

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523 BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET	FOR AID USE ONLY <i>Batch #20</i>
---	--------------------------------------

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY Agriculture	AE10-0000-G831
	B. SECONDARY Agricultural economics--Turkey	

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Land ownership and peasant orientations in rural Turkey

3. AUTHOR(S)
Frey, F.W.

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1967	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 35p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC TU333.32.F893
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
MIT

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (*Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability*)
(In Rpt.no.6)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-RAB-198	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS Attitude surveys Land titles Turkey	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER CSD-811 Res.
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

LAND OWNERSHIP AND PEASANT ORIENTATIONS IN RURAL TURKEY

Report No. 6

Rural Development Research Project

Frederick W. Frey

with

Ayşe Sertel

**Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts**

1967

The field survey on the basis of which this series of reports was prepared was conducted in 1962 with the support of the Turkish State Planning Organization and the U.S. Agency for International Development Mission to Turkey. The role of these two institutions has been confined to this original support. The findings, interpretations and presentation in this and other reports in the same series have not been critically reviewed by either institution and are the sole responsibility of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

- I. The Importance of Land Distribution
and Land Reform.....1
- II. Relevance of the Data from the Rural
Development Research Project.....3

ASSOCIATIONS OF LAND OWNERSHIP

- I. Land Distribution in Rural Turkey.....5
- II. Village Landowning Patterns.....12
- III. Regional Land Tenure Patterns.....15
- IV. Individual Perceptions of Land Distribution
As a Problem.....18
- V. Full Landowners Contrasted with
Other Villagers.....20
- VI. Land Ownership as a Predicted and
Predictor Variable.....23
- VII. Best Predictors of Land Ownership.....24
- VIII. Land Ownership as a Predictor of
Other Attributes.....26

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report deals with selected attitudinal, behavioral, and environmental associations of land ownership among Turkish peasants. Because land distribution is generally a key element of agricultural development in modernizing countries, a deeper understanding of the effects of owning or not owning land would seem necessary for any sound evaluation of developmental policies.

ASSOCIATIONS OF LAND OWNERSHIP

Land Distribution in Rural Turkey

A sizeable majority (3/5 to 2/3) of Turkish peasants own all the land they farm. About four out of five Turkish peasant families own at least some of the land they farm. However, comparison of results from the 1950 and 1963 Agricultural Censuses and the 1962 Rural Development Research Project indicates some decline in land-owning among Turkish peasants over the period of 13 years.

The main patterns which emerged from the Rural Development Research Project's survey were the following: 1) Among males, the families of literates are more likely to be full landowners than those of the illiterates. 2) The greatest percentage of full landowners occurred among the 16-19 year old group and among respondents over 50 years of age. 3) There seemed to be little significant relationship between village size and land ownership patterns. 4) Considerable regional variation in land ownership exists in rural Turkey. The Black Sea and Marmara Regions have the highest percentages of full landowners and the East Central and Mediterranean Regions have the lowest. 5) Peasants who owned all the land they farmed did not appear more innovative, more involved with the community, or more generally "modern" than other peasant farmers.

SUMMARY - 2

Village Landowning Patterns

Survey results revealed that roughly 2/3 of all Turkish peasants in 1962 lived in villages where about 2/3 of the families owned all the land they farmed. Furthermore, in 1962, nearly 2/3 of the Turkish peasantry lived in villages whose lands were free from concentration in the hands of just a few landowners. Another finding was that 1/4 of the respondents lived in villages where no one worked as an agricultural laborer and another 1/4 of the peasants lived in villages where a majority of the inhabitants were agricultural laborers. Nearly 2/5 lived in communities where less than 10% had such a status. Finally, when questioned about land disputes between villages, 41% of the respondents said their village had experienced land disputes.

Regional Land Tenure Patterns

Survey results showed the Black Sea Region to have the greatest incidence of peasant ownership. The Marmara Region and the North Central Region also ranked high. The Mediterranean Region generally displayed the lowest degree of peasant ownership, and the Southeastern Region also ranked comparatively low.

With regard to the incidence of land disputes, however, this regional pattern changed. The Southeastern and Mediterranean Regions, poorest in land distribution, appeared to have the lowest incidences of inter-village land disputes. The South Central and Aegean Regions which rank fairly well in land distribution seemed to have the greatest inter-village friction over land. Inter-village land disputes do not seem to be a simple result of overall inequities in land distribution.

Individual Perceptions of Land Distribution as a Problem

When asked what problems confronting their villages the respondents felt to be most important, land received the fourth highest percentage of mentions, roughly ten per cent. In response to the question of what a villager would wish for if he could have one wish come

SUMMARY - 3

true, land ranked second among the responses given. A more detailed analysis of these findings revealed: 1) that land was much more salient as a village problem or as a personal wish to males than it was to females; 2) that literates were slightly less concerned with land issues than were the illiterates; 3) that village size and urban proximity seemed to make no difference in the saliency of land issues; and 4) that mild regional differences in the prominence of land issues did exist.

