackie's husband, Loren, is a decedent of Norwegian immigrants who homesteaded in 1909 in this east central area of Alberta. The transfer of the family farm for the Rodvang's is multi-generational challenge involving several extended family members.

Shari. Shari is the fourth generation of the Finstad family to work the land she still calls home. She grew up in a farmyard just down the road from her current home. Shari considers herself a rancher and their farm operation is focused principally on cattle and grass production. Her paternal family emigrated from Norway to Iron Mountain, Minnesota and later moved to Canada purchasing land in the Stirling, Alberta area. Still

later, they applied for a homestead in what is now the Manyberries area, near a small hamlet in southeastern Alberta. She said those ancestors had built up, unlike many settlers, some equity in the United States and came to Canada with some money and cattle. We talked about her family ranch and what it is like to grow up and then raise children in what some might consider an isolated rural area. Shari's two sons and daughter are living off the farm now. She and her husband continue to ranch with Shari's mother, brother, uncle, and cousin. The future of the Finstad Ranch is being considered within the processes of family succession.

Terri. Terri's connection to the land goes back to her grandmother and her mother's great aunt and uncle. She grew up in the Medicine Hat area going to a rural school so although not fully immersed in the business of agriculture, the culture of farming and ranching surrounded her. Terri describes the farm her and her husband farm as a first-generation farm. Busy with on and off-farm business and raising two son's Terri's workdays are full. On their farm south of Stettler, Alberta, Terri and her husband Brad raise Hereford cattle and field crops. We had an excellent visit about the opportunities and challenges of raising young men on a farm and the questions and challenges that arise concerning the generational transfer of a family farm. Terri is a talented photographer and well worth a follow on Instagram @tlmappin, Lazy M Bar Ranch.

Lee. Lee told me her birth farm, a ranch west of Red Deer is in a place called Yankee Flats. Her Danish Grandmother came from Nebraska, through the Dakotas to Yankee Flats and her paternal grandfather's family was English – already settled in the area in 1918. There was a large German immigrant community there as well, and Lee

said there was some animosity between the Danes, Germans and Icelanders. Later, after receiving her education degree, Lee moved to Foremost, Alberta and took a teaching position in the Manyberries area, soon meeting her husband an area farmer whose family came from Russia to homestead near Etzikom. Lee said she always knew she wanted to live the lifestyle that a farm offered, and she knew when she met her husband they would be a good fit. On one of her many drives to the hockey arena Lee said her middle son told her, "You know if Colby and Dakota don't take grandpa's house maybe I'll take it when I farm." Lee continued, "That's the first mention ever of him coming home to farm. That's great. I have a daughter who wants to go into veterinarian medicine. Well, so she's still interested in that too. I don't think we can count her out." The family succession plan with extended family is in the works but no final plans are made for the transfer of the family farm.

Cohort 3 – Ages 22-37 years

Signe. Signe was born in Carberry, Manitoba and continues to farm some of the land she grew up on where her family farmed with both sets of Signe's grandparents. Her paternal great-grandfather came from England via France around 1910 and her maternal family is of Icelandic heritage. After graduating from Olds College in Alberta, Signe spent time gaining experience in the feedlot industry before coming home in 2002 to buy land from her great aunt and uncle and started to farm full time. The Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) crisis in the cattle industry hit the following year and Signe worked every job available to make her land payment and pay for the cattle she had bought a year earlier. Signe now commutes to the farm she purchased and lives with her husband and two daughters on their farm just south of Brandon, Manitoba. Signe has

much invested in farming and ranching and although her career choice has challenged her financially and emotionally, she loves her farms and would encourage her own daughters to pursue a farming career. Succession planning is complex, involves two non-farming siblings on her side of the family and while being discussed with her father there is no formal agreement.

Lori-Anne. Lori-Anne studied Cultural Anthropology and wrote a thesis on farm and ranch succession. When she heard her mother, Edith was being interviewed about the transfer of the family farm she expressed interest in contributing to the process. I interviewed Lori-Anne at her home on the Wine Glass Ranch in early February 2018. In her studies Lori-Anne said she was somewhat shocked at the lack of research including "peripheral family members" and the literature she found was about "married parents passing along the ranch to one child". Lori-Anne spent time away from the ranch she grew up on studying in both Lethbridge, AB and Nova Scotia and later experienced an extended trip to Tanzania. Lori-Anne's love for her home is evident and she told me about having her great grandmother's diary and how she has done many of the same things her great grandmother experienced on the ranch and wrote about in her diary. "Went skating in the mud hole." Lori-Anne's great grandmother wrote about the skating hole Lori-Anne herself has skated with her family. While Lori-Anne and her partner live on the family ranch, she does not consider herself a rancher – not making a living off the ranch, but she wishes she could. Lori-Anne's father also owns a ranch and there are stepsiblings and extended family members. She feels family members are on the same page for the most part concerning the transfer of the family ranches and thinks

communication is good and there is some transparency with the generation responsible of the intergenerational transfer of the family farm.

Larei. Larei was one of two participants who did not grow up on a family farm. Not one to shy away from truths Larei described her dad as a dropout and a stoner who lived out a Canadian/American dream. Upon realizing he was going to be a young father he went back to school for his GED and continued his education to become a chiropractor and successfully supported and educated four children. Larei's choice was to become an educator and she did practicums in Claresholm and Foremost, later taking a teaching job in Coutts. After her second child was born, she left her full-time teaching career and decided to stay home, while also working occasionally as a substitute teacher. Her grandmother was Danish and had some farming history in the Foremost, Alberta area where Larei and her husband Ryland now farm. Larei is working to raise four children and farming with her husband, mother and father-in-law and brother-in-law after an uncle of her husband did not have any sons and Larei said helped to "set them up" in the business of farming.

Ricki. Ricki is a dedicated daughter, wife and mother. She is passionate about her roles in the agricultural industry and is a community giver. Activity and contributions to breed associations and sustainability projects are only two of the ways Ricki contributes to forwarding the business of agriculture. Ricki and her daughter are the fourth and fifth generation to live on her paternal great-grandfather's farm in the Granum, Alberta area. Ricki and her husband farm with her Mom and Dad who live just a few miles away on the farm Ricki grew up on. Her early memories are of working on the farm, "very hands on", with her family at a time they ran a bull test centre with about 300 head of bulls on

feed. She said she remembers the winter cold and being bundled in a snowsuit holding the gate while her dad bed the cattle – that was her job, even at a kindergarten age. Ricki said that being involved in 4-H and the Junior Angus Association opened up many opportunities for her and she has sat on the Alberta Angus Board and the Canadian Junior Angus Board using her own initiative to start a National Young Cattleman's program. While recognizing the costs of volunteerism Ricki says this is where opportunities are found for personal, business, and industry growth. The family has been working on a succession plan for an extended period of time that is complicated by having four generations of farmers to consider.

Jocelyn. Jocelyn is Carolyn's daughter, one of three daughters in their family. She grew up in the Readymade, Alberta on the family farm where her Mom and Dad farmed with her paternal grandfather, grandmother and an aunt and uncle. By the time Jocelyn was grown her cousin had also joined in the farming and ranching operation. Her Mom and Dad predominately worked the cattle side of the farm and her aunt and uncle and cousin the grain side. Jocelyn attended University in Saskatchewan after graduating from high school in Coaldale, Alberta attaining a degree in Education. In 2012 she moved to East End, Saskatchewan with her husband to live and work near his family's ranch on the ranch her family would purchase. A young mother, a full-time teacher and rancher, Jocelyn's plate is full. She compared growing up working in the purebred cattle industry as "doing a lot of fun things" to the adult reality in the purebred industry, raising a family, working off farm and juggling farm books etcetera, in the mix. Jocelyn says she and her husband have definitely asked themselves why they like the ranching life. They both have university degrees, but she said chose the ranch life although it is hard to put a

finger on one thing, it is the lifestyle they want for their children, but that it can feel like only "blind determination" to keep going sometimes. Jocelyn said, "It is a legacy type of thing but you want to be able to provide something lasting for generations to come."

Leah. Leah was born in Consort, Alberta and raised on a farm outside of Coronation, Alberta close to the hamlet, Throne, Alberta. Leah works in Manitoba doing sustainability work with mother cow herds. Although she was busy in her early life with dance and piano Leah said she started to become more interested in her parent's cattle operation when she was 15 or 16 years old. She said she loves cows and loves native grass and the history of her family farm gives her a deep sense of belonging and sense of duty to be a good steward of the land. During her university studies in Edmonton, Alberta Leah guessed three quarters of her classmates were women and many younger agricultural professionals she knows are women, but she does not think that is necessarily translating into women becoming agricultural producers. She works hands on to help her parent on the ranch in person on trips home and by arm's length doing research for better herd management tools for her parents. Leah told me some of her insights on the movement afoot to "advance" women in agriculture and how she feels women only events are beneficial safe places for women to learn together. She gave the example of a women's calving clinic and observed women said how beneficial it was to meet and freely express themselves and share information with one another. Leah noted women were able to discuss calving techniques without interruption but later noted women had said they have a very difficult time implementing new ideas on their farm when they take new information home.

Danica. Danica is the youngest of the participant in this project. She grew up on a generational family farm southeast of Medicine Hat, Alberta in Cypress County. Both of her parent's families have deep histories in farming and ranching in the Cypress County area of Southern Alberta. Danica is currently attending the University of Lethbridge working towards a Master's degree in History. One of Danica's brothers is in the early stages of taking on the family farm that Danica described as "mixed" but with a central focus on beef production. Both the maternal and paternal family farms are farmed by members of her family. Some of the land near Elkwater was inherited by Danica's mom and while her parents are heading towards a retirement age Danica says her dad is not ready to stop farming and move off the farm. Danica told me growing up on a farm was great – exploring the land, skating on the dugout, feeding cattle, participating in 4-H. As avid reader, Danica said that she did not spend a lot of time doing farm work while growing up, preferring staying inside to read, it was later when she became more interested in outside farm work and now enjoys regularly going home to help. She says her favorite time of year is branding season when family, neighbors and friends come together to help each other, visit, eat great food and work together to brand that year's calf crop. Danica talked about the complexity of her one brother working to take over the family farm and her position as well as the position of her non-farming older brother.

A Preface to the Interview Narratives

I chose to present excerpts of the women's narratives without immediate analysis, allowing them to largely stand on their own in this chapter. Uninterrupted by my scrutiny, the women's stories undeniably and broadly represent and explain, make evident their loves for their family farms. These are the women's words and the moments they shared

with me – how they expressed their love of farmland, love of their lifestyle, their love of family legacy. The quotes are descriptions from the point of view of the women as they experienced, in front of them, the passing scene of a family farm. My aim is to analyze how highly-organized, overarching default belief systems and conceptual structures of what to love and who to love function within a family farm and to whose benefit and detriment; to expose how family-farm-based perceptions may be dressed up by love, tradition, and philosophical musings, but nonetheless remain oppressive while simultaneously feeling/being so very "normal" and "natural" – unquestionable. I feel this research is better served by a distinct presentation of the dynamics enmeshed with the love the women shared as they spoke about their lives as farmers, allowing the women to speak for themselves. My choice to analyze the way the women talked about love was in no way intended to undermine their love of family and farm; rather, I aimed to recognize and illuminate the generosity of self the women give to their family farms, as demonstrated through the love they spoke to in their reflections.

Dissemination of my research within the agriculture community is a priority for me. I spent time reflecting on how to best reveal the roles women, intentionally and unintentionally, have within the systems that justify and maintain the status quo of family farms. This is complicated by how the love and care women described, felt, and provided can also lend itself to a denial of their experiences, frequently rooted in the idea that women are "too emotional" or romanticising their struggles – exemplifying how it is hard for women to win. What these women understood and experienced within the overarching patriarchal structure of farming, through the themes of love they described, was also political. While women and girls are discriminated against on many levels, a

particularly cruel way is through conceptual notions of love taught and upheld within the family farm. Nonetheless, I ultimately chose to position my unpacking of this analysis independently of the women's responses within the layout of this thesis because I wanted the women's voices amplified, to be presented first, to be open to interpretation/contemplation without analytical interruption.

Love of Land

Land is central to the business of farming. However, the implications or repercussions of emotion, particularly with regard to love of the land and attachments to the physical landscape, have been left largely unexplored by researchers. As my 21 interviews revealed, the affective attachments to land and to the family farm are relevant to discussion of women's exclusion from or minimization of in the intergenerational transfers of family farms. The interview data showed the often deeply expressed love the women had for the land they farmed or land they had lived on while growing up. While they remain historically and contemporarily disadvantaged in accessing farmland of their own, this paradox highlights some of the critical complexities to be found in women's relationships to farming.

Throughout the interviews, a love of land was frequently described by the women through both verbal and nonverbal physical expressions while they shared stories of their family farm histories. The women's descriptions included the different examples of how this love of land shaped their commitment to, and their bond with, the land they farmed. As I analyzed each interview, I considered how the women's attachments with land reflected in the intergenerational transfer of their family farms; I pondered who benefits

and how any benefits, detriments, and involvement may be gendered; I listened for changing perspectives between the three generations.

The labour of love can be hard to recognize and in my consideration of the significance of the interviews, I worked to expose an often invisible, yet central, emotional investment women and girls make to the culture and the business of a family farm. As well I considered ways the historical and current state of family farmland ownership and transfer practices, can rely upon women's and girl's love for the land to uphold and reproduce unequal gendered, normative patriarchal structures.

Women characterized this bond to their land as foundational to their lives; it was not only their way to make a living, but also a mainstay in how they participated as a member of their families. Their comments stretched across generations, encompassing both those that came before them and those who would follow. This contemporary emotional relationship the women expressed with their land is also historical. As one theorist of emotions determined, emotions like love hold historical meaning through ideas, social movements, and cultural traditions (Oatley, 2004). The women I interviewed talked about love of land and how that love had multiple manifestations; how it was nuanced and ethereal; the land becoming part of them. Land represented a particular part of their identity, self-esteem, and value. This complex love expressed for their land appeared to be just one of the guiding motivations to grow and maintain their family, their farms, and their traditional rural lifestyles. The women also spoke to a reciprocal relationship with the land, wherein their love for the land was returned through the ways the land provided for them and their families.

Oatley (2004) has said if emotions embody central human values, then we must listen to the stories, to the humanness, to better understand. That is what I tried to keep in mind as I listened to the women's stories. I first present the women's responses that spoke to their love of the land, divided into generational cohorts. I also compare and contrast the way that love of land was expressed across the different generational cohorts.

Cohort 1

It was a crisp and sunny, beautiful January day when I sat with Joan at her kitchen table on her ranch in southern Alberta. In answering a question about whether she identified as a farmer or, as in Joan's case, a rancher, she described what some of the important factors were for her about being a rancher. Joan's first response was how she enjoyed living in a rural area and loved her scenic view:

> "I like living in the rural area. I like living out in the country. I like to be able to see and not have people around me. I have the greatest view of the Sweet Grass Hills, here, every day. I just love that. I just would not be content in the city. I lived in the city, to go to school, and to university, and I couldn't wait to get out. I just did not like it. That's, probably, why I'm still here and not in the city. Because I'll be 75, this year, and I don't really want to live in town. Though, I'm getting tired of the driving. But as long as I can drive, I'll probably stay here. No. I like to be, I like to work with the land."

Emma also expressed an emotional reaction to the prairie landscape. As a new bride, Emma did not know until her wedding reception that her new husband was quitting his teaching job and intended to be a farmer on a remote farm in an isolated area of southern Alberta. Eighteen years old at the time, Emma remembered how she came to love that farm. She recalled her first reaction on seeing it, the beautiful scenery.

> "There was a little country trail out to it [the farm]. Hardly a road at all, and it twisted and turned, and all of that. But, it was beautiful. It was right at the foot of the Sweet Grass Hills. And I thought, okay well the scenery is beautiful. I guess we'll give it a try. So, we went out there, and much to my surprise, I came to really love it. There were periods I questioned my love for him, but really and

> truly, it was ... and I guess it's different when you are the, what would I say? The couple on a farm than when you're the kid helping in a family farm. Because now all at once, you're part of making decisions, and we were so poor, and all the time I'm thinking, why did we quit that teaching job, which was there for as long as we wanted? And it was quite a struggle, but at the same time, it was like I said, it was something that you worked together to make it happen, we had our two girls on that little farm."

All of Emma's sentiments for the farm grew from an initial feeling for the beautiful scenery; the landscape helped her to balance the sometimes difficult life and work of a family farm.

The women in this oldest cohort had the most lived years to reflect upon, as all had grown to adulthood on their own foundational farms. Emma remembered how she knew and felt about family land as a child by saying,

> Well, I was born in a little two room house, out in 117. Which is south and west of Milk River. And it just seemed like when I got old enough to, I can remember things from when I was three and a half, four years old, and it just seemed like a fairy-tale life, because I had my cat, and I could wander around, and life was just beautiful…We could go wandering through the field, and we had a lot of trees in the backyard. Almost a forest patch, I used to call it.

Emma's sentiments and satisfactions included the memories of a love of privacy, specific views from her childhood of life being "just beautiful."

Shanee also expressed her love for the land when answering whether or not she identified as a farmer. As if it were a prerequisite to become a farmer, Shanee explained, "of course - you love the land." Memories of the love of springtime on the land, for Shanee signalled a hopeful time of personal regeneration.

> Yes, I am a farmer, I have always loved the land and especially springtime when everything is new and fresh. The sun shining through the east windows in the early morning sunrise, birds singing, a new beginning.

She went on to expand on her love of land and how that love extended to a connection to God,

> . . . emotional inheritance was love of the land and the blessings to the farmers in general. Connection to the land is a connection to God and all his creations. Ownership is a term of purchasing the land. Stewardship of the land is being a farmer that takes care of the land like a shepherd cares for his sheep.

For Shanee being a farmer was synonymous with being a good steward of the land. She went on to explain what can happen if love of the land is missing,

> And then the ones that rent, if they're forced to cash-rent the land out, the ones that do rent and don't care. Don't have the love of the land, they just use it. And by that, I mean get as much ... Yes, get as much seed out of it as you can with as little effort, little working effort… And as a farm-owner and lover of the land, you want people looking after it like you would, more reasonable.

Joan also spoke to overlapping principles of stewardship and a reciprocal relationship with land. The idea of reciprocity within a family farm was described in distinct ways by the women in each cohort. Their descriptions took complex, overlapping forms including common characteristics of respect, gratefulness, responsibility, and a stewardship directed not only toward the tangible land specifically, but toward past and future generations as guardians of the family farm. As Joan explained,

> You know, I respect the land. I respect the environment. I tried to take care of it. The wildlife, we have deer here, all the time. None of us hunt. We're not hunters or shooters. But, I guess, that's the main thing. I have the tide of the land because I love it. I love being on it. I appreciate what it's given to us. It's given us a way to make a living, and a way of life, that we all enjoy so much.

Joan expressed her reciprocal relationship with the land; the land gives to her and she loves it back. Joan also expressed gratitude for the land, viewing it as inextricably mixed with her and her family's financial circumstance, and their way of life, possibly not available to be experienced by others.

Edith described her love in working with cattle, about her love for her job as rancher,

> I think I make a far better rancher than I ever did a nurse. I don't like sick people but, at that time, you were a nurse, a secretary, or a teacher pretty much. Right? . . . yeah, I love it." I always say that, boy, [referring to her eldest son] if I'm sick, or if I'm depressed, or if I'm whatever, there's two things that would get me out of that no matter how I feel. It's dancing with my husband and working cattle. I absolutely love it, and I always say to my son, "If I'm a little bit late getting over to the corral, you better not start. You better not start without me."

Love of land for this older generation women included love for prairie views and the solitude of living out on the land. The women talked about how love for a family farm grew over time, but also spoke of their inherited love of land that included a spiritual connection to God through land. They respected the land and took their duty to care for it to heart. There was a particular historical knowledge of land that, for some, seemed especially meaningful. Their investment in that history was evident in their voices and in honest, affective, impassioned recollections about their family land. This cohort was more retrospective in their comments than the younger generational cohorts but nonetheless they, like subsequent generations, spoke to correlations between work on the land and a love for their family land.

Cohort 2

While the women in Cohort 2 also made nuanced references to love of physical land and love of particular places or views, they did not use the word love as frequently as women in the previous generation of Cohort 1 when referring to specific physical traits of farmland. Cohort 1 was perhaps more introspective in their answers in describing their life on family land because many aspects of their family farms future were already decided. For several of the women in Cohort 2, love was associated with what they described as their ongoing jobs or work as farmers or ranchers, all the labour that took place on their family farms or ranches on the land. Harmonizing with comments made by

Edith, the youngest in Cohort 1, some women in Cohort 2 more directly referenced the interchange between love of the land and a love of their labour. Love of the land was tied to what the women considered a privilege of enjoying the outdoors, including working with livestock, understanding the land and the intrinsic independence that came with farm life. In Cohort 2, comparisons were similarly made between times living and working in an urban setting vs. in a rural environment, illustrating their preference for farm life and work.

In addition, responses from the Cohort 2 included a warning of sorts about the pitfalls of loving your job on the land as a farmer or rancher. Due to their current positions actively working through the transitions of their family farms, the downsides, and snags of being a farmer were potentially more front of mind. This generation was comprised of many who not only farmed but also held off-farm/ranch paid employment; thus, the challenges of their dual-labour circumstances seemed to factor into their responses.

Jackie, who had always worked on her family farm while also managing a nursing career, made a decision to leave the nursing profession to dedicate even more time to work on the land and ranch with her family. She stated,

> One of the things I love about my job [as a farmer], and I just said this to Loren [Jackie's husband] last night when we went out for a walk because we'd been in the car all day, yesterday. I said, I know I don't make very much money at this, but I love the fact that I'm outside. I'm not shut in an office. I'm outside. Even when it's -35, you know, you can dress for it or you can take breaks, and come in, and go back out. It's not so bad, you can make it through. I don't know how else to say that I just really think there's nowhere better to work than outside on the land.

Jackie saw trade-offs to increased and exclusive work on her ranch, including relinquishing the security of the regular paycheque she received from her off-ranch work as a nurse. She also explained her emotional connection to the physical land,

> I often have felt kind of weird when I tell people this, I always think that if you walk on pavement or cement, it's different than if you walk on real earth. I'm a walker, I walk a lot, so I believe that if you have tension or emotions, and you go walking, you can kind of put that into the soil or into the earth. It sounds of kind of weird. That's an emotional attachment that I feel to land or to earth.

The soil is more than just dirt for Jackie; it holds a healing strength. Despite feeling awkward speaking about this connection to land, Jackie shared the comfort she found from working on land to which she had such a strong sentimental attachment. Lee also explained her attachment to the land around her home by saying,

> I feel tied to our home and the land around our home. I work in our yard and that's part of our farm. I've always said that I want to be buried in the Etzikom graveyard so that, let's say the Hutterites do buy everything in town, they're not getting that piece. I am going to be there forever. So maybe it's a bit sentimental. I don't know, but I do feel that a little bit. I know Sean feels it certainly a lot more. At one time, I could have moved our farm and just farmed somewhere else.

However, for Lee, it had taken some time and perseverance for this sentiment to grow, explaining,

> Yes, and we've persevered. I mean look at those stupid trees that grow in my yard that I've just been fighting with. Now they're flourishing and it's, yeah. That's an emotional thing for me too, to have that.

Shari spoke to her love of being outside. Her preference, compared to urban life, was being outside on her family land and home. Shari explained this by saying,

> And so I, I never, ever remember my mom saying, "You know, you should go outside and play. Why don't you go outside and get some fresh air?" It was always, "Come in for dinner", right? "It's time to come in for dinner." So I always loved outside and the city never had an appeal to me. I mean, I lived in Medicine Hat, I've lived in Lethbridge, and I've lived in Calgary, and couldn't wait till the weekend till I could get out of the city and head for home or just head for whatever. So I never just enjoyed city life.

Shari's account of her work on her family ranch, like others in Cohort 2, involved an affective attachment to the land, the outdoors, and to their work as a farmer or rancher.

> You have to have a passion for this job. It is not for everybody. And if it's not your passion, by all means, you know, not to be involved in this. But I enjoy because, like I said, I love being outdoors, I love working with cattle, and I love working with the various livestock. And when it comes down to it, I feel like what I'm doing is worthy, it makes a difference to our society.

The commitment, the perks, and the purposefulness of being a rancher were all significant to Shari, but she noted that being a rancher was not for everyone. Ranching took passion.

As Shari recounted her love of her job as a rancher, she also incorporated her mother's longevity, her mother's place, and her mother's loves into her own personal history:

> My dad has passed away but my mom is still out here. And she's 83 and still very physically active. And so she loves her garden, loves her home, and has no intention of moving.

An intergenerational commonality, Shari understood she and her mom share the love of living and working on the family ranch, with neither having any intention of moving. Frequently, the women included a nod to their history, the shared emotions they had with the generation before them.

From Cecilie's perspective, it was imperative to love your job, despite the occupational hazards and the burdens. Being entrusted with the responsibility and management of something someone else has left in one's care is, as Cecilie says, "a high honor." As she explained,

> I would say I am a dyed in the wool, agriculture, farmer/rancher, producer - for sure. As an advocate for agriculture, I think there's no higher honor than feeding the world. When people say, "I'm just a farmer." I'm like really? There is a lot … that's a high honor that people entrust you. You're entrusted with land. Sure, it

> looks good on the outside that you've got all this land and assets. Yeah, but when it comes down to it, you're working a lot of long hours for a little money. It's like when somebody says, "I'm a businessman and I love what I do." That's the same thing. Who in their right mind would be up every hour - last night because . . . the block heater went out of the tractor, so you've got to start the tractor every hour or every two hours? You might as well check the cows while you're up. You better love what you're doing. Sometimes I don't like the stress that goes with it, but everything has stress. There is no stress-free job

For Cecilie, love was about her *responsibility* as a farmer or rancher, as one that had been entrusted with land. While Cecilie did not use the word love in specific reference to land, she held nothing back in describing her ardour for agriculture. What came first, the land or the love? I speculate it is a specific type of emotional responsibility a female farmer can feel toward the land, a love that binds. Still, Cecilie also recognized and commented on some of the encumbrances that come along with that kind of commitment - debt, long hours, less than ideal work conditions, and stress – suggesting that one *must* love their job as a farmer; the love acts as a ballast.

Robbie, when asked about her connection to the land, felt "a responsibility and a pride. There's a lot of pride involved." Expressing dedication and feelings of worth and pride enmeshed with her connection to the land, Robbie continued to explain her relation to her farmland,

> Yep, every part of it [the land]. Like from the time that I was young, and summer fallowing, I love the smell of dirt being turned. I love the smell of the hay crop. I love the smell of prairie in the spring. I love it and I can't even think of anything else I really couldn't find more ... Not the big city, it's not Vegas, and it might be Mexico if I ever go there. Well you know how the smell of the ocean might be something that causes you to emote those feelings but I love those things.

Robbie also talked about her "home place" saying,

> So that was my very first farm home and I love it. We farmed that place. As a kid my family farmed that place for years and it's the most peaceful place ever. It's a beautiful, beautiful farm, I love it.

As other women in the cohort, Robbie shared unspoken memories and feelings about farms and homes as beautiful, peaceful places. A “home place” is used in the agricultural community to signify beginnings: the place where the family or family farm began.

At times during interviews, smiles and nods of understanding and emotions bubbled over. Beaming smiles, tears, and sighs - or all three - express a deeply felt love for home, work, and the generations that comprised their family farm. This middle cohort expressed a strength they felt the land gave them; a desire to be close to their farmland in life and after death. There was honor and pride in ownership seen in their juxtaposition of the difficulties of the work tied to land ownership responsibilities. Love was sometimes balanced against concessions made.

Cohort 3

While all the women across the cohorts had their own unique farming experiences, the women of Cohort 3 may have had the most variety in circumstances. Less traditional routes were followed by some by being hands-on, primary owner/operator of their farms, and being recognized as such. Others stayed connected to their families’ farms by travelling home on breaks from secondary education to help on their farm or ranch. One used her agricultural education to provide cattle management protocols while she worked away from home in the agriculture industry. Some were self-described first-generation farmers, and others were just starting in farm businesses on a new variation of a family farm, such as a mother and daughter who had moved their farm to a new location in a different province leading to a more rapid shift into new roles. Nevertheless, the Cohort 3 women were equally as fervent about their farms, families, and love of the land. Like Cohort 2, the love they spoke to was more associated to their

work on the land, and work with farm animals. The women described what joys life had offered them because of the land.

Danica, living off her family farm at the time of the interview, spoke about the type of farm/ranch work she enjoys – how she loves branding season,

> I do enjoy working with cattle I think the most. I just go ahead and feed them every night when I'm home, it's just so right. It's the hardest part about living in town now is I don't have that when I'm here. Yeah, I just went out. I love branding time. It's the best time of the year.

Danica's expression gives a sense of how natural evening cattle chores feel to Danica – they are part of her role and identity. She echoes the sentiment of other women regarding the opportunities life on the farmland offers as compared to an urban lifestyle; the practicalities of keeping animals fed is the type of work Danica enjoys, and she misses those times when she is in town.

Jocelyn explained how she enjoys sharing her family farm work experience with the staff at her work as a teacher,

> I keep focusing on calving season but, oh, my gosh, I love telling stories in the staffroom about calving season because they're like, "You were doing what?" Like especially before the kids were born and it was easy to leave the house at night and do the checks and just like describing some of the things that we did and pulling calves and they're just like ... It's like a foreign concept, even in a rural community, if you're not actually a part of this, when are you going to see a calf actually being born, right?

Jocelyn described her triple life as a teacher, rancher, and mother, and yet her enjoyment of being a rancher and devotion to her family business were evident in her interview and she stressed how important access to full ranching experiences of helping a cow calve, for example, is something she is willing to wear many hats to do.

Leah's love of her family land came out in conversation through a description of the paternal history of her family farm, which Leah had compiled for a century farm

event. The historical land purchasing stories melded with her experience on her family land and she relayed,

> There are memories too, you know? That's when we got this land and that's, - I know that hill over there that we tobogganed down… I think just the love of the land is certainly something. That land in particular. Yeah, I think it definitely is belonging. It's like, that's where the family is. Especially on my dad's side, that's where my family has gathered for several generations now.

Like any home one can grow to love, a family farm extends its arms to reach out to include heartfelt sentimentality across the space and place. Over time, a love of land morphs and interweaves with family, history, identities, and a sense of belonging. It is not uncommon for family land to have been named, at times still named for the original homesteader or family from whom the land was purchased.

Lori-Ann described her view on generational sharing of the understandings of places on her family's ranch saying to me,

> And then reading my ... I've got my great grandma's diary and she didn't write much, and it's a two year diary, and that's all we have. And she just wrote a little bit every day, like, "Made bread." Leslie, her husband, "fixed the tractor". "Vernice went back to school.", or something. But she'll say, "Went up on the big hill, went down to the mud hole.", those are all terms that we still use so we can see exactly ... that's what I would write in my diary, "Went skating in the mud hole." So, that's really ... I love those comparisons that it's funny that my great grandma did the same things that I do, on the same place.

The diary entries linked Lori-Ann directly with her great-grandmother and their shared experiences on the land that comprised their family ranch. Lori-Ann continued this theme, and recalled asking her grandmother how she felt about those specific places on the family ranch.

> Yeah. And even grandma talking about it, and I like to ask her ... I don't know if we have more time or if it's just my own perspective, but I look at the ranch and I see different things, like I feel great affection for certain parts, or sites, more of that purposeful connection to it. And I ask grandma about that, and, no, to her it was just home, it just was what it was. And I think it's also the change of, this isn't

> the norm anymore, and so I can see, I work in the city, and I come home, and the hill is there, and it's like this ... I just had the word and it just left my mind but like a ... not a beacon, but a symbol of that exact shape, is just like, "Okay, that's home." That's exactly it, yep.

Lori-Ann's description here added a depth to the sense of her emotional investment in her family's ranch by including her direct linkage to generations before her. Her description of home, a shape of familiarity, allowed the deeper sense of belonging or perhaps a very comfortable ease and security of "home".

Signe sat at her kitchen table with one of her young daughters and shared how she felt about her foundational family farm, showing her authentic self as she spoke,

> I loved the farm. I still love the farm. We lived in the Sand Hills. My Dad's house is a half mile off the road. We were surrounded by ... my Dad and grandparents owned 18 quarters in one chunk.

Her description of her farm home as "tucked away" and "surrounded" could mean never leaving your family land as a child, going on daily adventures. As an adult, having eighteen quarters attached to each other becomes more meaningful in a generational sense as well, the responsibility for maintaining the land in a practical and sustainable way, the family land being accumulated in one space, snowballing from one generation to the next.

> I guess farming is in my blood. I grew up on the farm. I love the farm. I love being outside with the animals and growing things. I can't imagine just staying in the house. Even when my girls were just babies, I just put them in the little carrier and we'd go and help tag calves and yeah, I guess, it's just, I guess, part of me.

Signe gives a sense of the emotional yet immeasurable way all the factors that defined her feelings for being a farmer accumulate by stating, "I guess farming is in my blood." Nonetheless, leaning away from traditional gendered roles by not staying in the house, Signe preferred to take her young family to work with her.