Full Landowners Contrasted with Other Villagers

The following survey results indicated some attitudinal and behavioral differences between full landowners and other villagers: 1) Full owners seemed to regard themselves as economically better off than most other peasants. 2) Full owners showed very few signs of being more innovative than other peasants. 3) Full owners did not seem to feel that they had any more stake in the community than other villagers. 4) Peasants who did not own all the land they farmed were less knowledgeable about political parties than full landowners. 5) Full landowners seemed to live in villages that were somewhat less developed and more remote than those housing other villagers. 6) Male farmers who were full owners seemed to be more likely than others to look to the village headman for leadership. 7) Landownership did not seem to be associated with a less favorable opinion of the city.

LANDOWNERSHIP AS A PREDICTED AND PREDICTOR VARIABLE

The data concerned with the predictability of landownership on the basis of various other factors suggested that no single factor was a very good predictor of a respondent's land ownership status. However, a cumulative ordering of predictors indicated that sex

SUMMARY - 4

was the best predictor of land ownership, followed by subjective poverty, village centrality, age, village development, household size, external mistrust, and cognitive flexibility.

Landownership as a predictor of other peasant attributes seemed to be very weak. Landownership was the best predictor of only one item in the survey -- marital status; even in that case, the association was a very feeble one. The general implication of the findings seemed to be that mere landownership, regardless of amount, quality or terms, made very little difference to peasant attitudes and behaviors in rural Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

The Importance of Land Distribution and Land Reform

This report deals with selected attitudinal, behavioral and other associations of land ownership among peasant farmers in rural Turkey. The topic would seem to be of obvious importance. Wolf Ladejinsky, one of the leading students of the subject, has summarized prevailing opinion in the following manner:

When the system of land tenure in predominantly agricultural countries provides the cultivator with a reasonable reward for his efforts, it stands for economic, social, and political stability in the countryside and very often, and by the same token, in the country as a whole. The obverse is true when the system of landholding denies the cultivator the conditions under which he can secure for himself a reward for his labor commensurate with his role as a producer. In the main, and with more recent notable exceptions such as Japan, Taiwan, and Egypt, the latter condition still prevails in many parts of Asia, Latin America, and the Near East. This state of affairs was accepted as "normal" only a few decades ago, but this is no longer the case.¹

Ladejinsky goes on to point out that "The current search for adjustment of the land tenure systems stems from the circumstances under which vast numbers of farmers live and work somebody else's land."² And he concludes that "...in the final analysis the issue is one of land to the landless."³

Many other experts have urged the importance of land tenure and land reform. Staley, for example, has observed that, "Historically, great changes in the rights to land preceded or accompanied the transition in the West from medieval to modern economy."⁴ Rostow reminds us of Adam Smith's "...perception that surplus income derived from ownership of land must, somehow, be transferred out of the hands of those who would sterilize it in prodigal living..."⁵ Reports issued by economic missions to Latin American nations contain statements that "The land tenure system almost completely blocks the development of a progressive agriculture," and the lack of peasant proprietors is often said to account for the low yield

of agriculture in various Near Eastern nations.⁶ Appropriately, successes as well as failures of agricultural development are attributed to land distribution. Much of the economic progress recently achieved in Mexico, for example, has been ascribed by economists to land reform.⁷ Land reform is also a cardinal tenet in the programs of most rural protest movements, communist or other, and the acquisition of land is frequently said to be the paramount goal of a peasantry.⁸ In short, observers from many different disciplines, ideologies, and nations have regarded land distribution and peasant proprietorship as a key to agricultural development and national stability.

The basic argument of those who stress the importance of land tenure is that "What the farmer wants is a piece of land of his own," and that if he owns his land, his incentives to increase agricultural productivity are significantly enhanced.⁹ The land-owning peasant is seen as more likely to accept innovations, to improve farm property, to resist pressures toward urban migration, and to feel that he has a stake in his community. The proponents of this view see "...the diffusion of ownership among the tenants as the main purpose of agrarian reform."¹⁰ They tend to endorse the dictum that "ownership is the magic that turns sand to gold."

Although majority opinion probably affirms the importance of land ownership and reform, many writers point out that it is no panacea and that land redistribution must be embedded in a much broader program of agricultural support. There are even those who argue that "This dogma of the value of dividing up land has been swallowed hook, line and sinker--insofar, at least, as it concerns someone else's land," and who cry "Emotionalism! Thy Name is Land Reform."¹¹ Certainly, most students of the subject would agree with Ladejinsky's comment that "While it is easy to postulate that landownership stimulates productivity, it is extremely difficult to measure its actual effect."¹²

Relevance of the Data from the Rural Development Research Project

One of the recommended policies of the Second Five Year Plan of the Turkish Government emphasizes providing more land to farmers with too little or no land of their own and states that land distribution and rent adjustment are to be regarded as part of the very conception of agricultural reform.¹³ Land distribution, however, is one of many goals which Turkey is trying to realize in the rural area, and since resources are scarce, its importance compared to other goals will have to be estimated. Some judgment about the relative benefits of public investment in land reform is demanded; thus, some evaluation of the impact of land tenure arrangements and land distribution on peasant productivity and satisfaction is required.

The data collected by the Rural Development Research Project's survey of approximately 8,000 Turkish peasants by no means furnish the basis for a full and definitive evaluation of the impact of land tenure on peasant agricultural productivity and satisfaction.¹⁴ This survey was not primarily, nor even secondarily, focused on the land ownership problem, and a survey of this type is probably not an adequate vehicle for obtaining many kinds of information needed. Nevertheless, the facts (1) that the problem is extremely important, (2) that relevant information is conspicuously lacking, and (3) that the survey does provide some pertinent information of a rather scarce kind have led us to examine our data on the significance of landownership for peasant attitudes and behaviors.