The cohorts of women regularly spoke to their preference for work with farm and ranch animals rather than more gender traditional roles, yet there was little complaint about the demands of the gendered roles they did fill, only descriptions. There were many assumptions about the domestic and reproductive labour women provide and a given that farm women will do significant quantities of the productive labour as well. The love of work on the land, being productive, invariably included their love of the farm/ranch animals. Throughout the cohorts, the women spoke to a history with generational land and the bonds formed with land, through work on the land itself and with the animals that are raised there. All the women expressed feeling that they knew the land, and that the land was part of them. Their love for seasons, the landscapes, the lifestyle, their family stories, and the personal preferences for rural settings were embedded throughout the cohorts. Through their descriptions and expression of how they love the land, the women left little doubt that they participated in multiple foundational ways within their family farms and that the threads of love of those foundations were tied through the generations. Family farmland appears to be much more than a place on the map, but a treasured place in the mind and in the heart for these women who farm.

Another closely related dimension to love of land was a love of the opportunity to learn and live the family farming/ranching lifestyle and the love of the memory of doing so. In the next section, **Love of the Family Farm Lifestyle**, less tangible ideals and emotions run in and between the lines of the women's stories about their heartfelt experiences of living, growing, working, and being girls, and becoming women on family farms. The next section builds on the foundational love of the land adding the complexity of the practical and the emotional commitments to the family farm through the expressed

love of the learning of and experiencing the family farm lifestyle. Sociocultural foundations like, the family farm, are constructed in the way we negotiate our emotions, the way we talk about love, and the way we think about love - and what we do with it. Shields (2002) said emotion is "taking it personally" and she emphasized there is something about "self" at stake. The next section further examples what the women said about their felt experience living on a family farm and what is at stake for them through the love they feel and practise. While feminist scholarship and research has held awareness of emotions, as a taken for granted, less examined are emotions as conceptual schemes (Shields, 2002). Emotions and the sophisticated belief systems that in turn manage a particular emotion's end game, so to speak, should be acknowledge, understood and challenged if necessary. As an example Cancain (1987), showed in her research how in American society "...the gendering of love reinforces conventional gender arrangements that make it women's responsibility to be the caretakers of close relationships." The care taking of close relationships can be costly for women and girls on a family farm as in examples of relationships lost over disruptions of who has access to family land, or running the risk of ostracization when perceived as a source of interference rather than loving and supportive, or being stereotyped into a person who cannot “really” farm.

Love of the Family Farm Lifestyle

This selection of narratives expands on the interviewee’s references to love. Their stories and memories continue to provide important opportunities to critically analyze how meanings of emotion are negotiated, by whom, and in what circumstances (Shields, 2002). Time and again in our interviews, women spoke to their memories of well-loved

family farm practises; the intimate, treasured experiences of a family farm environment that stood out for them as children or adults. However, the women also embraced broader concepts, values, and emotions throughout their recollections to indicate how they *felt* about farming, their own lives and lifestyle, as well as the lives of family members surrounding them and their experiences within their families. Through their stories, the women pointed to particular feelings, values, and actions to show how their circumstances, participation and opportunities unfolded into a generational cultural lifestyle.

Cohort 1

For Beryl, the view of the Rocky Mountains from her home lends to an understanding of one reason why she has spent her life at the base of the Rockies; other reasons, both tangible and emotional, also came through Beryl's discussion of her interests in and appreciations for ranching. She spoke to the similarities and differences between her experiences and those of her children Cheryl and Jay, by saying,

> I was always so lucky to live on a ranch, Live out here. We really are. And my kids have appreciated it too. Like Brian and I, we used to ride to school. But Cheryl and Jay, they didn't ride to school because they were on the bus by then. Like when dad, I think dad gave Brian and myself a cow and a calf and a heifer or something but then we built up our cow herds so when I got married I brought mine here. But he didn't just give them to us. He'd deduct expenses. Yeah, you just can't … It's expensive.

Beryl also considered herself fortunate for the learning of the business of cattle with her father and said,

> I always loved chasing cattle with my dad. I'd help him. Because Brian was away playing football or doing something. Because dad had some land rented around the Morley reserve so we'd have to take them up there.

Perhaps it was the opportunity to learn from her father that encouraged Beryl's love of chasing cattle with her Dad; she hinted that the opportunity was special "because Brian was away", creating space for her in what could be considered a traditional father/son chore. While it is work to be done, it is also a pleasure, a fond memory of family.

For Joan, horseback riding was always an important interest. Riding comprised a major portion of her ranch work over the years, and was also included in her recreational endeavours with her husband and children as well. Her grandchildren also carried on the 'horses for work and sport' family tradition by competing in rodeo events. Joan reminisced on her many experiences with horses when recounting her relatively recent forced retirement from horseback riding.

> I like to work with cattle. I like my cows. I liked my horse, but they sold it on me. I haven't ridden, since. I'm still mad at the boys. Well, I can't get on it anymore. My knees haven't got the spring anymore, to get up onto the horse. So Vane told me, if I couldn't get on by myself, I couldn't ride anymore. Because that's what we used to tell him, when he was a little kid. If you can't get on the horse by yourself, you can't ride. So now he's telling me that. But I did enjoy, I rode all the years, I enjoyed it a lot.

While a person can ride a horse for pleasure alone, for Joan and others in this cohort, the pleasure of riding came within a combination of life-long gratifications woven together with the necessities of a ranching business; including a western family tradition of using horses to manage cattle. Joan sounded a bit wistful during this recollection, and understandably so, as she could no longer participate in this practice that had once defined her as a person. She also remembered her late husband's role as part of her subsequent enduring bond to horses saying,

> So I couldn't ride, I rode a little bit, but I wasn't a very good rider. I learned, Darrell taught me how to ride. He always had a quiet horse for me. He always gave me a good horse to ride. He spoiled me, there. I always got a good horse to ride.

She further described this connection to horses and work on their ranch by saying,

> I couldn't imagine my boys doing anything else, but riding horses, and looking after cows, because they just love their horses, love to do that. They farm, out of necessity, because that's where the money is, right now, with high grain prices. But they're really ranchers, at heart, they like their cattle. Yeah and they're good with them.

Identifying herself as a rancher and continuing to work as a rancher, Joan explained that she couldn't imagine the next generation of her family not being riders/rancher because she recognized their love of horses and looking after cattle. While she notes that her sons raised grain out of financial necessity, Joan identifies that their 'real nature' is to be ranchers.

The circumstances and settings of learning to drive were another set of vivid memories included in many women's histories. Joan smiled, her eyes twinkling, as she recounted a particular story of learning to drive, which included her husband and first and second born sons.

> Vane gets out of the truck and he's all proud. He says, "I'm teaching Clark how to drive." He was 12, Clark was 6. I couldn't even get mad, because they drove perfect, all the way down there, and underneath the auger, and everything. "I'm teaching him how to drive." "I said, "Does your dad know this?" "Oh yeah, he told us to come." Oh, but he's been driving, since he's 6 years old. He's a good driver. Anyway. I get off on my little stories.

Joan recognized Vane's feelings of pride being able to teach his younger brother to drive, and her joyful retelling of this story, and her own sense of pride that Clark was a good driver as a result of starting to drive at such a young age pointed again to her own enjoyment of those memories and experiences.

A similar sense of pride and fond remembering was present in Shanee's story, as she shared how she had also learned to drive the grain truck as a young teenager.

> My dad showed me how to do books and finances, and I always did the farm income tax with him since I was a teenager. I hauled the grain at 14, and when it came time to get my license at 16, the driver's license guy just handed me my license when I told him what I had done, and I never even had to drive around the block.

Like Beryl, Shanee also included how her father had taught her about the financial end of their family business, connecting those lessons explicitly to also learning to drive, so that she could be/feel useful as a worker/family member on the farm. There was an almost fiery expression of independence, and a matter-of-factness about how independence and the business of farming was taught and learned, in this case from father to daughter.

Emma also remembered her first experiences driving as a young girl as part of the adventure of growing up on her foundational family farm.

> And as we got older it just seemed like the natural thing, I learned to drive when I was, I believe I was eight years old, maybe nine, and he, being three years younger than I, taught me how to shift the gears, and taught me how to drive. So, we had an old army jeep, and when I think of it today, no seat belts, and he and I would end up going over rock piles, and everything in that old army jeep. We just had so much fun in that army jeep. And then there was the horseback riding. We spent hours on horseback. And whether dad knew what daredevils we were, I don't know, but he never allowed us to ride with a saddle. We had to ride bareback all the time.

Pat didn't use the word daredevils, but she certainly could have as she described some of the potentially dangerous shenanigans she experienced with her brother at a young age,

> It was great. I learned how to drive a jeep when I couldn't even reach the pedals. I was driving the tractor when I had to jump off [the seat] and stand on the clutch because I was too little to push it down. But no, we never had any wrecks, which was good. Well no, we did. I remember my older brother had a runaway. They had - used to work everything with horses, and that was a good experience too. I can remember as little kid, you'd ride the hames on the lead horse, you'd have them all head and tail behind you. It was cool. Really was. Used to be a lot of fun. And actually, he had a bit of a wreck because he was running a team, of horses with the rake and the guy was coming over to crop dust. He buzzed everybody, said goodbye, I'm leaving now and spooked the horses. Shit happens. Anyway,

> that was great. We always had lots of hired men; we always had lots of fun. But we all worked, had to do your share.

Pat enjoyed talking about these exhilarating experiences. Her attitude seemed to be that fun (and some risk) was part and parcel of their work. Fun and work went together; you were expected to do your share of both.

Another type of farm family lesson addressed was about life and death:

> I remember watching the miracle of birth of a newborn calf many times. And the heartbreak of having to help pull on the chains of the calf at a difficult birth, that the newborn did not survive.

The miracle and the heartbreak of animal reproduction had a clear impact on Shanee; these experiences were complex and left enduring memories. Even though her family had stopped raising livestock decades ago, the retelling of her experience still cracked her voice. Joan, too, considered what the circle of life on a farm meant for her,

> I would say, maybe, we have a more realistic view of life. Because you go through the life circle, on the farm. You see animals born, you see animals die, and you understand the sort of thing happens. Not only the farm animals, but the pets. Even the crop year. You grow a crop, and then it dies, in the fall, you harvest it. We're into that life cycle, which I don't think people, other wives, would be into. Yeah, they don't see that. They just live their daily life, of putting food on the table, and working at their jobs, and stuff. I don't think, you don't see the circle of life, and how nature looks after things. Even, how nature cleans up the messes. You know? They have maggots that look after things. You know?

Joan mulled over the role of the circle of life on a farm and said it offered a more realistic view of life.

Other remembrances of different types of learning, which sounded like whispers of the heart, included enjoying time with family and gaining an understanding of the financial importance, beauty, and relief in a timely rain. Lorna's eyes filled with tears as she remembered,

> I remember our old two-story home with the big front porch veranda with a deep-freeze in it. Those years, we always seemed to get nice, gentle soaking rains. My dad and I would set up top of the deep-freeze for hours watching the rain, listening to the birds chirp and flutter their wings in the little rain puddles to bathe. The air smelled so fresh and clean. My dad would be so happy, "A million-dollar rain for God's land," he said.

Her father's happiness and their time together was an emotional memory for Shanee. Her comments and her physical expression made clear the prominence of her father and how he shaped this experience on their farm. Glenda showed similar emotions when she talked about what made her family happy,

> Early years, way out east I can remember standing and watching, with the family watching it, the nice rain and how it smelled. I mean that was one of the memories that was excellent.

These and other lessons learned on a family farm, tied to heartfelt emotion, were a common denominator for the women in this cohort. Stories or anecdotes about family farm history or other members of the family were regularly emotionally charged, remembering not only how the women felt, but speculating on how other family members may have been feeling too. Smiles, sighs, tears, or lumps in the throat were physical demonstrations of the range of emotions the women experienced through even short thoughts or stories.

Cohort 2

In comparison to Cohort 1, there was a shift in the way Cohort 2 women responded in terms of love and learning and a family farm lifestyle. While there were heartfelt memories of what life was like for the women on their family farms, responses about learning and lifestyle centered more on work accomplished together with other (and all) family members. In Cohort 2, similarly to Cohort 1, the women also spoke of learning about the circle of life, urban and rural comparison, and learning to drive as it

relates running farm equipment and thus "pitching in" on a farm or ranch at an early age. Their love of learning to be part of the family itself and part of the family *business* were inextricably interwoven with what comprised their love of the family farm lifestyle. This is exemplified in this quote from Shari as she remembered her days growing up on the family ranch,

> But growing up on the farm we always, like most farm kids, were involved in the operation. We were in 4-H, beef 4-H, all of us, and so we were out there picking the cattle and, you know, involved in feeding. And back then of course, I think about feeding all the cows small squares. And you know, loading them up onto the back of a truck and then throwing them off and then having to cut the strings, and yeah. Very labour intensive. But we were involved in all of that and I loved that.

Robbie also spoke further to what growing up on the farm was like for her,

> I had a wonderful childhood. I loved being on the farm. I loved it right from the very beginning. We had tons and tons of outside time, different than now of course because electronics and stuff is so different. But we had tons and tons of outside time and we spent a lot of time, even as kids, we were always with our farm, dad and mom never made us feel like we were one door knock away from the bank, you know? But there were times now looking back on it and having them share the things they share, there were times that we were close. And as a result ... But they never made us feel like that, ever. But as a result, when you call it a family farm, it was a family farm.

Continuing to describe the operations on her foundational family farm Robbie went on to say,

> My mom drove tractor from the time that we were kids old enough to stay in the house by ourselves. But from the time we were little we knew how to drive so if we needed anything they knew that we knew where they were, and we lived out in the middle of nowhere anyways, and we knew how to use a phone, we knew which neighbors we could phone if there was ever a problem. I'm sure child welfare would have a fit about it now. But it was interesting. We were quite independent that way.

Robbie's mom worked on the tractor when Robbie and her siblings were young and she described how they were independent in that way, able to drive, calls neighbors if there

was a problem. She remembered how leaving young children was normal on her family farm and recognized how today's culture would question the conventions her family practised.

> It wasn't until we got older when I was 14, that's when I started driving tractor a lot and actually at that time I think mom started to spend a little bit more time in the house. Because I loved driving tractor, I loved it. Lots of times if mom was swathing, dad was combining, and Doug and I were running truck, my sister did all the meals. Like I said, a real family. And I think because of that, I believe that we all worked and it was hard and it was hot, but because we knew it was for the common good, we liked it all . . . it was truly a family farm.

As Robbie explained some of the work division on her family farm, she said she now feels this fostered an understanding of the common good – and that despite the hard, uncomfortable labour, working together was what truly defined a family farm.

While some interviews focused more on childhood experiences growing up on a family farm, others relayed more about how the women managed teaching their own children, and their own practices related to life running a family business. Carolyn's comments demonstrated a gender shift in what was taught to her girls by her, and she remembered how she worked for their inclusion in the family business when she said,

> I encouraged them all. We did lots of agriculture related things. We did junior breed shows. We did lots of 4-H, tons of 4-H. Tried to give them as many experiences on tractors and with cattle. Some of it was out of necessity because we needed people to do those jobs. A lot of it was me pushing and saying they are capable. They can do this. Don't worry about it. Let's get this done. They're 13. It's time to get on a tractor.

The support for her daughter's inclusion Carolyn described can also be another "job" that falls on women. Jackie echoed Carolyn in her feelings about encouraging and teaching both her children to be part of the farm from a young age.

> I think I really, really encouraged the kids to be part of the farm, that's different than my experience as a daughter. We had them on horses. When they were little, we had them out doing things. They probably felt like all we expected from them

> was slave labor, but it was more than that. It was making them involved, and they were aware, and they knew. They can do, even Evan, even though he doesn't live here, he could come home at Christmas, and he can do everything. He knows how to do all that stuff, and he can go out and help do anything you need done, and you don't have to worry. I think that was a big part of it.

Noting the difference between her up-bringing and encouraging her own children (daughter) to be part of the farm, Jackie noted how early on her children were participating in the work of a family farm. The benefit of lessons learned in the out-there-ness of a rural existence were also referenced again as Jackie continued by saying,

> It's kind of neat that way. They learn so much, just out there. We were, I think, always very safety conscious. For childcare, we had at the time, we had grandma and grandpa up the road, Loren's parents. That was our childcare, which I mean, if you don't have that, we sure know how hard it is for people if they don't have childcare. It was not a job, it was our life. If we spent time together, we have to be doing things, sometimes that's considered work. That's the way it is.

Overall, Jackie did not consider farming a job per se, but their life. Part of that life or lifestyle was doing things together that sometimes just happened to be work and "That's the way it is." Learning, lifestyle and earning a living on a farm were woven together, simmering together in the same pot and love lived here too.

Terry also voiced comparable sentiments regarding her children growing up on a farm and emphasized the life-skills learned in a rural environment, which are not always available in an urban setting:

> From a mom aspect, having raised and being able to raise boys ... And not just boys. Being able to raise children in a rural setting is second to none as far as I'm concerned. I think the life skills and the whole components around a rural setting and farm, whether it's grain or cattle, just the different things that it teaches you and teaches kids, you just don't see that in an urban setting. So I think it's important to have that opportunity for them. For sure.

For Terry, as a mother, the opportunity to raise children in a rural setting was considered second to none. She saw the life skills that are learned on a farm as different to what is

available in an urban situation and furthermore, understood a farm of any stripe as a place of important opportunities for children.

Cecilie reflected on learning and lifestyle on a farm from an adult perspective, how it had affected her life and work as she said,

> I have worked off farm in a school setting as a teacher's aide, but all my basis for what I was really good at there comes from agriculture, lessons learned. I've worked in mental health and addictions. The skills that I take to there come to what I've learned here.

The lessons Cecilie felt she had learned from the skill-building family farms in her life are also applicable and provide an advantage in her various off-farm employment situations. The multi-dimensional work and interpersonal relationship skills, while core to a family farm operation, can be taken with you into your off-farm employment situations. Cecilie also described a common conundrum about labouring on a family farm adding a cautionary note,

> It's the old story, "Don't ever learn a task, because it's going to be yours on the farm operation." That's true, right? You learn how to run the mixer wagon; you become the mixer wagon driver. You learn how to run the silage cutter, you become the silage cutter.

In the context of looking for a work/life balance on the farm Cecilie suggested one must be careful about what they choose to learn to do on a family farm – with knowledge always came new responsibilities. In the same theme of possibly getting more of an education than she bargained for, Terry said,

> Once the kids came along Brad kept working and I was here. Just as a partner you kind of step up your A game. You fill in where things need to be filled in. Yeah. So you end up having cows and you're packing kids with you and hauling feed and feeding cows. You just do what you ... Yeah. So the workload, yeah, definitely was not ... Not necessarily prepared but what's the word? Everybody, I think, as you said earlier, you kind of romanticize about it, then when reality hits it's not always so romantic.

Terry's experiences on the farm ingrained in her that when the work was in front of you, you do what needs to be done, no matter the difficulty. She suggested that despite the sometimes romanticized view of farming and ranching, the realities of the workload can be far from the ideal. While prepared for challenges, it is hard to pre-imagine the extent and nature of farm and ranch work, particularly while human resources are still in diapers. Terry also reflected on how she felt had felt as a teenager about farms,

> Growing up, in that situation with the kids that I was with, a lot of the girls that I went to school with that were on farms didn't want to have anything to do with the farms. They want to get out of there and get out of there as fast as they could kind of thing. I guess I had an envy of the land and the work and the different aspect. I'm looking in the window and they're looking out the window. Here I'm very proud having married Brad and knowing that he took the step to break out on his own. It's been a lot of hard work and we're by far not even close to being where we'd like to be but I love all aspects of the farm.

As we spoke, it was easy to tell Terry was a devoted farmer. While the view from the window has changed to a "looking out" vantage for her, and though she has had first-hand experience understanding the challenges that are glossed over in more idealized visions of being a farmer, Terry said she still loves all aspects of the farm.

As Lee talked about the farm where she grew up she related how she felt as a young girl,

> I felt pretty capable as a kid that I could do a lot of stuff. I'll tell you that really plays into getting a job. When I got my job, I worked at a golf course and I was the only person there, male or female, who could operate a tractor or front loader or start a machine up. I mean, it was just what you did. That's where your skills were. I always knew that I wanted to have that lifestyle.

As it happened, after Lee graduated university with a teaching degree, she moved to teach at a rural school. She told me,

> In your life there are always little hiccups here and there, but I met my husband and he was a farmer it just was a good fit. As part of the farm that I'm on now, I've driven grain truck and had those jobs before we had kids or when the kids

> were really small and my mother-in-law would babysit and my sister and law and I would help haul grain or any of those things. We do take meals out to the field. Have harvest suppers and I think that's important. We love that part of it and the men love it too.

Lee felt life on a farm was a good fit for her and she was involved in many ways including running equipment. She continues to also do the work of taking meals to the field, and feels harvest suppers are a central tenet to harvest time and said the men love that part of harvest too. Work and lifestyle are often synonymous for farming families, sharing specific values of working together, sharing time together, and sense of self – accomplish, yet together.

> When years have been busy and they haven't had time to stop, they hate that. Where not everybody gets together. I think it's ... I take my job as a wife and mother to possibly future farmers seriously. I try to educate people. My son plays hockey in Medicine Hat so we are exposed to city kids. So for them to come to the farm, first of all they think that is just the biggest adventure they can have.

Family time together, while working, was a commitment/priority included by other women and Lee too, took her job seriously as a wife and mother of future farmers and made opportunities for young people who live in urban settings to experience a rural lifestyle.

The Cohort 2 women's memories were often of family working together to reach farm family goals. As Robbie said, "....when you call it a family farm, it was a family farm", expressing how it takes each family member to be involved for farming to be successful. Often when asked, the women confirmed they considered themselves a farmer, yet the roles seemingly the least complicated to claim were that of wife, mother, and daughter. Growing up on a farm, women become a participant in both the work and the lifestyle in many roles.

There were many more specific references to moms, sisters and daughters and how they participated on the farm and how they farmed. In one example, Carolyn insisted her daughters could do farm work. Robbie also recalled, “When I was 13, mom took me out in a John Deere 5020 and she was going to show me how to summer fallow.” Cecilie said, “My mom’s life was not easy. My mom. It was a lot of work for my mom. She cooked from the time she got up in the morning until she went to bed at night.” Women also talked about inclusion of their children in learning the lifestyle and they described the significance of their sons’ and daughters’ inclusion in farm business operations. Importantly, for some, their daughters’ inclusion was specifically campaigned for and encouraged, as mother's advocated for their daughters. This was exemplified by Carolyn telling other family members of her daughters’ capabilities to start running farm equipment or in the description of these women taking on the personal mentorship of their daughters in roles considered “non-traditional” for family farm women and girls. Jackie also noted the generational difference between herself and her daughter and the level of inclusion in the family farm.

Cohort 3

The emotions related by the youngest group of women held a familiar tone of feelings in relation to love, learning and lifestyle on a family farm. Often, they spoke from a more contemporary standpoint, and were somewhat less reflective, which is understandable as these women are currently living these experiences and just beginning to watch, imagine, and participate in the transfer of values to their own children. These women shared more about their education on and off the farm and their understandings and feelings about balancing off-farm work and money, with on-farm work, money and

children. Again, while specific words of love were used less by some of the women, the nuanced traces of love, commitment, loyalty, and fondness remained.

Jocelyn shared with me,

> I think raising a family in this environment is what I've always wanted to do, just the life lessons that it teaches you, hard work and dedication and knowing, persevering through hardships.

Danica was the youngest woman interviewed, still attending university when we spoke. She told about what it was like to grow up on a mixed farm in southeastern Alberta saying,

> Growing up on the farm was great. I feel like I had a lot more experience as that, well, I feel like I just had more freedom than kids in town. I don't know. We had a farm situated, we're down in like a coulee and there's a lower creek bed. I and my brothers were outside a lot, summer and winter, which I feel like sometimes town kids don't really get to take advantage of. Just the spaces. I wouldn't say a lot of the times we were safe now that I think of it, right? Yeah, we would go ice skating on our dug out. There was a great little creek that ran through, still runs through that we'd go swimming in. We had chores to do like at night just feeding the yearlings, which still goes on today as well. Then we were all in 4-H.

Danica noted the physicality of having a coulee and creek and the connection to how those spaces had provided opportunity to be with and play with her brothers, sometimes in potentially dangerous situations. Danica tied together the chores of her childhood years to chores that happen today on her farm. In reflecting on annual multi-family branding events, Danica smiled and said,

> It's the best time of the year. Everyone just gets together and you all help each other, and you go visit your neighbors and do the same thing and then all this great food at the end. It's just such a nice social gathering. So, yeah I love branding.

For Danica, the physical work of branding the calves was secondary to the sense of community and cooperation that came from these events. Leah, another young women

living off-farm at the time of interview, echoed Danica's sentiments in respect to feeling a farm was a great place to "be a kid" citing,

> I have a brother and a sister, and when I was growing up my dad was farming full time and my mom was a nurse. I did farm stuff as long as I can remember. I think it was great, because there was so much room to play and explore. I think it helps the relationship between my brother and me because we were the only kids for several miles. We had to learn to play with each other. Our cousins lived up the road, so that was really good. I think I was about nine when I started doing chores after school, just forking out hay for the steers.

For Leah it felt as though being the only other young person in the vicinity made her relationship with her brother stronger, resulting in them learning to appreciate each other. Their experiences were similar to other farm children, isolated together, but often with cousins living near enough to visit on occasion. Leah expanded her description of farm life as a child by including,

> Well, when I was a kid, she [Mom] was still working shift work at the hospital. Then I don't even remember what year, I think I was about 12 or 13, she started doing public health. I think just like, helping out as much as you can, so I always liked riding horses and working calves, so that was something I did a lot. Both my brother and I would do afternoon chores after school, so that would depend on who had other activities after school. If we were both home, we'd each do half. Definitely some, maybe not all the food prep, but food delivery. Started driving tractors and hay equipment when I was about 13.

A common link between the women, recounted too by Signe, was reminiscent of an ideal childhood as comprised of having the space and resources for building forts, riding bikes and having pets (sometimes doubling as production animals). The warm memories of childhood and comparatively standard family farm work practises were often linked closely together and Signe described her experience working and learning,

> I think as a kid there were just jobs we had to do. We had to feed our 4-H calves and we had to do the yard chores and help bed pens and haul manure or whatever the job was going on at the time. And then I think as you kind of work into the farm, you get your jobs that you just do. Like, I bale all the hay and I run the forage harvester and when we're doing chores I run the loader. It's just ... I don't

> know, it's just you kind of get to where that's your thing that you do . . . And I don't think it's really like ... it's like you are going to do this. I think you just kind of fall into your jobs that you may be like more or . . . [have a propensity for.]

As others had many times throughout the interviews, Signe described her perspective on how other family members work positions evolved, rationalizations of sort, why certain people find themselves in particular jobs on a family farm. The love of being a farmer for many women required carrying out the work you may have had a propensity toward as a farmer, traditional domestic and reproductive roles, and many times off-farm employment.

Signe expanded on how she was translating work practises to the next generation, saying, “I love having my girls on the farm and I like having ... being able to have my kids with me and not in daycare. I don't want to miss out on this first five years.” Having her girls with her on the farm meant for Signe that she could be a farmer as well as a mother with an enhanced active role in the first five years of her girls’ lives. Ricki, a farmer and young mother as well, shared Signe’s fervour and ambitions and also stressed her desire to spend time with her child by saying,

> I want to raise my own child. If I have to give up some things, I would definitely do that. To be able to have some of the life experiences that you have on a farm, some things live, some things die. To allow your kid to have those opportunities is huge, because it helps develop them as a person. And to be comfortable around the industry, and animals, and just things that you don't get in the city.

For Ricki, raising her daughter at her farm was worth making concessions if necessary. While recognizing the benefit of lessons learned and a lifestyle preference, Ricki also acknowledged pitfalls existed in the family farm work/life balance for her and explained,

> It is tough because you definitely have to divide yourself. I'm not one that likes to be the laundry, cleaner, cook-meals person. I'm one that likes to be actively involved in making the management decisions, and the working cows, because I like working cattle. And I made a point, Scarlet was on my back, we were

> processing cows, she was with us. I think that's important. I know I was actively involved when I was little with mom and dad. And I think it gives you a lot more appreciation and value for what the hard work that has to go into things. It's not easy, you do have to work hard and figure out where that balance is between life, and family, and cows, and business.

Confirming the choices are not always easy and recognizing someone has to do traditional gendered chores/duties, Ricki said she would still rather be a farmer. She enjoys being part of the management decision making process and working with cattle. Ricki also felt while her lifestyle was challenging, it was important to include her daughter in the same way her parents had included her in their family farm and family farm operations. Ricki continued by saying,

> I know the things that we discuss about how we really want our kids to be actively involved in the operations, not that you want them to be slave labor, but you want them to feel a sense of accomplishment in learning all those things. And not just be, "Hey get out of the way. You're in the way, you're causing ... we can't get it done fast enough . . . because not every job can you take your kids to. And this is what I do for a living, learn the trade, or learn the skillset. So I see the value in teaching them young, because they're able to learn those skills, their minds are much softer to absorb things."

Again, for Ricki the balancing act of being successful at your business, including your young children so they learn early a sense of work accomplishment, and feeling the value of being able to do that at her job as a farmer was important and meaningful.

Jocelyn talked retrospectively about what it was like for her as a girl growing up on her family farm.

> Growing up it's kind of you get more of the glamorous side of ranching, like you're helping with a few of the jobs but I'm still at school all day long, we showed cattle all summer, so we did lots of fun things associated with the purebred industry. So I mean, really good place to grow up, like very thankful for that.

Jocelyn also related her current perspective by saying,

> Now as a mother and a wife and a full-time working mom outside of the ranch, there are just so many different facets to this ranching gig that I didn't really know about. I've taken over all of the books and the registrations for the purebreds, paying all the bills. Travis also, he and I have a separate company for the commercial cattle, so there are a couple different companies that we're balancing here. So I do a lot of the office stuff and when we have big days on the ranch, like preg checking and weaning and those kind of major days, I do my best to take time off work or when I was on maternity leave, lining up someone to watch the kids.

As time has passed Jocelyn's viewpoint has expanded to include the work that is difficult to anticipate, mentioning just a few of the jobs she has/had on the ranch as an adult as well as balancing her teaching job and children. For her, while family ranching is recognized as demanding and complex, it boiled down to something her and her husband wanted for the lifestyle and family,

> "But then we were like why did we want to do this? And it's what we grew up with, it's the lifestyle we wanted for our kids. Yes, it's like a blind determination to keep going and sometimes why? It is hard to pinpoint exactly why we do these things. I think raising a family in this environment is what I've always wanted to do, just the life lessons that it teaches you, hard work and dedication and knowing, persevering through hardships. And so those are skills that I don't think come naturally in other environments. And like working cohesively as a family and always being together, like for every Christmas we never have to worry about being apart, aside from feeding the cows in the morning. So it's a family thing, for sure, for me and for Travis.

Larei was one of two women interviewed who did not grow up on a family farm. She explained how she came to live on a farm.

> One of his, he loves the land, so. And that's how it started. I moved out there because I loved him and he loved the land. Obviously I've grown into loving it as well. The lifestyle. I love the lifestyle, but some days, yeah.

Larei described how her husband loved to be on a farm and her love for him was what took her to live on a farm. She further noted the connection between love and lifestyle,

> My husband, who loves farming and loves, the lifestyle is blessed, and also we're blessed because we love the lifestyle up there and to have had that opportunity. I do feel like there's something to be said for the farm lifestyle. And we're kind of

> trapped out there. My kids, their friends are their siblings. Just the value of family also is emphasized. Even just hard work. They see how much work goes in.

As Lori-Anne observes below, her experience on the front line as a little girl were familiar and expressed like many of the other women as welcome memories of family time and family learning:

> . . . and we just do whatever she's doing, right? If it's making supper and taking it to the fields, that's what we're doing too. If it's cutting the grass, we're out as well. It just seemed like we never didn't have parents around, right? They could flex that time. And I remember being really little and I asked mom about this to make sure it wasn't my imagination, because I remember being really little and it feeling like the middle of the night and being bundled up and taken down to pull a calf that needed to be pulled. And I thought, "Did you really take us down there?" And she's like, "Yep, yeah. If we both needed to go, then we'd just take you guys.", and being set up on a fence or a shelf and being just, "Be quiet and stay there." kind of thing. That all felt just totally normal. And now I realize, that's really fortunate, you're absorbing so much information, and experiencing so much, and connecting with your family and other creatures.

Lori Ann said her recollections were always of having her parents around regardless of what was happening. She recalled another learning moment,

> Dad said to us, very clearly, and again my recollection is Dad, that said very clearly, "If you do this, you will have to absolutely love it because." ... basically what I took from it is almost, there's no other reason to do it. You're not going to make any money, you're going to have so many worries, and it's going to be work all the time, very stressful some or all of the time, depending on your personality I guess. But it is amazing, if you want to do it, if that's what you really want, then absolutely do it. And I would have absolutely done it, if I had a partner in the right timeframe to do it.

In this cohort there were memories and loves for working together as families and sometimes with other families in the community. Similar to the other cohorts, Cohort 3 women talked about early happy memories growing up on the farm and remembering that their hopes were to raise a family in familiar circumstances. Some now have young families of their own and are actively farming and hoping to pass on the opportunities they see in family farms and the ideals they hold in their hearts. There was recognition of

the difficulties and rewards of working and raising a family in that work environment. In comparison to other cohorts, there was more inclusion of women and girls in their stories and a broader range of work roles acknowledged. While some were fully immersed in traditional social roles of mother, daughter, sister, they were farmers too and see themselves as such. They often also worked off-farm. It appeared for this cohort that the family farm lifestyle and a love for what you do was a driving force outweighing the negatives of choosing to work on and in a family farm.