All respondents who were primarily farmers were asked if their families owned all the land they farmed, owned part of the land they farmed, rented the land they farmed, were primarily agricultural laborers, or had some other tenure arrangement. There are several drawbacks to this kind of item. First of all, and least significantly, some land tenure arrangements are difficult to code into the available categories. For example, if several members of the family were agricultural laborers and the rest rented and

tilled a small plot, how could the family be categorized? However, pretesting indicated that such awkward arrangements would be very few, and indeed it turned out that virtually all answers could easily be coded in terms of the above categories, which are similar to those employed in Turkish censuses. Only two per cent of the respondents gave an answer which had to be residually coded as "other".

Second, the question elicits no information as to how much land the peasant farms. One can reasonably argue that this information is much more significant than whether the peasant owns the land he farms. He may own all his land, but it may be such a small plot that he barely survives. On the other hand, a renter may have access to ample land at reasonable terms. It is clear that some affluent peasants own much land and rent still more, but technically they would have to be placed in our "own part..." category. There is no easy inference from the item asked to the possibly more important consideration of how much land the peasant has access to on equitable terms. The present distinction is merely that of ownership status. We should have liked to ascertain how many hectares each family farmed, but our pretesting indicated that when we attempted to ask such questions our respondents became fearful that the information might be used against them for tax or other purposes and either gave us highly dubious answers or refused to answer at all. It was not felt worthwhile to jeopardize the interview by a determined pursuit of this specific datum.¹⁵

Third, the item reveals nothing about the quality of the land available to the peasant. A smaller amount of irrigated or especially fertile land may be much more productive than larger fields that have poor soil, bad light or water, are subject to flooding or wind erosion, into which cattle regularly stray, or which are particularly plagued by certain kinds of pests and diseases.

Fourth, the survey provides no information about the parcelling or degree of fragmentation of the peasant's land. The amount of scattering (that is, the number of parcels, their distance from

each other, and the difficulty of movement to them) significantly affects the peasant's productivity and, possibly, his orientation to his work.¹⁶ A renter with consolidated landholdings may be better off than an owner whose holdings are quite fragmented. Fragmentation would seem to be a problem in Turkey since, according to the Agricultural Survey of 1963, fifty per cent of the farms are divided into six or more parcels -- and twenty five per cent of the farms are split into ten or more parcels.¹⁷

In the analysis which follows, therefore, we shall be dealing only with land ownership as depicted by the survey item previously described. Exploiting the scope of the survey instrument, we shall examine many potential concomitants of land ownership--attitudinal, environmental and behavioral associations at both the individual and village levels. Exploiting the large sample size, we shall control for possibly contaminating factors such as sex, age and literacy. Finally, using our reduction of predictive uncertainty technique, we shall ascertain how land ownership compares to a selection of more than twenty other variables in its ability to predict peasant attitudes and behaviors.

THE ASSOCIATIONS OF LAND OWNERSHIP

Land Distribution in Rural Turkey

The severity of the land tenure problem in Turkey is not easy to assess. One of the main reasons is that Turkey lacks a national or even a very extensive cadastral survey. She may remain without one for a long time, since the attitudes of the peasants toward such an operation, the high cost, the difficulties of the terrain, and the great complexity of some of the tenure arrangements, where, for example, a single small plot may have dozens of shareholders, make a national cadastral survey an almost impossible undertaking.¹⁸

The most recent Turkish censuses indicate that approximately thirty per cent of the total land area of Turkey is cultivated, roughly 65-70 million hectares. Although technological changes cannot be predicted very accurately for more than the short run, it seems unlikely that the available land area for farming can be appreciably expanded through draining swamps, irrigation, etc. After World War II there was an extension of the total land area under cultivation, but for the past decade or so little change has occurred. Use of the available land, however, has altered in this period. Essentially, the change has involved a reduction of land given over to pasture and an increase in cropped lands, fallow, and, to a lesser extent, vineyards, orchards and olive groves.¹⁹ Still, for the five years preceding the 1962 Rural Development Research Project survey, the area devoted to cropped lands had not changed significantly. If the available land area for farming remains stable, if general agricultural technology and peasant motivations stay roughly the same, and if the pattern of urban migration does not change drastically (three rather large "ifs"), then one would expect increased pressures for land in rural Turkey, simply on the basis of the marked population growth alone.

The significance of the size of the farm must be interpreted in terms of many factors, among them the quality of the land, the type and number of crops, standard of living conditions, expectations, and so on. Nevertheless, the average or typical farm size in Turkey seems to be rather small, considering the traditional dry cultivation of cereals that constitutes the predominant mode of farming.

In 1952, 84 per cent of the total farm population operated farms of less than 100 decares (roughly 25 acres). This 84 per cent of the farm population cultivated about 60 per cent of the available land. The Agricultural Survey of 1963, one year after our survey, showed that 88 per cent of the farms were less than 100 decares and that 72 per cent were less than 50 decares, and these two groups respectively held 49 per cent and 26 per cent of the total cultivable

land area (state farms excluded). In other words, in 1963 about 12 per cent of the agricultural operations worked about 51 per cent of the available farm land.