Love of Legacy

As the women talked about their family farm legacies, they included numerous varied yet familiar stories about foundation farms and the current farms they lived on or to which they remain connected. While historically there are examples of farmers literally dying with their boots on, the more common practice is to sell one's farmland or negotiate how to pass the family farmland, home and business assets to the next generation.

On one hand, this passing on of the family farmland and assets can be understood as a legacy that is a straightforward gift of property or money shifted from one generation to the next, an often matter of fact and taken-for-granted process. However, with some scrutiny, a family farm legacy may also be considered far more encompassing and complicated. A family farm legacy is a complex construct holding multi-layered tangibles and intangibles difficult to separate from one another. Legacy itself, while rooted in the past, also leaves marks on the future as it encompasses why and how a lifetime of farming/ranching has mattered and how someone's life is remembered. Privileges, responsibilities, or tribulations – perhaps all three – are intertwined within decisions

about who is given, or not given, special legacy status because of a familial relationship. Each inimitable legacy, material or non-material which is passed to a family member directly impacts each individual's circumstance and all future generations of family. Importantly, even though it is deeply personal, a family farm/ranch legacy is certainly of no one person's invention.

Cohort 1

Glenda was raised on a family farm and although she did not farm for a living as an adult, her heart had stayed with the land she eventually received through inheritance. She explained,

> I mean that's kind of ingrained in you, from back [previous time]. You knew what your grandfather went through to have the land, and then, what your parents went through and you saw, like there was tough years. Some years there was maybe $900 to get through the winter, - and that was food and whatever. There's a bond to the family farm. It's just there. It's just one of those things.

Glenda expanded on how she understood her bond with the farm, saying,

> I still don't think of it [her farm] - it's not just a money thing like, "Oh, we can sell this." I haven't got there yet and I won't sell it in my lifetime. I appreciate what my parents did for me. We didn't have it to begin with, and now, we do. It's kind of just passed down to keep care. There are financial benefits, but some years, maybe there won't be.

Even though she inherited the land when past the prospect of going farming, she still did not see the land as a cash asset but rather a gift and felt the whole point of having family farmland would be missed if she did not "keep care" of it. While Glenda and her own immediate family now rent the land to others, she still felt a responsibility and spoke with a tone of care and commitment to keeping the farm in the family and respecting what she felt was her family's legacy. It bothered Glenda that while her brother had originally received access to the family land to become a farmer she had not. She said her son

would have loved an opportunity to farm, noting, “If we had more land, I think Warren would become a farmer. He loves the farm. There's not enough.”

Joan also spoke to the importance of the history of keeping the land in the family and the monetary and affective investments over the generations as she commented,

> Oh, I find it very important [the history]. I'm very proud that we can say we have 5th generation Hughson's, still on the place. The place has been in the Hughson name, since 1910. Grandpa homesteaded and he sold it to JM. JM sold it to Darrel, and then I inherited, and the boys will get it, or they've got some of it now.

Joan was proud of the line of succession of 5 generations on her late husband’s paternal side of her family farm. For her, holding onto the family ranch was a source of deep pride, a legacy of family ranch ownership from one generation to the next. In a personal sense, Joan felt pride in her investment of labor, physical and emotional. She went on to describe the current situation on her ranch,

> Vane got this, right here. This is in Vane's name, so yeah. I'm very proud of it. Proud of what the family has done, and the history, and to keep it all going, because that took a lot of work. Struggling, to make ends meet and keep it going. I know it did, for me. I think it did for Grandpa Hughson, back in the early days too, in the 30s, it wasn't easy then.

Joan also noted the struggle and the financial pressures felt by family farmers that came before her, recognizing herself as well. Because she lived through her own times of struggle and toil, she also felt a bond and sensed she could relate to previous generations, knowing first-hand it was hard work to farm and ranch then, as it is now. She was proud of ensuring her sons Vane (and Clark), were part of the 5th generation of Hughson’s farming and ranching since 1910 on the same land as their progenitors.

Similar to Joan, Shanee had a formal family farm succession plan in place for her farm’s material assets. Shanee added in her legacy experience how ill health had, to

some extent, changed how she felt about passing on the family farm especially in respect to trying to keep things equal among family members.

> Okay, yes, the family succession plan is in place, and it's especially important to us, but it is challenging to keep things equal when one son farms and has children and the other son has no children and works off the farm. The emotions, at first, are hard to let go of things, but sickness changed all that. Sickness changes all that, second chances at health changes your perspective on things, material things come second to the happiness of your family and their safety and their health.

Shanee was aware of the hardship in letting go of the physical land and assets, but also the personal emotional struggle of stepping back from one's life's work and identity as a farmer and asking herself how she will be remembered.

There was a generational ideology about selling the family land and Shanee used this analogy to describe one way land ownership is viewed, "…concerns about selling the land in future generations, as long as you have the chicken, you have the eggs. But once the chicken is sold, the dollars are spent. There are no more dollars." Using this analogy, Shanee expressed how she believed once the land was sold (the source of production), the money would be spent (on depreciating assets) and not only was there no land, no equity (no chickens), there was no equitable way to earn a living. The family farm business legacy would be gone if the land were sold hence too, the ability to learn to be a farmer, teaching farming or profiting from being a landowner would be forever gone. She followed with another comment about land ownership and the importance of kinship [blood/marital relationships] by saying,

> Kinship, [it is] most important to have good relationships [with kin]. Ideas must be shared and issues expressed openly and honestly, we must accept the dreams and hopes of all parties and embrace the in-laws with the understanding that the family farmland may not be their love as it was ours.

So, while being concerned how future owners of her family farm may be more interested in cash than farmland, Shanee also understood it was important to keep an open mind about other family members and understand "the family farmland may not be their love as it was ours." I felt Shanee realized not everyone in her immediate family shared her love of family farmland and farming and that this was particularly important to recognize in forming a legacy of land.

Pat related her attitude about her foundation farm inheritance story and her parent's fairness by saying,

> I think Mom and Dad's will was the fairest I've seen for country people. Four kids, two boys, two girls. The boys got thirty percent and the girls got twenty. But you weren't cut out as some others were [women and girls], which I thought was pretty fair. But everything was held in trust until you were 25, which was also a smart thing to do. Dad died in 1960. I would have been, well I was born in '48 so I was 11. I would have given it all away. Having it in trust till I was 25 was a good thing to do.

Pat had worked with many family farms as an accredited land consultant and as such had witnessed many scenarios of the different type of family farmland and personal legacies play out over time witnessing first-hand, the sale of land in order to settle family farm estates. She reflected on her parents' approach to the farmland legacy – Pat and her sister were not cut out of land inheritance completely, as were others [women], and considering historical practices, she considered it "pretty fair" that her and her sister were not totally excluded from the legacy of intergenerational family farmland ownership.

In Emma's case, while living in the same community for many years, Emma had moved to a few different farms and farmyards in her life as a farmer. At the time of the interview she was in the process of leaving her farm home to move to town; making way for the next generation of land owners and farmers in her family. She described one of

her earlier farmyard/home moves; the move had marked a beginning for her son in becoming a farmer with land of his own.

> Well, obviously ... transfer [of land] is much easier if it is within the kin, because I remember the day I left where we had raised our children, and I cooked for five hired men, and washed their dirty clothes, and baked bread twice a day, and all of those things. When I left that place with my last load of stuff, tears weren't just running down my face. I was sobbing. Just absolutely shaking and sobbing. And I got to the main road and I thought, what's the matter with you? Doug is coming here, he loves farming and ranching. His wife loves farming and ranching. This is where he grew up. It's important that he carries it on, and passes it on, passes that love onto his children.

For Emma, leaving the farmyard where so much of her life and life's work had been invested had been almost unbearable. She reconciled that this would be how her son would be able to "pass on the love to his children" – through Emma, taking the last load of her stuff – down the road. Emma also talked about another physical move saying with a sigh,

> And then it became easier. I didn't have that connection with the other ranch, because I had never lived there. However, now I'm finding in leaving where we lived the last 24 years, am I having a difficult time? Yeah, I am. Because that's where I had all those wonderful times with my grandkids, I worked and raised a beautiful bunch of trees around, and had, well not a beautiful yard, because you don't have the water to have it out there. You keep the grass and that mowed. But, mostly I think of the times I had with the kids, and the times I spent with my family there.

Emma ended by saying,

> [I think of] my mother and dad, and the Hungarian sausage making days, and the cabbage rolls making days where we would end up with 30-40 people at night for supper, and practically eat all the cabbage rolls. And the pie making days, and the dill pickle making days. I get thinking about that, and I think, well you know, that's living in the past. My grandson is going there. He'll be raising his family there, I hope. And I'm not one to like to live in the past, because the past is over and done with. I think as long as I see the love and the commitment to the land, and family, I can move on.

As lifetimes go, Emma had collected many fond memories from her life living on a farm. Albeit, many of her personal traditions are a thing of the past, they are part of Emma and her sense of what it was like to be a farm woman. She sees herself as making her mark, Emma's legacy, as a designer and maintainer of her generations of family and family farms, but now it is time for her grandson to have the same type of opportunities she had enjoyed, loved as a farmer. For Emma, if she can see the love for the land and love for family, her legacy felt secure and she is able to move on (as required).

A common thread in the women's stories of legacy connected a nuance of having been the one responsible for land holding and the one committed to indemnify all the legacies of family farmland ownership and succession. There were normative standards of passing on a family farm to male family members, considerations of the importance of in-laws sharing the love/or not, ideals of fairness in legacy – sometimes partially dismantling historical standards of inheritance. Along with this there were other descriptive recollections of legacies that maintained and perpetuated the dominant traditions of family farms. In this cohort if not stated overtly, it is a shared understanding, if you inherit land you don't sell land, as you will always be better off financially (and emotionally) in comparison to selling land and turning it to cash in addition to not becoming the "destructor" of a family farm legacy disregarding traditional legacy practises. Love and the women's legacies were contained in kinship and a hope for seeing the love in the family farm's care and continuation.

Cohort 2

In many ways, the women of Cohort 1 considered their work for family farm legacies as done and their mark has having been made. For Cohort 2, the interviews

coincided with a more active stage of planning or processing a legacy of land and farming for their families. Members of Cohort 2 also spoke to many of the personal, relational complexities of legacies of family farmland, the intricacies, and the complications of family farm love. Complications of love and devotion, complications of work and money and the complexities of the history a family farm can carry, and its reflection onto decision making as to the future of the farm and the farm's legacy. This group's family farms were often still in the throes of change and turmoil; legacies were being examined and reconciled.

One woman began a part of her family farm legacy by describing generational relationships to shed light on how a legacy had developed on her husband's family farm and said,

> So Gary and his mom … Gary and his sister don't have a relationship. They were kind of pit against each other. You were valued when you were successful. As opposed to [being] valued for who you were. Then grandma and Gary were very close. When grandma wanted to leave her land wealth to Gary, and he said, "No, that's not right. You need to leave it to dad." That's what happened.

In giving context to how her father-in-law came to be a land owner she did so by explaining family rapport. She continued to summarize the emotional, relational and practical events many, many decades later,

> Then when it came down to the nut cutting and Art [Gary's father] had … you know they had had conversations, well then he really struggled with succession. He came to the point where he almost … he told me, "I hate my kids. I wish they were never born." He was so frustrated. What he was really saying is, "I'm not prepared to make this decision. I don't know how." That's how it came out. It was at the post office. I said, "You get in your truck and you get down to our house right now. We're going to deal with this." We've had some really tough conversations, but there had never been any conversations because Edith [Art's wife] had died, Art was on his own. He really didn't know what he wanted to do. He kind of did, but he didn't have a sounding board and his kids didn't get along.

She continued she had pushed her father-in-law to deal with the emotional baggage that had developed from the decision-making of the intergenerational transfer of his family farm and acknowledge the tough emotional strain he was experiencing. As the land ownership discussion continued in the family, she commented on how these decisions would affect her and her livelihood by saying,

> I said, "You guys just go figure it out. I am just Gary's wife. Do I want to protect interest for my family? Yes, but whatever you guys decide … First of all, Art, it is your wealth. It was your dad's wealth, or step-dad's wealth, and he transferred it to you. You helped earn grandpa's wealth. He transferred it to you. Gary helped you, so what's going to happen? We need to know." I'm not going to go buy a tractor that's X amount of dollars if I'm not going to have a land base, right?

She spoke to struggles with fairness, more egalitarian resolutions and compensation, and the "fairness" of love and breaking of tradition. Who decides what is fair?

Later, after Gary's father's land legacy was decided she said,

> Gary was very, very, very angry over the whole thing. I said, "Look dude, you tell me anybody else that you know of that just got gifted a million dollars. You need to change your outlook and quit being selfish and quit being back in that old paradigm of competing with your sister. So what? Let's do the best we can with what we've got. Let's make it something that our kids can succeed with. I said, "You can't take it with you. If helping them get organized …" I said, "What a better gift to watch your kids succeed.

For this women there was an explicit and implicit understanding this process was a father's decision to make. Then her generation would aim forward and do what they could to make the next generational shift a success and be able to watch her own children succeed.

Carolynn also had wishes for her children to be successful in family farming and said,

> There are three of them [daughters]. It's complicated. I would love for Rosie and Roberta to be more involved in the business. My other partners are not as enthusiastic.

She said she would love for all her daughters, Roberta and Rosie and Jocelyn, to be involved in her family ranching business but that other family members, immediate and arm's length, were not as keen on the inclusion that may have been complicated somewhat by moving the family farm to a different province to combine forces with a new son-in-law and his family farming. By way of explanation Carolyn continued,

> It's not going to happen. There's no way that Roberta or Rosie would end up being involved in this business. It's just not happening. I've figured that's that. That's how it is. We'll move on from there. Some things are hills worth dying on and some are not. Rosie is in Wichita. Roberta is in Qualicum Beach. They're not around.

The fight for full inclusion of her daughters was a hill that Carolyn did not think she wanted to die on. Her non-farming daughters, Roberta and Rosie were well established in other lives and livelihoods. A family relationship with her brother-in-law Doran and nephew (Brant) was also still part of Carolyn's legacy and she related,

> The place in Lethbridge, we are moving heaven and earth to make sure that we don't screw that up for Doran. Doran's hope and wish is that he gets to keep farming and that his son gets to keep farming and that his grandchildren will farm. And their grandchildren. It's very important to Doran.

The original family farm in Lethbridge is still connected to Carolyn and she doesn't want her decisions to interfere with her brother-in-law's success and his wishes for future generations to farm the family farm.

> We [Carolyn and her husband] understand that our connection with Brant and Doran is very strong. If we don't get this straightened out before we're dead, Roberta, and Rosie don't have a connection with Brant [Doran's son]. They are cousins. They never worked together much. They did a little bit, but never made decisions together, never relied on each other, like Byron and I did. We want to make sure that that situation in Lethbridge has been dealt with to the best that we can possibly deal with before it's too late, before we're run over by a bus.

Carolyn is anxious to deal with these ownership issues, before anything were to happen,

confirming her wish for her brother-in-law and nephew to farm the family land, saying "The last person on this earth I want to disadvantage is Doran. The second last person I want to disadvantage is Brant. We went through a lot together."

Robbie echoed ideals comparable to Carolyn about the desire to secure family farm legacies. Robbie said,

> Kinship is important. I would far rather see my land go to a family member when that farm that I loved so much, that when I first started out, that actually belonged to my uncle and then when he passed and his wife passed, then the son and the daughter have it. They parted that out and subdivided and that's where my nephew is. And I'm thrilled that it's my nephew. I'm thrilled that Brandon is there because I wouldn't want anybody else there. It's a beautiful yard, I mean I wish I was there, but I already have a place to live, and I'm thrilled that it's him. So kinship is important. And emotions that are attached to that, you bet. You love your family and you're happy to see them succeed and once again I know what this life offers and I'm happy that Brandon [nephew] is going be able to have the joy that I did if he chooses.

Clearly it is difficult for the decision-makers on a family farm to decide who qualifies as a future farmer and who does not. But, mixed with concerns of the financial viability and the incentives to continue the farming operation into the future can be put into jeopardy if a base (source of wealth) is diminished (part fact, part rationalization), and there is risk that comes with the love and the hope for success.

Shari noted the influences of her father's approach to decision-making,

> My father, first of all, had a rule that in order to own the land, you must live and work on the farm, and we grew up with that. And so it was not a surprise to us when it came time to developing a succession plan. And then the other rule that my dad had is, "It all depends on who you marry," right? And, because I know for him, to move out here as a single person, male or female, would be very difficult. Because he saw this as, you know, a team event, you know? A family event. Because we are so remote and if you didn't have family, if you didn't have someone, you know, a spouse to rely on, this, chances of success would be very difficult. Now I know that are, maybe not current attitudes. But that was what his attitude was. So those were the two rules.