In 1952, 1.5 per cent of the farm families owned farms of 500 decares (about 124 acres) or more and their farms covered approximately one quarter of the total area cultivated. In 1963, .43 per cent of the farm families owned more than 500 decares and their farms covered 11.17 per cent of the total area cultivated. Thus, during these 11 years a very mild tendency toward equalization of landholdings may have taken place. At any rate, the number of very large owners seems to have decreased, if the data are reliable.²⁰

Most germane to our analysis are data on the distribution of land ownership. According to the 1950 Agricultural Census, approximately 74 per cent of the farm families owned all the land they farmed, 22 per cent owned part of the land they farmed, and another 4 per cent were tenants, share croppers, etc. The 1963 Agricultural Survey found that 67 per cent of the farm families owned all the land they farmed, 17 per cent owned part of the land, and 17 per cent were tenants, share croppers, or landless.²¹ These data seem to reveal a decline in landowning among Turkish peasants over the thirteen years.

The Rural Development Research Projects's survey in 1962 found that 58 per cent of the farming respondents said that their families owned all the land they farmed, 22 per cent said that their families owned part of the land they farmed, 15 per cent were tenants, 3 per cent were agricultural laborers, 2 per cent had some other tenure arrangement. It is clear that the pattern revealed by this survey is basically similar to that displayed in the census findings. A sizeable majority (three fifths to two thirds) of Turkish peasant families own all the land they farm. About four out of five Turkish peasant families own at least some of the land which they farm. Certainly this is a degree of landownership which compares very favorably with most developing societies. At the same time, significant improvement is plainly possible. Japan, for example,

before her relatively recent land reforms, had 54 per cent of her farms owner operated, and after the reforms this figure rose to an impressive 92 per cent. Taiwan had 60 per cent of her farms owner operated before land reform and raised this figure to 85 per cent afterwards.²²

There seems to be a rather small discrepancy between the results obtained in our 1962 survey and those secured by the 1963 Agricultural Survey conducted by the Turkish State Institute of Statistics. The former shows 58 per cent of the respondents reporting that their families owned all land farmed while the latter shows 67 per cent making that report. In most areas of common coverage, such as number of rooms per household, literacy, village facilities, and the like, the two surveys give very similar results. A nine percentage point difference of this type is anomalous. There is always the possibility that it is due to sampling error, although the probability of an error of this magnitude with such large samples is slim. The questions asked in the two studies were not identical, so that slight variations in wording might account for the discrepancy. The 1962 survey did contain a typographical error which, if read by the interviewer, might have confused the respondent. (In one place, the second person singular was used rather than the second person plural -- misin instead of misiniz -- so that the respondent might possibly have thought that his personal landholdings rather than those of his family were being queried.) But the interviewers were warned about this, and several other words in the question indicated that the family was the appropriate reference. A more demonstrable difference between the two studies is that the 1962 percentages refer to individual respondents while the 1963 data refer to families. This would mean that the larger families would be more represented in our sample. If they were less likely to own land, a difference in the necessary direction would occur. However, we reran our data to consider only the reports of male household heads, thus letting the family become the analytic unit and making it spokesman the same person as the probable respondents to the 1963

survey. The reports of household heads were not significantly different from the reports of our total sample of the adult male peasantry.

Of course, it might be that our respondents were somehow more reluctant to reveal land ownership to us than they were to the census enumerators. This seems unlikely in view of the manifest candor the respondents displayed in other portions of the interview and in view of the fact that the 1962 survey probably appeared less "official" to the peasants than the 1963 survey. A more plausible explanation emerges when we inspect the replies by sex. Sixty one per cent of our male respondents said their families owned all land farmed, as opposed to but 54 per cent of our female respondents. One might assume that the males would be better informed on such a matter, and that the females pull down the true figure. In any event, whichever survey is more accurate, this discrepancy is rather small and seemingly will not strongly affect the contemplated analysis, which mainly involves contrasting those respondents whose families farmed under some other tenure arrangement.

Before that, however, we shall present a few other breakdowns of the gross pattern of land ownership revealed by the 1962 survey. This is done in Table 1.

The main patterns displayed in this table would seem to be the following: 1.) The results obtained in the two independent subsamples are close enough to argue against there being a high degree of capricious variability in the responses. 2.) Males report that their families own all or own part of the land farmed more often than do females. Since males and females presumably reside in the same types of families, this discrepancy would seem to be more perceptual than real. It is difficult to ascertain which report is more accurate, but we have assumed that the males are more reliable because their report is closer to that of the census data and their decisional roles in the family would seem to provide them with better information in this area. 3.) When sex, literacy,

Table 1

Family Land Ownership by Selected Respondent Characteristics

<u>Respondent Characteristics</u>	<u>Respondent's Family</u>				
	<u>Owns All</u>	<u>Owns Part</u>	<u>Rents</u>	<u>Labors</u>	<u>Other</u>
Total sample (farmers only-5,153)	58%	22%	15%	3%	2%
Sub-sample #1 (2,624)	55	23	16	4	1
Sub-sample #2 (2,529)	60	20	14	3	2
Males (2,670)	61	25	11	3	1
Females (2,389)	54	18	20	4	3
Male Literates:					
16-19 years old (188)	68	21	10	1	1
20-29 " " (399)	61	24	12	3	1
30-49 " " (531)	63	25	9	2	-
50 or more " (139)	79	15	3	2	-
Male Illiterates:					
16-19 years old (86)	63	21	12	3	-
20-29 " " (192)	53	26	13	6	3
30-49 " " (498)	51	28	15	5	1
50 or more " (539)	64	25	8	3	-
Female Literates:					
16-19 years old (57)	60	30	11	-	-
20-29 " " (83)	60	22	11	5	2
30-49 " " (55)	55	25	18	-	2
50 or more " (10)	50	20	30	-	-
Female Illiterates:					
16-19 years old (144)	60	12	25	2	1
20-29 " " (539)	51	19	22	5	4
30-49 " " (807)	54	17	22	3	3
50 or more " (490)	58	18	17	3	2
Village size:					
0-199 (242)	60	14	17	6	1
200-399 (987)	61	22	12	3	2
400-599 (1,019)	59	21	16	3	1
600-999 (1,369)	56	25	14	3	1
1,000-1,999 (1,207)	56	21	17	4	2
Region:					
North Central (828)	58	28	11	1	1
Aegean (693)	52	32	12	3	1
Marmara (425)	71	16	11	1	1
Mediterranean (563)	43	18	25	9	5
Northeast (337)	61	19	17	1	2
Southeast (473)	55	9	22	12	2
Black Sea (973)	72	17	9	1	1
East Central (415)	48	31	17	2	1
South Central (444)	52	21	21	2	4

and age are controlled simultaneously, several interesting patterns emerge. Among males, the literates are, not surprisingly, more likely to be full landowners than the illiterates. Many other economic indicators in the survey portray the literates as more affluent than the illiterates.. On the other hand, this does not seem to be true among the females, although other evidence suggests that the most affluent group of all is the female literates. Findings such as this also influenced us to place greater reliance on the male reports. The female illiterates, however, are more likely than the female literates to report their families as tenants, excluding the oldest age group for which there are only ten female literates. Still more interesting and convincing is the age distribution. In every group, except for the female literates with the one unreliable small cell, the greatest percentages of full landowners occur among the 16-19 year old group and among the respondents over fifty years of age. This consistent curvilinear distribution appears to reflect the fact that the 16-19 year olds are still largely living with their families of orientation. The next two age groups seem to confront the problem of establishing themselves economically or of waiting until they inherit land from their parents, while the oldest age category reflects successful establishment or accomplished inheritance. 4.) There seems to be little significant relationship between village size and land ownership patterns. 5.) Considerable regional variation in land ownership exists in rural Turkey. The Black Sea and Marmara Regions have the highest percentages of full owners and the East Central and Mediterranean have the lowest. On the whole, and for reasons which are not perfectly clear to us, the northern regions of Turkey (Marmara, Black Sea and Northeast) have the highest percentages of full landowners. The southern regions (Mediterranean, South Central and Southeast) have the highest percentages of renters, sharecroppers, and other tenants. The Southeastern and Mediterranean Regions also have the highest percentages of agricultural laborers.

Village Landowning Patterns

The Rural Development Research Project survey actually gathered information regarding land tenure via two different methods. The individual peasant respondents were questioned directly about their land ownership, as we have seen. In addition, the leader of the five person interviewing team sent to each village completed a lengthy "Village Information Schedule," in every case, obtaining the necessary information from direct observation, village records, discussions with village leaders, etc. It is interesting to compare these data about the village with the information directly gathered from individual inhabitants about their families. Although the questions employed were different, in a gross sense the two procedures should check one another and together reveal more about land tenure patterns than either reveals alone.

Four questions from the Village Information Schedule are relevant for the present inquiry. The first of these asked, "What percentage of the villagers own all the lands they farm?" The results indicated that 28 per cent of the peasant respondents lived in villages where more than 90 per cent of the villagers owned all their land, over half the peasants lived in villages where at least three quarters of the villagers owned all their land, and just a little over one quarter of the peasants lived in villages where less than a majority of the villagers owned all their own land. These data are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Interviewer Team Leader Estimates of Land Ownership Patterns in Villages

<u>Villages Where:</u>	<u>Per cent of Respondents Living in Such a Village</u>
More than 90% Own All Land Farmed	28%
75-90% Own All Land Farmed	26
50-74% Own All Land Farmed	19
25-49% Own All Land Farmed	11
10-24% Own All Land Farmed	9
Less Than 10% Own All Land Farmed	6
No Family Owns All Land Farmed	1
	<u>100%</u> (N = 6,433)

These figures are, as we have emphasized, estimates made by the interviewing team leader from his observations in the village, inspection of any pertinent records, and discussions with available informants. Overall, they seem clearly to be compatible with the data on land ownership obtained through direct individual interviews, although they depict slightly more land ownership than those figures. A crude calculation of the percentage of respondents living in families which own all land farmed can be made by taking mid-points as representative of the categories of these grouped data and making the necessary multiplications. Such a procedure suggests that about 66% of the respondents live in families owning all the land they farm. This is a little higher than the 58 % obtained from direct questioning, but is in the same area, and it is almost identical with the percentage reported in the 1963 Agricultural Survey. It seems that one can conclude with confidence that roughly two thirds of all Turkish peasants in 1962 lived in villages where about two thirds of the families owned all the land they farmed.