Shari said her father expected future landowners to live and work on the ranch and rule number one was common knowledge among family members. The other imperative was based on who one decided to marry – who you loved. Shari spoke about who in her family actively ranched and in her descriptions of family ranch participation, included some of a conversation she had with her sister regarding family land saying,

> And so I asked her, I said, you know, "Do you feel like you were treated fairly?" Or, "How come you, you know, aren't mad at me, that I got land and you didn't?" Basically, this is how I think the conversation went. And she said, you know, "It was because we were raised differently. We weren't raised with the thought of 'monetary value is the most important thing in life'. And so she says, "I don't have any resentment because", she says, "I know that if I had the same amount of land that you guys inherited, you know, just to have my name on land, that would cripple the operations outfit. And that wouldn't be fair to you guys."
> .

This cohort was more descriptive of interpersonal relationships within their experience of transition and farm legacies of land. Their candour revealed thorny family dynamics playing out over generations while also demonstrating deep commitment to and appreciation of those around them, clearly working to understand how their legacies were developing in parallel with understanding ongoing shifting within their own farms and farms they were akin to.

Cohort 3

For many of Cohort 3, they too were occupied, immersed emotionally and practically with a family farm legacy. In varying degrees of embeddedness these women were contending with, in a monetary and emotional sense, at least one family farm legacy. Many were still tied to more than one previous generation of farmers. While Cohort 1 and 2 had largely left behind the circumstance of their foundation farms, these younger Cohort 3 women were in the midst of current transitions from their foundation farms, the transition of the generation of farmers. Sometimes the descriptions of the

context of their farming conditions were laced with anxiety and negative imagining of the future of farming. Some were becoming more rooted in their foundation farms by carrying on the legacy of becoming farmers or ranchers in their own right. Some were examining their most likely inevitable departure from their foundational family farm, acknowledging there was a good chance they would not be farmers. Love and devotion directed toward different family farm members and the farms themselves continued as a theme.

Jocelyn talked about the transition of being a daughter on a family farm and then choosing to become a rancher.

> Yeah, so we talk about this quite a bit, why did we decide to do this? We were like why did we want to do this? And it's what we grew up with, it's the lifestyle we wanted for our kids. So we do these things, we make these sacrifices for the next generation, that's kind of ... Like it's enjoyable for us, it's what we know, we love cows, but yeah, we have kids now and that really solidified that as soon as our son Nash was old enough to really grasp kind of what was going on here and see how much he loves it. That's why we're here. You do it for your kids, for sure. And it is a legacy type of thing but you want to be able to provide something lasting for generations to come.

Jocelyn and her husband are both well-educated and had other good career choices in place to earn a living and she said they have talked a lot about their decision to ranch, to create a legacy that lasts for generations to come. Jocelyn also recognized a range of emotions in describing part of the legacy planning with her parents saying,

> It's just a range of emotion; I think the hardest thing for me was going from a relationship with mom and dad as just they're my parents, that's all, like what was our relationship, to now business owners with them. And it's a totally different side that you all have to see, you learn kind of what their strategies are and if they don't mesh with yours, it can get a little intense at times. So, yeah, and I mean it's been really exciting at times, for sure, it's been everything. It's such a roller coaster. Which is why we love to just get it all written out and done and then I feel like the roller coaster could end and maybe you could go back to that relationship of just parents and daughter type of deal because, yeah, it's totally different. And mom started doing the books and the registration when we got here

> and then trying to take that over and find my place in the company and then her find her place and yeah, it's interesting, to say the least.

For Jocelyn there was a significant difference between her relationships with her parents as a daughter in comparison to a business relationship as a rancher. Alluding to some emotional tensions, Jocelyn felt that for her and her mother, finding their place in the new ranching business was "…interesting, to say the least."

Signe had also experienced complicated emotions while both sides of her family positioned themselves in the families' farm legacies, and she seemed to feel she had many people to consider and be responsible to; including her own young family. Signe told me how much she missed her mom and her mom's influence on decision making, and how she had supported Signe in her work on their family farm.

> "I miss my Mom terribly. My Mom and I were a team. Like, my Dad's not a fantastic manager and I've pretty much been managing the farm for probably 10 years. Financially and getting the work done too. When I wanted to change things, I would go and talk to my Mom and then we'd talk to my Dad about it and she was, 90% of the time, on board with me.

Signe paused, taking a breath, but then continued to explain her circumstance,

> Dad has a new girlfriend that's not ... well, she hates the farm and doesn't want to live in the sticks and hates ... so that's been very difficult to me. Because my Dad and I have been a team, too.

As Signe understood and expressed, there is love for a family farm and sometimes there is just the opposite. Signe pointed out that without her mom, it feels to her that not only is a sense of support gone, but other roadblocks have been put in place threatening the future of her farm. She added,

> We've been talking a lot about it this winter and I would dearly love for him to put my name on the land because I'm supposed to inherit the land and my sister and brother get the proceeds of the cattle sale and whatever money he has put away. It would offer me, especially with this woman coming in; it would give me some peace of mind.

Signe is hopeful to gain some security by having confirmation of her family land legacy and said it would give her some peace of mind. She is also already considering the generation that will follow her as farmers as well,

> And if my girls don't want to farm, that's fine and I would be more than happy. I, with Sharon [Signe's sister] and Lavern living in the farm yard, her kids were with me all the time and I'm very close with her kids. And if her boys want to farm, I really would love to help them if my girls don't want to. I really love her kids. My sister always worked [off farm] and my mom looked after them so they came with us all the time. And so they've been a big part of my life and I ... and I would love to help them if they really want to farm.

Signe said she is okay with the idea that her girls may not be interesting in farming for a vocation and said she was also very close to her nephews who grew up in the family farmyard.

Family farm legacies are fraught with concepts of fairness and equity. The question is often raised by family farm members, active farmers and scrutinized; are all members of the family treated fairly and equally? How do you treat the next generation (and all the others) fairly and equally? In this research these questions encompassed ideals of opportunity. Understanding the fairness and equity in monetary legacies begins with opportunities to learn to be a farmer. In a reflection on a question about equality, Leah noted,

> I think yes and no. I feel like I always remember my dad coming in when Evan and I were home, and he'd be like, "I need someone to come help me," so equal opportunity. I would often be baking already, I'm like, and well, I can't go. Doing something else. Equal opportunity, but not necessarily uptake, I guess.

Leah thought in one sense she was offered opportunity by her dad to help out and be involved in learning how to be a farmer, in another sense it wasn't an opportunity at all

because there was a prioritization of her traditional female role as a food provider. Along the same vain Danica had said,

> My dad has my brothers. They helped. There's honestly not really enough for me to do. I always feel frustrated, because I think there's more I could be doing, but I don't know how they things break down and I'm like, "I don't know how to fix that." I'd feel more frustrated than anything." Yeah, when I was growing up, I don't know, as a daughter with two older brothers, I can't really say that I wasn't interested in the farm, but now I feel like I'm more interested than I was when I was younger.

In reference to the hands-on physical farming Danica's older brothers had helped her Dad and now she can feel frustrated because she did not learn the same things as her brothers. Danica also responded to the fair and equitable question with this response,

> Fair/equal. Growing up, you know what? I would say I'd been treated fairly. If I would've showing more interest in the farm, I think I definitely would have been treated differently, I think than I have with the farm. My parents, I don't know, they don't ... I wanted to figure out how to put this into words, is I never showed I think enough interest in the farm to warrant being treated fairly, I feel in how it should be divided out. Because I've heard from my parents' own mouths than being like, "Well no, we should be dividing this equally." And to that, frankly I say bullshit. I don't believe that. I think Tanner has worked the most for it. I think he's put the most money into it. I think he's the one that could most successfully run the farm.

She thought she had been treated fairly on her family farm and had she displayed more of an interest in farming she would have been treated differently. Her parents have indicated they feel they should be dividing the family farm assets equally and Danica doesn't agree with them and feels her brother has invested the most and has the best chance of being successful in preserving the farm's legacy. She said, "I don't want our family to fight or us kids to all hate each other just over money or land. It's not worth it to be… [My first priority is that it] stays in the family." She concluded her thoughts by saying,

> That's the thing. I'm not going to split it to sink it, kind of thing. Yeah, the most important part of it to me is it just stays in the family and it stays as a whole.

> Yeah. So, but yeah fair and equal. Yeah, I think that would be fair. I don't really think in terms of equal on that, I think in terms of fairness.

While still young women and in the early stages of beginning life on their own family farms, Cohort 3 expressed love, a consciousness, and concern for the maintenance of something meaningful and viable for the generations to come. Tradition loomed large and family love diffused resentments over monetary gains. Tensions in interpersonal relationships, alignments with mothers and with brothers were discussed. Traditional roles were upheld; a willingness to do whatever it takes to safeguard family farms staying fiscally viable and ownership within the family. In many cases, women and girls stand down and make personal and material sacrifices so as not to be a disrupter to the family farm succession legacy and to family relations. There was more analysis of (conscious/unconscious) of normative gender roles by being a female primary operator and by considering girls roles and opportunities to become farmers.

The women interviewed left no doubt as to the love of their farm land, love of their lifestyle on the land and how their love committed them to the land, to the history and future of family and family land through concepts of legacy. The love of family farming was summed as Signe described, “I guess farming is in my blood. I grew up on the farm. I love the farm. I love being outside with the animals and growing things. I guess, it's just, I guess, part of me,” an internalized a part of who she is. This complexity of self, shared by the women compounds for women and girls the view of and response to questions about land ownership and who will be future farmers, future land owners. Internalized attitudes and affective notions, as in the example of love, may leave women questioning their own legitimacy of being a farmer, or other women’s rightfulness to qualify as farm land owners. In turn these internalized views directly influence outcomes

in the intergenerational transfer of a family farm and control of arable land. Closely tied to an internalized view of self and how we are viewed by others is this idea of love, the way we talk about love, and act because of love and is reflected in how women participate and are represented historically and presently in agriculture culture and society.

Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions

In Chapter 1, I wrote about a revelation of sorts, realizing I had been asking feminist questions throughout my life, but had never understood them as such. Another eye-opening occurrence for me was coming to an understanding of why I had become so tired/agitated by prevalent media representations of the family farm. Family farm mailboxes overflow daily with agricultural publications; publications designed for men who farm, about men who farm. Appendix 2 is a typical example of the advertisements included in these publications and portrays a clear statement about family farms and their legacy across generations of males.

Common in agricultural print media, advertisements like this offer powerful visual and discursive instruction to viewers about not only who belongs in the picture but also signaling where the people in the picture belong within the farm business hierarchy. Visual representations of family farms are also often laden with emotion and inspire affective responses. I now understand these far-too-common images as powerful discursive representations, creating a rarely-questioned constitution of meaning, telling the reader - "This is what a family farm looks like" - a straightforward contradiction to the realities of family farms and the interview data.

While the flagrant misrepresentation - the historical absence of women - is insulting to me, given my personal feelings about my own investments – productive, reproductive, domestic, emotional – in a family farm, it also represents (and herein lies the problem) much of the love I and the women I interviewed hold for our family farms. I decided to ask other women how they felt about this media representation of generational

farm men. I asked the women I interviewed to tell me what came to mind when they saw this type of advertisement, and what it meant to them. Edith said,

> Of course. Well, there are all men. And it's generations of all men; it looks like, because there's a little ... a wee one here. Yeah, it's all men … It's all men. It's very intergenerational, it looks like, men, and I'm thinking how many women drive the combines or drive the grain trucks."

Another participant's response demonstrates a different interpretation and juxtaposition as follows,

> Pride in what you're doing. And what a commitment. You know, when you see the generations ... the commitment … And just the strength and the commitment to what you're doing. Hey, I'm doing the right thing, and it's passed on from generation to generation. It just ... almost brings tears to your eyes when you think about it, and I think about my grandfather and what he had. I can still see him bouncing on that old binder, and going, and then my father bounced on a binder too, when I think of it. ... sometimes you wonder why you worked so hard, but like I say, it's all commitment and pride in what you do.

These pictures, in keeping with the laws of primogeniture, could be interpreted as a symbolic and discursive image of gendered intergenerational family farm business where norms and conventions of discourse suggest no women are relevant to the intergenerational farm representation. The pictures communicate to women and men that "men are talking" and, further, that this particular conversation does not need or include women. In addition, Hall's (1996) idea of crystallization is demonstrated as the image shows how prior concepts and language have solidified the meaning of "family farm." Powerful representations like these encourage people to view and understand things in a particular way – as in the example of the interviewed participant when commenting on the image sees the pride and commitment intergenerationally. In these constructions of the family farm, women either do not exist or are missing in action.

In reference to the fold-out advertisement Jackie said,

> When I see that, I think that, a young woman would think, I can't do that. There's no place for me in that. How would I fit in? I think about all the women that I know, that drive combines all night long, and they're missing in that picture, invisible.

Carolyn when asked added, “Oh boy. There's a propagation of a myth, isn't there? That's frustrating.” Danica, the youngest interview participant said,

> “Yeah, well 20 bucks if this was a regular family farm the woman is driving one of those. Yeah, wow that's a lot of dudes. Oh, yeah this type of advertising is totally familiar. Yeah, it's a lot of guys. Now, you're seeing a little bit more sometimes, [more women and girls] but sometimes I'm wondering if they're just throwing them on there as a token.”

I interjected, I noticed one, I said, "Oh, there's a girl," but then she was holding a pad of paper and a pen. Danica shrugged, “Great, she's a secretary.”

One participant suggests that women have no place in this type of pictorial representation and questioned where they fit in given that they are invisible. While Carolyn recognized the picture as perpetuating a farming myth that depicts only men as “outstanding in their fields,” Danica’s interpretation included the recognition of the women combine drivers as completely missing. Women were replaced with “a lot of dudes” and she also questioned if it is tokenism when women are included.

In the advertisement women and girls are not visibly represented, they are in effect made invisible. Their love and care for their family farm is erased. The picture contributes to a discourse bringing together admirable and sentimental qualities while defining gender difference and exclusions without apologies. This historical discourse tells us who we are and that the work we do is important (or not). Through analysis of iterative discursive practises constituted and performed in family farm succession planning over time, over history, the structures and practices that are both detrimental to,

and enhance, family farm planning are identified and can be challenged, supported and optimized. Considering discourse as historical, with discursive practices holding threads of history, makes the analyzing of visual images like this useful to challenge intergenerational historical traditions and the changing effects over time.

Family farm values and shared beliefs travel discursively through time, carried through generations largely remaining unchanged or unchallenged as dominant discourses. However, in my research, some women's responses did challenge dominant discourses, and recognized the inequalities women and girls experience within systems of power and knowledge. These responses push back against gendered historical assumptions. For Emma, from Cohort 1, the oldest child and only daughter in her foundational farm family, she experienced a revelation of sorts. She described a personal shift in her understanding of traditional of gender roles and privilege, and how she felt these notions travelled with her father from the "old country", saying,

> Let's see ... I guess I always questioned, and like I said, when I went to Hungary, I learned to understand a lot of things that I didn't when I was growing up, and I always call it the old European mentality. And I will never forget after my oldest brother passed away, we were sitting in a room visiting with some friends of my parents, and my father made the statement, our oldest child died. And I'm thinking, what am I? Am I duck soup or what? And I guess I had trouble with that, did I have emotion, I knew my dad loved me."

I interpreted Emma's growing understanding of the "old European mentality" as her learning that it was common practice to disregard women. Though Emma said she knew her father loved her, she felt hurt that he did not recognize her as their first child because she was not a son. She continued by saying,

> "But, it was the hardest thing for him to ... no, I won't say respect me, that's the wrong word. To appreciate what I did in life, because I'm a carbon copy of my father. I'm very community committed. None of my brothers are. They couldn't care less about the community or what happens, and I always have been. I'm very

> political, which none of my brothers are. My dad was. My dad told me once that I should not be the one who's on county council; it should be my oldest brother."

Despite their similarities, Emma felt that her father undervalued her, thinking of his sons as the primary benefactors although, as her comments reflect, they did not share the same values, and her father often disregarded or even criticized Emma and her achievements. The taken-for-granted traditional discourse of primogeniture clearly played a significant role in how Emma's father understood and treated her; diminishing her capacity to be accomplished or bear authority.

Leah, a member of Cohort 3, when speaking about gender and family relations and common farm practices noted,

> Well, we're talking about brandings, and I always just hold this up as the example of exactly what I think happens, certainly in my family. Okay, so there's my mom and dad and me, and my uncle and his daughter, and another cousin, male cousin. We got finished processing our cows, came in for a break and something to eat, and the men sit on the patio, and the women go get the food. I got with (inside with the other women preparing) the food and I was like, you have got to be kidding me! We've all been out there since five in the morning."

Discourse carries both the words and the values and sentiments of one generation to the next. Emma and Leah, Jackie, Danica and Carolyn all question the legitimacy of the gendered discourse. By doing so, they work to disrupt common assumptions about family farm life and gendered relations. Dominant, often unquestioned, family farm discourse can operate outside of personal consciousness, in effect a reproduction of gendered social norms.

Older cohorts of farm women were unable to identify as farmers on the Census Canada form, as there were no categories other than sole operator (Wiebe, 1995) Not until 1991 did the Census survey include the opportunity for farm women to include or identify themselves as farm operators (the addition of one blank line). This change helped

somewhat to offset prior Census data where gendered assumptions and normative standards promoted women's invisibility. According to Wiebe (1995), "women who work[ed] incredibly long hours end[ed] up listing themselves as unoccupied." Wiebe (1995) also importantly notes this is just another example of women's invisibility perpetuated through official documents and across time that contributed to the general bias that women were not farmers.

Another example of women not being seen as farmers is how Joan spoke about the beauty of the Sweet Grass Hills, the wildlife she enjoyed, her love of cattle ranching and her commitment and determination to keep the inherited family land in the family. Joan's husband had passed away while their children were still young. A male relative approached her, at her husband's funeral, and she told me, ""Yes. He came up to me and he said, "What are you going to do with the place? You can't run it."" And, as Joan stated, she looked him in the eye and said, ""You just watch me." I said, "I'm going to keep it. I'm going to keep it going. The boys want to farm, and ranch, and I'm going to run it."" Joan's threads of love for the landscape, wildlife, cattle ranching and for her family could be heard in her resolve to maintain her generational farm even absent of her husband.

Joan has run a successful family farm with her family for decades now disproving the stereotypical perception voiced in that earlier encounter that women cannot "run" a farm. I speculate the male relative also held a deep concern for the ownership of the land, unimaginable to him; a woman could own a "place." I propose it was in part, Joan's love, for the land, for the lifestyle, for the family farm that propelled her forward (saying and thinking), "You just watch me." Oatley (2004) has said if emotions embody central human values, then listen to the stories, to the humanness - to better understand. In her

response and action, Joan provided a full debunking of the stereotyping that women cannot be farmers or pictured as such, while being farmers.

Emma's and Leah's, Carolyn's, Danica's, Jackie's and Joan's quotes demonstrate there are changes in women's consciousness and their positions across generations. Emma (age 78 at the time of our interview) described her father's "old European mentality" and the emotional tensions she felt, challenging her dismissal as the "first born". Leah (age 27 at the time of our interview) expressed frustration and the recognition of particular normalized historical power relations, where women are still currently assigned to the kitchen; working double shifts, and side-lined in opportunities to fully engage in the business of farming. Out of the picture, so to speak. These are acknowledgements of the grass root "sites of the struggle"; the constitution and reproduction of *new* threads of history to be passed from cohort to cohort, from generation to generation. That said, women in all the cohorts are surrounded, burdened and restricted by powerful, emotionally charged, potentially damaging discursive structures including conspicuous normalized representations of family farm legacies where women and girls are invisible.

Conclusions

Oatley (2004) asked if rather than "rationality or technology or economic relations," it was emotional relations that compose the core of our existential self. I asked: how women who farm are affected in emotive identification with ourselves and others? The practicality, the rationality on which Oatley (2004) speculates, or the internalizations that Weibe (1995) and others recognize as part of a "construction of women" in agriculture may not acknowledge or address the additional emotional burdens

or blessings women and girls may carry, and by this I mean the emotional where-with-all to "carry on" a family farm. In relation to the intergenerational transfer of the family farm; love is one emotion binding women to family and farm. The love of land described in the interviews is part of the women's identities within the overarching social, political and historical conditions of land ownership, historically disadvantageous to women. As illustrated in the interviews and literature, women and girls who love also often stand aside, stand down, or are set outside the generational transfer of family farms, over and over - in the name of love.

Each practical, rational, irrational, or internalizing moment are laced with gendered emotion, heartfelt emotions that may not have advantageous outcomes for women (Shields, 2002). Gendered emotion is enacted "naturally" because it feels so "right" making it difficult to examine or change the way we feel or identify the detriments and benefits of "feeling" a particular way (Shields, 2002). Patriarchal social systems were designed to inflict guilt/punishment on women and girls who resist the system standards and then they could be viewed as not loving, not giving enough. Women who risk challenging or withholding feminine-coded gender norms could also be sanctioned (Manne, 2018). For example, when I ask one woman if she felt she had been treated equally in the intergenerational transfer of her foundation farm she said,

> "Equal is impossible, unfortunately. They would have had to sell the farm at the time. In my head I realized that it was impossible to be equal. Ted [her brother] was farming and I was away. I had married out by that time."

She continued, reflecting on earlier years,

> "I think the only time that it really bothered me was [when] my brother had a lease and some deeded land out in special areas. He'd sold all his cows. I was hoping for some summer grazing. We did it one summer. We took steers up to the ranch, up to Ted's place. [Later] He said he wasn't going to do that again and that

> he had a neighbor who was interested in leasing the place. I'm like . . . You're not using it. You would still get all the oil revenue from it. Why can't I use this? Why can't I bring our cattle up here to use this land? He made that decision at that time. I don't know why, actually, there are a few scenarios that popped into my head at the time, that he doesn't want me to have a toe in the door. He was entitled to it and I was not. It is land we both grew up on. Land he didn't need anymore. Land that I could have used."

Years after farming on her own family farm she had accessed some pasture land to rent that was part of her foundational family farm. After one season, as her comments indicate, her brother denied her access to that land. While understanding this situation as lacking in fairness and feeling confused and angry, she said later in her interview,

> "Ted and I are civil. We get along. We call each other if we're sick. We wonder what's up. We go to each other's kid's weddings. There's no animosity. It's gone. Luckily, our kids didn't get married right at that time. I'm not sure I could have done it. Now it's whatever. Life is long and there's no sense in harboring grudges about things you can do nothing about."

Jenkins & Oatley (1996) postulated assertion, attachment, and affiliation are human's basic social motivations, managed by emotion. As I asked earlier, what does loving the lands you farm have to do with social motivation and, further, how do the women who love their farm land participate on the family farm? How do the farming women and girl's attachment and affiliations with others reflect in the way they participate in a family farm and intergenerational transfer of their family farm?
In the above instance it seems, you let go and temper your animosity, because you value and love the family and the land more and pragmatically, left with a sense that you can't do anything about it anyway.

Our humanness resonates within us and the emotional theme of love for their land was evident throughout the stories of the women I interviewed. I heard the love in their stories. I felt the love in their presence. I saw the love as the women described their

relationship with land. Other researchers have also recognized farm women's love of land or their "place attachment" and also described a deep affective bond with place that farm women. Hintz (2015) noted an evident humility as the women she interviewed did not describe themselves as central to the farming of the land. She said while women shared their perspectives about their farms they included future generations, the cycle of seasons, nature, personal interconnectedness with land and the idea of reciprocity (Hintz, 2005). Baldwin (2017) considered the affective attachment to the land in their research describing a love of land that encompassed nature, domestic animals, wildlife and spiritual experiences — much in line with the responses of the women I interviewed.

Viewing ourselves, our motives, and our decisions from outside of what feels "natural" to us can be intimidating and unsettling. As farm women, in keeping with the patriarchal normative standard, we might even ask what kind of woman doesn't "love" her family farm land and act and decide accordingly? There is a complexity in what is true; a love expressed for the farm land and the landscape, an implicit bind that demands both the beauty of love and care but also demands little or no disruption of the historical patriarchal discourse of what and how to love, how to view love.

In her work discussing agrarian feminists Nettie Wiebe (1995) explained what it had been like for her as a woman, self-described farmer, and farm leader,

> "… I became increasingly conscious of how very significant the backdrop of male dominance in agriculture is for farm women. Like a painter who slowly assimilates the knowledge that the apparent discolouration of the strokes from her paintbrush are in fact caused by the dark tone of the canvas she is working on, I continue to discover historical and contextual background that influences the issues that farm women identify as important, as well as how we work on them …" (Wiebe, 1995).

The male dominance in agriculture Wiebe (1995) describes as the "dark tone of the canvas", I interpret as systemic patriarchy. Our history and systems of land ownership and control have been constructed by and dominated by men for men and, as Wiebe (1995) suggests, creates the “backdrop” for women and girls in agriculture to work upon. Throughout the three cohorts, the women interviewed expressed a love for land that was similar and different but most certainly all enduring. As Shanee said if you are a farmer "...of course you love the land." This too is, in part, a “historical and contextual” background, a historical foundation for how men and boys, girls and women conceptualize a family farm and understand their roles within the construct of a family farm. Examining emotions like love in a social context where it is a not a deliberate or a self-conscious act per se can reveal the power love holds in perpetuating and upholding historical social, institutional practises and age-old discourses of social meaning (Shields, 2002). In spite of women’s love of family farming and the other affective connections to the physical land they consider to be a part of them, women live the repercussions of a history where women and girls have long been denied opportunities as primary land owners. They are excluded from inheritances or transfers of full estates and thus disadvantaged and sidelined as farmers or participating influencers in the intergenerational transfer of family farms.

Gender Expectations and Participation

Shedding light on the reproduction of gender norms within agriculture and on women’s broader historical participation in a patriarchal system is relevant in understanding gender implications of a family farm. Patriarchal, historical ideals of responsibility, family togetherness, experiential learning, and pride were wound tightly

within the family farm discourse and social discourse. For women to counter this condition can be in many ways for women or men, unimaginable. In not adhering to the dominant societal norm there is too much to lose; women risk the possibilities of ostracization from the advantages of power and loss of purpose. It matters that we consider the force of affective attachments, the social meanings and the influence love has on women and men who farm or ranch and that we explore how love informs conclusions and generalizations about attachments and motivations to stay connected to "the land." Or in the case of some women in this study, disconnect.

Misogyny

During my research, I began to question whether notions of slave labor, the absence of the historical stories of women who farmed, roadblocks to learning how to become a farmer, to outright land ownership, and responses to the women's emotional investment on family farms constituted forms of misogyny. Manne (2018) has argued for a re-assessment of the term misogyny and its meaning by presenting a new analysis of the concept of misogyny. Her moral philosophical approach defines misogyny in part as a cultural logic to maintain social institutions, gender roles, norms etc. According to Manne misogyny operates by way of policing attitudes, social interactions, and interpretations of social life events (Sadler, 2020). Manne does not subscribe to misogyny only being reducible to individual attitudes or individual feelings but more as group project, gaining traction in social dynamics (Sadler, 2020). In reference to Manne's proposition Sadler (2020) said,

> The logic here is actually pretty straightforward: The patriarchal order is sustained by an ideology of gender norms that mandates particular roles and social functions for men and different ones for women. Misogyny surfaces when women attempt to step outside of their appointed roles and functions in the patriarchal

order.

While more commonly misogyny is misconstrued as an act by a disturbed violent man, directed at one woman, Manne (2018) argues any side-step women may take away from the normative gender roles will be subjected to different tactics to keep them in place, held back from their own, what should be, *ordinary everyday successes*. In the case of female farming, female farming partners or women co-workers are expected to affirm masculine prerogatives maintaining a status quo of the cultural givens in the case of the family farm where the majority of primary operators/owners are men.

Misogyny in agriculture can be and is subtle and/or unrecognizable as access to goods in limited supply (e.g. arable land) and other forms of power and social status are negotiated. So engrained is the expectation to accept "just the way it is", alternative paths are not always seen, imagined, or considered viable by men or women. For example, one of the women in this study, in attempting to access the use (not even vying for ownership) of family land, after one year of renting the land was denied further access to that land by her brother. She speculated that her brother felt threatened believing he could lose the goods he considered himself entitled to (the heir apparent as she had described). While she experienced her own anger, she also became the target of his. She said, “life is long and there's no sense in harboring grudges about things you can do nothing about.” Her comments are reflective of many similar stories that I have heard within the industry and within this research. I have abridged my own experiences of loss of access in very similar ways that at the end of the day are in fact generationally extended, emotionally riddled, exonerations of the (male) beneficiaries.

In another case a woman specifically asked me if she could diverge from the research questions to explain,

> When [her eldest brother] came back, ... I guess actually my expectation, not even my hope, not my hope - probably more than that, I remember thinking about, "Man, when [her eldest brother] lives here, maybe even if I'm working elsewhere, every Saturday we'll replace an old gate that needs to be replaced." Or, "We'll just get this, we'll work together, and I'll support him so much, and we'll just figure it out. And it can be his but I'm just here to put everything I can into helping him be successful, and helping, because it means the ranch is successful." And that is not at all how it went. I felt like we would be partners in a way, I'd be a very small, small partner, but we'd be partners in a way.

She described her feeling as more than just hope in imagining how she would support her brother on their family farm, expressing a willingness and ability to put her all devotion and caring into the family operations to help ensure her brother's success. She continued to say,

> It was very hard on our relationship because he was very defensive. So when he first came back, he really wanted to establish, "This is mine, the Quonset is mine, the ranch is mine, I run this, the cattle are mine, this is my wife and my children." And he just really felt like he needed to put up those walls right away and that lasted for a long time. And it was just sickening for me, and I was off work for part of this time, actually very close to when he first moved back. And so, I would be sitting here in my house and I would see ... and he was just started to come back, and I would see him, and a couple of neighbors, and dad, and people ride by to go gather cows, and I would think, "Am I just the person who runs this house? How could you possibly not think to tell me about this?

The willingness and devotion toward the success of the family farm she extended to him was met with a gatekeeper response from her brother, pushing her to the hurtful periphery rather than risk her stepping out of line further.

> And so that is a solid example, and it happened dozens of times in spite of gentle reminders, hard discussions, everything. It felt eye opening for me, it really felt like, "So, when we need to move cows, and at this point still mom's cows, our cows, you can call dad's friend but you can't remember to call me, I'm not on your priority list there." That was really heartbreaking and it made me feel like just the person who runs the trailer [living in house trailer on the ranch] for a long time."

I asked if she felt her brother was aware of what he was doing and she responded again,

> Yeah, he's a smart cookie, I think he probably was. And fear there, probably lots of fear of, "No matter how much I say, I just want this all to work and I want to be here to support you in it." If you don't truly believe that to your core, if you feel like, "Nah, she's just trying to wiggle her way in or get some credit or take over something, or something." Then it's just not going to work, right?"

This experience was heartbreaking for her and made her feel small even though she tried to assure her brother she was only there to support him. She saw and felt him as fearful and distrustful of her and rationalized the relationship would not work the way she had hoped. She also remembered,

> I worry about my siblings all the time, about their happiness, and their worries, and yeah, constantly. I mean, again, I'm fortunate that I don't have fears about the equity of it all, or the equality of it all because I just don't. And really, I remember [my brother] and I, when we were pretty young, standing in our front yard and looking up at the hill and talking about, "Man, we don't want this place to get split up anymore. This is crazy; we all get along well enough to do this.

Being psychologically restrained in particular ways, as shown in these interview excerpts, the way women and girls are expected to feel and the expectation they assist in others achieving their own personal positive outcomes and positive feelings, disadvantages them from becoming outright landowners who farm. Throughout the interview responses of the three cohorts of women there was explicit recognition of paternalistic roles, the changing roles of women and girls, and the new opportunities playing out in their family farm dynamics. Simultaneously, the dearly loved histories of their family farms were described, in a large part, as histories where men were dominant decision makers as normalized and supported. While change is constant, threads of history tying lifestyle, values, and particular world views, including how emotions should be felt and understood interpersonally, tie farm families together over time.

Conducting research that engaged in historical understandings of the intergenerational transfer of gendered norms and included feminist analysis of presumed roles and responsibilities assigned to, and practiced by, women and girls within family farms demonstrates the historical and contemporary limitations of women farmers in a patriarchal system. However, while women and girls often are, and historically were, disempowered and excluded from those realms or spaces that wield authority equal to men, change is a foot as is evident in the interviews I conducted with women who were integral to the operations of a least one family farm. The interviews reveal evidence of increasing types of inclusion in family farm decision making and a raised awareness among women, and others, with respect to women's prospects to be primary operators of a family farm. Women are also increasingly seen as potential inheritors of, or are gaining access to, full farm estates. While identifying as a feminist was a point of pause for many of the women I interviewed, a consciousness of inequalities on a family farm was often plainly acknowledged.

Perhaps the method of oral history afforded my subjects the space to express contradictory views about their rights to the family farm? My own experience with incremental ideas of equality for women and girls in farming began with validations of my own experience growing up on a family farm; by considering my own history and through communication with other women whose experiences were similar. Initially and to this day, there is discomfort for me with the prospect of this thesis questioning the patriarchal dominated status quo of family farming. I felt particularly hesitant about revealing the problems of structural misogyny when the women interviewed placated or worried who would read or hear their stories of when fathers, brothers, or sons pushed

back against their grandmothers, mothers, sisters, daughters or themselves. My discomfort in exposing this contest with men in their lives also lies within the emotion of love.