The second question asked, "How many people own a major portion of the village's lands?" Forty four percent of the peasants lived in a village where "no one" owned a major portion of the village's lands, and another 21% resided in communities where more than ten large landowners were designated. Hence, it would seem that nearly two thirds of the Turkish peasantry in 1962 lived in villages whose lands were free from concentration in the hands of just a few landowners. In fact, of the remaining 35% of the respondents living in villages where a few landowners did own a sizeable chunk of the village's land, over half lived in villages where there were five to ten such landowners. Merely three per cent of our respondents lived in communities where there was a single landowner who owned a major portion of the village's lands. Although, despite common training and reliability checks, the form of the question obviously left some room for differences of interpretation of the term "a large portion", the overall implication would again seem to be that most peasants live in villages where landlordism is not an egregious problem.

The third question asked, "What percentage of the villagers work on lands owned by others (i.e., as agricultural laborers)?" Just under one quarter of the respondents lived in villages where no one worked as an agricultural laborer, and nearly two fifths lived in communities where less than ten per cent had such status. Less than a fourth of the peasants lived in villages where a majority of the inhabitants were agricultural laborers. These estimates of the incidence of agricultural laborers seem high when contrasted with the direct reports of the respondents, but the reason for this may be that the latter referred to respondents who were primarily agricultural laborers while the estimates refer to villagers who do any agricultural labor at all for others, even though they may own or rent land as well.

Finally, the fourth question asked, "In the past two years have there been any land disputes between this village and other villages?" Forty-one per cent, or two of every five peasants, lived in a village which had experienced such a land dispute. Villagers are quite edgy about possible encroachments of other villages onto their village's lands, and the newspapers frequently report clashes over peripheral fields and pasture. The survey data would seem to reflect these tensions. The data, of course, relate only to inter-village conflict over land; intra-village conflicts were not tapped by the present item. However, the headman of each village was queried about pressures which the villagers bring to bear on him as the authoritative leader of the village. He was asked, "Are there things which the villagers want the authorities to solve but which the authorities do not bother to attend to?" Then, the 42% of the headmen who answered this question "yes" were asked, "What are the most important of these?" Land problems were cited by 13% of the headmen, ranking third behind roads (33%) and water (22%). Again, the headmen were asked, "As headman, what are the village matters that take up most of your time?" In this instance, land ranked second in frequency of mention, being named by 14% of the headmen and coming just after roads, which was listed by 15%. Although land problems are not the most salient

concerns of villagers, compared to other problems they do seem to be matters which are particularly likely to demand governmental reconciliation.

Regional Land Tenure Patterns

Regional variations in response to the four items from the Village Information Schedule and to the direct questions previously examined are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Regional Variations in Landowning Patterns

<u>Characteristics</u>	Agricultural Regions - Rankings								
	<u>I</u> <u>N.C.</u>	<u>II</u> <u>Aeg.</u>	<u>III</u> <u>Mar.</u>	<u>IV</u> <u>Med.</u>	<u>V</u> <u>N.E.</u>	<u>VI</u> <u>S.E.</u>	<u>VII</u> <u>B.S.</u>	<u>VIII</u> <u>E.C.</u>	<u>IX</u> <u>S.C.</u>
Peasants Whose Families Own All Land Farmed	4	6.5	2	9	3	5	1	8	6.5
Peasants Whose Families Own Some Land Farmed	3	4	2	9	5	8	1	6	7
Peasants Living in Village Where More Than 90% Own All Land Farmed	2	8	4.5	9	6	7	1	4.5	3
Peasants Living in Village Where Less Than 25% Own All Land Farmed (ranks inverted)	2	4	5	9	8	7	1	6	3
Peasants Living in Village Having 1-4 Dominant Land-owners (ranks inverted)	9	2.5	2.5	7	5.5	8	1	5.5	4
Peasants Living in Village With No Land Dispute in Past Two Years	5	8	4	2	6	1	3	7	9

With the exception of the last item, the incidence of land disputes, the general similarity of the regional rankings across these items tapping land distribution is quite apparent.²³ The Black Sea Region seems to have

the best land distribution on every measure. The Marmara Region and the North Central Region also rank high, save that the latter appears to have relatively many of its inhabitants living in villages where there are a few landowners who own a large portion of the village's land. The Mediterranean Region generally displays the poorest land distribution, and the Southeastern Region also ranks comparatively low.

When we come to the regional rankings according to the percentage of villagers living in a village which has been involved in a land dispute, the overall ranking pattern changes.²⁴ The Southeastern and Mediterranean Regions, poorest in land distribution, surprisingly appear to have the lowest incidences of inter-village land disputes. The South Central and Aegean Regions which rank fairly well in land distribution seem to have the greatest inter-village friction over land. Fifty seven per cent of the peasants in the South Central Region and 51 per cent of those in the Aegean Region live in villages which were reported to have been involved in land disputes in the preceding two years. Inter-village land disputes do not seem to be a simple result of overall inequities in land distribution. This lack of any clear-cut and strong association between land ownership patterns and the incidence of inter-village land disputes is also evident when we cross-tabulate in individual land ownership reports and the question on village land disputes. Table 4 presents these data, controlling for sex, literacy and age, and dividing the respondents into those whose families own all land farmed versus others.