This thesis shows how women and girls who farm love their family land. The women I interviewed expressed love for what and how they and their children learn on a family farm, they love the ideal of a family farm legacy. So what about love and what does love have to do with women's participation in light of patriarchal gendered norms travelling from one generations to the next and embedded by law and custom within the intergenerational transfer of the family farm? Standards of what emotions or the right way to do emotions is practiced in social contexts. Many questions about gendered emotionality and its real consequences remain (Shields, 2002). Although, and here in lays a true challenge for women and girls who farm, the attitudes and values held and reproduced by grandfathers, father's, brothers and sons upon whom women have relied are part of the structural difficulties and the various ways women have been subjugated (Traister, 2018). The men and boys who are operatives in universal systems that build and maintain insurmountable roadblocks for women and girls are also our husbands, our brothers, our fathers, our uncles, our sons and we love them, family and family farms. (Traister, 2018). These structures and this love are entangled in family farm discourse.

Moving Forward

A demonstration of a historical discourse represented in contemporary print media exemplifies Hall's (1996) concept of crystallization and how it works to affect the way we see and feel and understand particular institutions, like a family farm. The ideas of legacy in family business may also be included in this nostalgic narrative. Whether

implicit or explicit, each generation of farm family children are exposed to and are encouraged by cultural representations to position themselves within the traditional framework of rural family business. Recognizing these points of normalized power are the same points that become the impetus of change (Fairclough, 1992).

> For Leah, movement forward for women in agriculture meant,
>
> > I have think education, ownership. I think ... I feel like I can really only comment on this for myself, but it probably applies to some other women too, but learning how to say what you want in an assertive manner, and I feel like sometimes, it has to be some give from the other side too. People to be listening.

Education and ownership were two ways cited by Leah to advance women in agriculture. She said that people need to be listening to what you are saying. She related an example of women's efforts to be heard and then being quelled, stating,

> > When the women at our low-stress handling clinic, they were saying that they were really happy to have something that they could come to that's just them. A lot of them were saying things like they'll go out and work the cattle, and it'll all be going good, and their husband will get home from work, and it'll all fall apart because they can't get them to use these techniques.

This is an example of how women are indeed supporting one another, sharing information, and embracing opportunities to expand their professional expertise. However, as Leah points out, without the cooperation of their husbands, the skills and expertise women gain through these experiences are wasted. Leah recognized this prioritizing of masculine authority, and I interpreted her as challenging a point of normalized power, as demonstrated in the dominant agribusiness print media where women are not represented within the "picture" of cattle handling, and thus their efforts continue to be ignored or dismissed by men or sometimes other women.

Challenging the male-dominated status quo or disrupting normalized discourse on a family farm is complex and riddled with emotion. Yet, the hidden history and the

hushed voices of women and girls who farm must be heard. After interviewing female farmers and asking what it meant to them to be a farmer, Trina Moyles (2018) said, "some of the women laughed, some of them wept. And others weren't sure where to begin because no one had bothered to ask them the question before" (p. XXVI). Through this project, I have aimed to continue the important work of asking women this question… and perhaps even encourage them to ask themselves.

References

Primary Sources

BASF Ag Solutions (2017) Insert Western Producer.

Bedry, P. (2018, January 26). Personal interview.

De'Athe, S. (2018, February 21). Personal interview.

Eklund-Forbes, L. A. (2018, February 7). Personal interview.

Fleming, C. (2018, February 9). Personal interview.

Fleming, R. (2018, July 8). Personal interview.

Harty, L. (2018, January 23). Personal interview.

Hughson, J. (2018, January 23). Personal interview.

Hulit, E. (2017, December 8). Personal interview.

King, L. (2018, January 23). Personal interview.

Lagler, G. (2018, September 17). Personal interview.

Mappin, T. (2018, January 9). Personal interview.

Reimer, S. (2018, January 7). Personal interview.

Renke, D. (2018, February 28). Personal interview.

Rodvang, J. (2018, January 8). Personal interview.

Rodvang, L. (2018, April 29). Personal interview.

Schoonbaert, L. (2018, April 27). Personal interview.

Sibbald, B. (2018, September 24). Personal interview.

Statistics Canada. (2016) *A portrait of a 21st century agricultural operation*. Retrieved from Statistics Canada website: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/95-640-x/2016001/article/14811-eng.htm

Templeton, C. (2018, September 26). Personal interview.

United States Department of Agriculture (2012). *2012 Census of agriculture highlights.* Retrieved from http://www.agcensus.usda.gov.

Wasko, J. (2018, September 26). Personal interview.

Wearmouth, E. (2018, January 26). Personal interview.

Wills, L. (2017, December 8). Personal interview.

Secondary Sources

Adovasio, J. M., Soffer, O., & Page, J. (2007). *The invisible sex: Uncovering the true roles of women in prehistory*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Baldwin, C., Smith, T., & Jacobson, C. (2017). Love of the land: Social-ecological connectivity of rural landholders. *Journal of Rural Studies,51*, 37-52.

Berger Gluck, S. (2013). From claifornia to kufr nameh and back: Reflections on 40 years of feminist oral history. In A. Sheftel & S. Zembrzycki (Eds.), *Oral History Off the Record* (pp. 25–42). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bertocchi, G. (2006). The law of primogeniture and the transition from landed aristocracy to industrial democracy. *Journal of Economic Growth. 11*(1), 43-70. doi:10.1007/s10887.

Carter, S. (2009). "Daughters of british blood" or "hordes of men of alien race": The homesteads-for-women campaign in western canada. *Great Plains Quarterly*, *29*(4), 267-286.

Cavanaugh, C. A. (1997). "No Place for a Woman": Engendering Western Canadian Settlement. *The Western Historical Quarterly*, *28*(4), 493-518. doi:10.2307/969883.

Chemaly, S. (2018). *Rage becomes her: The power of women's anger*. Atria Books.

de Beauvoir, S. (1972). *The second sex.* (Translated by H M Parshley) Penguin. (1949)

Elder, G., Gield, J. (2009). Life course studies: an evolving field. In G. Elder Jr. & J. Giele, (Eds.) *The Craft of Life Course Research* (pp. 2). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Foucault, M. (1976; English Translation 1978). *The history of sexuality.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1995). *The archaeology of knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Gluck, S. B., & Patai, D. (1991). Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history. London, UK: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1996) The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert & K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction of media studies* (pp. 185-225). London: Blackwell.

Herbert, R. (2017). *Ranching women in southern Alberta*. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press.

Hintz, C. (2015). An ecology of love: Women farmers, sense of place, the Georgic ethic, and ecocentricity. *Journal of Sustainability Education 9*. http://www.jsedimensions.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Hintz-JSE-March-2015-Love-Issue.pdf.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983/2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* University of California Press.

Jones, J. (2018) Living the examined life in the antebellum north, and in the post–World War II United States: The Grimké Sisters from South Carolina: Pioneers for Women's Rights and Abolition, by Gerda Lerner. *The American Historical Review*, *123*(5), 1547–1559. https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/rhy212.

Lerner, G. (1986). *The creation of patriarchy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. (1997). *Why history matters: Life and thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lindgren, H. E. (1996). *Land in Her Own Name women as homesteaders in North Dakota*. Fargo, ND: University of Oklahoma Press.

Little, J. (2015). The development of feminist perspectives in rural gender studies. In B. Pini, B. Brandth, & J. Little (Eds.), *Feminisms and Ruralities* (107-118). London: Lexington Books.

Little, J., & Panelli, R. (2003). Gender research in rural geography. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(3), 281-289. doi:10.1080/0966369032000114046.

Machum, S. (2015). A rural woman's impact on Canadian feminist practise and theory. In B. Pini, B. Brandth, & J. Little (Eds.), *Feminisms and Ruralities* (pp. 31-41). London: Lexington Books.

Manne, K. (2018). *Down girl: The logic of misogyny*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McCallum, M. E. (1993) Prairie women and the struggle for a dower law, 1905-1920. *Prairie Forum*, *18*(1), 19-34.

McManus, S. (2000). Gender(ed) tensions in the work and politics of Alberta farm women, 1905-29. In C. Cavanaugh & R. Warne (Eds.), *Telling Tales* (pp.123-146). Toronto, ON: UBC Press.

Moyles, T. (2018). *Women who dig: Farming, feminism, and the fight to feed the world*. Regina, SK: University of Regina Press.

Oatley, K. (2004). *Emotions: A brief history*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Oatley, K & Jenkins, J.M. (1996) *Understanding emotions.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Patai, D. (1994). When method becomes power (response) In A. D. Gitlin (Ed.) *Power and method: political activism and educational research.* New York: Routledge.

Patterson-Black, S. (1976). Women homesteaders on the Great Plains frontier. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, 1*(2), 67-88.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(2), 175-196. doi:10.1080/0951839032000060635.

Sadler, B. J. (n.d.). Good Dog, Bad Girl [Review]. Retrieved August 15, 2020, from https://floridareview.cah.ucf.edu.

Sangster, J. (2015) Reflections on the politics and praxis of working-class oral histories. In K. Llewellyn, A. Freund & N. Reilly (Eds.), *The Canadian oral history reader* (pp. 119-140). Montreal & Kingston, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Schackel, S. K. (2011). *Working the land: the stories of ranch and farm women in the modern American West*. Lawrence, KS: Univ. Press of Kansas.

Scott, J. W. (1991, July/August). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, *17*(4), 773-797. doi:10.1086/448612.

Shields, S. A. (2010). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Traister, R. (2018). *Good and mad: The revolutionary power of women's anger*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Villa, M. (2017). *Women own less than 20% of the world's land. It's time to give them equal property rights.* Retrieved from World Economic Forum website: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/women-own-less-than-20-of-the-worlds-land-its-time-to-give-them-equal-property-rights/.

Wang, C. (2010). Daughter exclusion in family business succession: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 31*(4), 475-484. doi:10.1007/s10834-010-9230-3.

Wiebe, N. (2002). Farm Women: Cultivating Hope and Sowing Change. In S. D. Burt & L. Code (Authors), *Changing methods feminists transforming practice* (pp. 137-161). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Appendix 1: Consent Letter and Interview Questions

A History of Rural Women and the Intergenerational Transfer of the Family Farm
Diane McKenzie Graduate Student
Master's Thesis
University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge Alberta

Letter of Consent

Date:

Dear,

You have been invited to participate in an interview for an oral history project for my Master's Thesis: *A History of Rural Women and the Intergenerational Transfer of the Family Farm.* Women are underrepresented in the historical records and my personal goal is to gain more knowledge about your life and your perspective of a woman's role in the intergenerational transfer of a family farm. I appreciate that you will take the time to make an important contribution to this learning process. The interview process will most likely be approximately 2 hours in length.

A single interview, with the potential for follow up question by email or phone communication, will be held at the place of your choosing. Diane McKenzie will digitally record the interview and may take notes during the interview. There are no anticipated risks to participating in this project, nor is there payment offered for participating. You will not benefit directly from participation in this research.

Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the interview at any time or may choose not to respond to certain questions without penalty. If you choose to withdraw, you will be consulted regarding what is done with the interview data. This interview conducted by Diane McKenzie is being supervised by Dr. Carol Williams (Department of History and Women and Gender Studies). If you have any questions or concerns about the research or the conduct of the researcher you are welcome to contact Dr. Williams, Professor, Department of History and Women and Gender Studies, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, AB T1K 3M4 at (403) 380 1818 or by email at carol.williams@uleth.ca. Questions regarding your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Office of Research Ethics, University of Lethbridge, (403) 329 2747 or email at research.services@uleth.ca. This research project has been reviewed for ethical acceptability and approved by the University of Lethbridge Human Subject Research Committee.

Conditions of Participation:

I will receive a copy of Diane McKenzie's project in which my interview is cited for my approval and suggested revisions before completion of the project. Diane McKenzie will provide me with the digital copy of the interview in its entirety.

Please check your choice(s) for the materials that can be collected:

☐ I, _____ consent for the digital file and transcript of my interview on _____ (date) to be stored digitally on Diane McKenzie's password protected computer.

☐ I _____ consent to my photograph being taken and used in this and other projects undertaken by Diane McKenzie pertaining to women's roles in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm.

In terms of identification and reproduction of my interview, I agree to the following conditions:

Please check your choice for the terms of identification:

☐ My identity may be revealed in the project and any presentations that may result from this project or any further work on this topic by Diane McKenzie. A copy of further work on this topic by Diane McKenzie will be held in the institutional repository of the University of Lethbridge Library. Another copy will be held by Diane McKenzie and by thesis supervisor Dr. Carol Williams, Department of History and Women and Gender Studies, University of Lethbridge.

☐ Should I prefer anonymity, I will choose a pseudonym throughout the thesis and interview transcripts. This usage will be sustained throughout any subsequent academic publications and presentations. I understand that my identity will be protected to the best of the researcher's ability. I understand that within the agricultural community, there may be identifying factors in the interview that are discernable by other members of the agricultural community.

I understand that I will be able to see all sections of the publications and presentations in which I am quoted or referenced to highlight sections where my identity could be identified. I would be able to make suggestions on how the researcher might increase my anonymity.

In terms of storage, transcription, and preservation of this interview, I agree to the following conditions:

☐ I agree that the digital recording of my interview will be transcribed and used by Diane McKenzie in the oral history project for Diane McKenzie's master's thesis.

☐ I give Diane McKenzie permission to keep one copy of the interview for her personal records after the project is completed.

☐ All other copies of the interview not held by Diane McKenzie or myself or housed at the University of Lethbridge Library will be destroyed following the completion of the project.

☐ Diane McKenzie will send me the final version of the transcript to me for approval before submitting my transcript and interview to the repository.

☐ Alternately, I would like all copies of my interview and transcript not held by me to be destroyed following the completion of Diane McKenzie's project.

I have carefully studied and understand this agreement. I understand the purpose of this oral history project and realize that the information I share with the interviewer is to be used for the purposes of the interviewer's master's thesis. This oral history project is focused on a historical perspective of women's roles in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm.

I freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this project.

_____ (Printed Name of Participant)

_____ (Signature)

_____ (Date)

_____ (Printed Name of Researcher)

_____ (Signature)

_____ (Date)

Diane McKenzie
University of Lethbridge
430 642 7385
mckenzie2@uleth.ca

Interview Questions

A History of Rural Women and the Intergenerational Transfer of the Family Farm

Please, tell me about yourself. Where were you born? Tell me about the members of your family that are actively farming and those who have left the farm. How long have/did you live on a family farm?

Can you tell me about your experiences as a daughter, mother, grandmother ….. on a family farm?

Do you consider yourself a farmer? Can you describe to me why you enjoy/do not enjoy the work you do/have done on a family farm? Why is it important to you to be a farmer?

Do you think that you and your siblings were treated fairly/equally in the intergenerational transfer of the family farm? How would you describe the terms fairly/equally in relationship to your family farm?

Do you have a family farm succession plan? If you think it is important, can you tell me why?

What emotions would you use to describe the transfer of the family farm? What comes to mind from your past experiences (with the intergenerational transfer) or what you are currently experiencing (planning for the intergenerational transfer/or not planning)?

Does kinship matter? If so can you describe to me why? Is there an emotional inheritance you would like to pass on in your family?

Please describe your "connection" to the land? Emotionally and practically what does being a land owner mean to you?

Do you own land outright or know women who do own land separate from male relations? Under what circumstance did you become a landowner?

Does/Did your family farm have a partnership agreement or incorporation documents? Has that changed over generations of farmers in your families?

Are you included in farm business decision making conversations or family meetings? Can you recount an example or could you describe your participation?

Over the years, as a daughter, mother, or grandmother can you describe your responsibilities to the working of the farm business – have they been implicit or explicit –

Or, can you describe the combination of how family members knew/know who is responsible for what jobs on the farm? Is there a division labour between the farm and family? If so, How so?

Is the transfer of the family farm a positive experience? If any, what do you see as roadblocks to the successful transfer of the family farm?

If you were to write your own job description, what would that look like?

What if another family member wrote your job description, what would that look like?

Do you feel stereotyped as a "farm woman"? If so, please explain.

What would you say are some specific characteristics common to farm women? Do you think that some of what you know is a knowledge specific to farm women?

In general, do you think that men and women, boys and girls are treated equally in relation to the work and ownership of family farms?

I have heard the term "farminist" used in some media. Do you consider yourself a farminist/feminist? If so, what does that mean to you? Are there any problems with in equally in the family farm?

Have you been or are you involved in any Women's Organizations? What was/is your involvement? How would you describe your organizations goals – personal, organizational, political?

What thoughts or words come to mind as you look at this advertisement?

Appendix 2: BASF Media Foldout Advertisement