It can be seen that six of the eight comparisons between full landowners and others show that the landowners live in villages which are less likely to have been involved in an inter-village land dispute. Taken as a whole, however, this pattern is neither statistically significant (using the Wilcoxon Signed Banks Test) nor are the percentage differences very great. One should note, nevertheless, that the two inversions occur in the age groups whose

Table 4. Peasant Land Ownership by Village Land Dispute in Past Two Years

	Inter-Village Land Dispute in Past Two Years		
	Yes	No	(N)
Male Literates:			
Age 16-19:			
Own All Land Farmed	42%	58%	(113)
Other	55	45	(55)
Age 20-29:			
Own All Land Farmed	44	56	(209)
Other	53	47	(137)
Age 30-49:			
Own All Land Farmed	44	56	(303)
Other	53	47	(171)
Age 50 or more:			
Own All Land Farmed	45	55	(105)
Other	32	68	(28)
Male Illiterates:			
Age 16-19:			
Own All Land Farmed	41	59	(29)
Other	32	68	(19)
Age 20-29:			
Own All Land Farmed	42	58	(64)
Other	46	54	(52)
Age 30-49:			
Own All Land Farmed	39	61	(211)
Other	43	57	(187)
Age 50 or more:			
Own All Land Farmed	42	58	(296)
Other	49	51	(160)

numbers are smallest and whose reliability is most suspect. Perhaps the most plausible conclusion is that the table suggests a possible relationship in the expected direction between land ownership and village land disputes, but that relationship is far from certain and strong.

Individual Perceptions of Land Distribution as a Problem.

It is interesting to fill out the picture of land distribution sketched so far by examining data on peasant perceptions of land as a village or personal problem. Two items from the Rural Development Research Project survey are relevant. The first asked what the respondent thought was the most important problem confronting his village, and the second asked what he would wish for if he could have one wish come true. Both were open questions, permitting the respondents to give any type of answer they chose, rather than structuring their answers in terms of a limited set of previously designated alternatives. One of the code categories for classifying the answers to the first question on the most important problem facing the village was devoted to answers naming land ownership, land distribution, land reform, and the like. Thus, we can compare the saliency of this issue with others reflected in the responses. For the total sample, land received the fourth highest percentage of mentions as the village's most important problem. Water ranked first, being designated by 29% of the peasantry, roads (15%) ranked second, "poverty" (12%) ranked third, and land (10%) was next.

The coding of the responses to the question regarding what the respondent would most wish for is somewhat less suitable for our present purposes. Wishes for more or better land were combined with wishes for cattle, crops and farming equipment, and we do not know what proportion of this response refers to land alone. Inspection of a sample of the verbatim replies suggests that at least a majority of these answers referred to land, but no finer inference is possible. In any event, the wish for "land, etc." ranked second among the categories employed. Answers coded "wealth" ranked first, being selected by 30% of the respondents, "land, etc." was chosen by 17%, a mixed bag of "other answers" ranked third with 12%, "water" was fourth with 9%, and no other category received more than 6%.

An analysis of these two questions was made that was similar to that presented in Table 1. Sex, literacy, age, agricultural region, village size, urban proximity, and so on, were cross-tabulated against these two items. The major findings from this analysis were: 1) that land was much more salient as a village problem or as a personal wish to males than it was to females; 2) that, after controlling for sex and age, the literates were slightly less concerned with land issues than were the illiterates; 3) that village size and urban proximity seemed to make no difference in the saliency of land issues; and 4) that regional differences in the prominence of land issues did exist, but these were mild and only moderately related to the apparent actual distribution of land in the regions. Land matters were most frequently perceived as the main village problem in the Southeastern Region (19%), the Northeastern Region (16%) and in the South Central Region (13%). They were least frequently perceived as the main village problem in the Aegean and East Central Regions (6% each), and in the Black Sea Region (8%) and, surprisingly, in the Mediterranean Region (9%). "Land, etc." was most likely to be the main personal wish in the Marmara Region (21%), and in the Southeastern Region (20%), while it was least likely to be the main personal wish among the inhabitants of the East Central Region (12%) and the North Central Region (14%). These results are not very impressive, however, since the range of variation across regions was only 13% (6-19%) for the first question and 9% (12-21%) for the second. Indeed, the lack of inter-regional variation in the saliency of land issues is probably the most notable aspect of these data.

Full Landowners Contrasted with Other Villagers

We wish to determine what difference, if any, it makes to the attitudes and behaviors of the Turkish peasant that he owns his land. To accomplish this we want to compare landowning peasants with other peasants who do not own land. Moreover, we need to examine these relationships in some depth, controlling for outside factors associated with our variables and possible obscuring their true relationship. For example, those respondents whose families own all their land are somewhat more likely than other respondents to be literate. Literacy, in turn, is associated with many other variables. If literacy is uncontrolled in our analysis, we might attribute to land ownership associations which were really due to literacy. To provide a few safeguards against accepting such spurious relationships, we have controlled for sex, literacy and age in the following analysis. Applying such controls simultaneously, however, takes a quick toll of even a large sample. Hence, we were compelled to dichotomize the major independent variable, land ownership, into those peasants whose families owned all land farmed versus all other peasants. This section is concerned with describing the differences, and the lack of differences, between these two groups, hereafter labelled "Full Owners" and "Others".

First of all, let us look at the more straightforward of the two questions we have just been discussing -- that which asked what the peasant regarded as the most important problem facing his village. Table 5 displays these data for male farmers, with literacy and age controlled.

Although the full owners tend, as predicted, to see land as the village's main problem less often than do the other male farmers, the differences are very slim. By this criterion, the land problem is not very much more salient for those who do not own all their land than it is for those who do.

Table 5. Per cent of Males Viewing Land as the Village's Most Problem, by Land Ownership, Literacy and Age

		<u>Full Owners</u>	<u>Others</u>
Literates:	16-19 years	7% (100)	12% (50)
	20-29 years	13 (184)	16 (125)
	30-49 years	18 (255)	19 (150)
	50 or more years	13 (92)	7 (27)
Illiterates:	16-19 years	4% (25)	28% (18)
	20-29 years	16 (55)	19 (43)
	30-49 years	14 (177)	18 (169)
	50 or more years	15 (261)	17 (150)

Similar analysis of a wide range of items from the survey yielded the following statistically significant relationships.

1. The full owners seemed to regard themselves as economically better off than most other peasants and they were less likely to see their problems as unbearable.
2. In 1962, slightly prior to our survey, a group of experts from Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and the United States interviewed 524 farmers in Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. They report that "It was found that the adoption of improved practices was much higher in areas where the land is predominantly farmer-owned and operated. It was found that where a farmer owned part of the land and rented the rest, that most of the fertilizer and care was lavished upon his own land and that the rented land was often neglected."²⁶ Though not as rich in detailed information about farm practices, our broader instrument and more extensive sample do not totally confirm this finding. Full owners were indeed more likely to say they would invest a windfall of 1,000 TL rather than spend or save it. But they were no more likely to innovate, to consult agricultural extension agents, nor to use a metal plow, nor to use government credit, etc. When they perceived innovational conflict in the village

they were less likely than others to side with the "modern" group. In short, there are lamentably few signs in our data that full owners are more innovative than others.

3. Similarly, indications that the full owners are more likely to feel that they have a stake in the community are quite scarce in our data. Full owners are no different from others in their feelings of efficacy vis a vis local or national government, their willingness to accept responsibility as a community for solving problems, their willingness to participate in village projects, or their ideas about what to do regarding outstanding village problems.

4. Peasants whose families own all the land they farm seem to be somewhat more knowledgeable about political parties than other villagers. Perhaps this finding is more meaningfully stated in reverse form: peasants who do not own all the land they farm are less knowledgeable about political parties than the full owners. Those not owning their own land give no indication of venting any dissatisfaction through partisan political outlets.

5. The owners seem to live in villages that are somewhat less developed and more remote than those housing other villagers, although the differences are slight.

6. Compared with others, the male farmers who were full owners seemed to be more likely to look to the village headman for leadership.

7. There was no difference between the two land ownership groups in terms of the favorableness of their views of the rural-urban migrant's life. Land ownership did not seem to be associated with a less favorable opinion of the city.

All in all, our analysis fails to find indications of most of the qualities which the possession of land is said to foster in farmers. More highly focussed research will be necessary to determine if this finding is accurate or if it is at least in part the result of the too blunt distinctions necessarily made in our questions on land ownership.

Land Ownership as a Predicted and Predictor Variable

Further insight into the significance of land ownership is offered if we can answer two basic questions: 1) what factors best predict whether a peasant will be from a family which owns all its land and 2) what other peasant attributes, if any, does knowledge of a peasant's land ownership enable us to predict. For this purpose we shall employ a reduction of predictive uncertainty technique. Essentially, this technique enables us to designate any of our survey items as a "dependent" variable and, at present, about twenty other items or indices as "independent" variables. The technique involves calculating according to principles developed in mathematical information theory, the error or uncertainty that would exist if we were to attempt to predict each respondent's position on the dependent variable from knowledge of its marginal distribution alone, and then ascertaining how much that error or uncertainty is reduced if we also have knowledge, singly or cumulatively, of the independent variables. For example, in the case of land ownership, we know from our sample marginals that 58 of the respondents were full owners and 42 fell into the residual category. Based on that information alone one could develop an optimal strategy for predicting any given random sub-set of respondent's land ownership and also determine the error associated with that prediction. However, were we also to know for each respondent whether he had been to the cinema, our prediction of his land ownership would be improved the more closely cinema exposure was associated with land ownership. If the association were perfect, we would have all (100%) of our uncertainty regarding peasant's land ownership reduced -- we should be able to predict the latter without error. The advantages of this technique is that it does not make the unrealistic assumptions about normality of distribution and having interval data that many correlational methods demand, and that it has a readily understandable interpretation. ²⁷

Best Predictors of Land Ownership

The absolute and relative importance of the following variables as predictors of land ownership was considered: having visited the nearest city, radio exposure, cinema exposure, newspaper exposure, sex, age, household size, literacy, schooling, language spoken, acceptance of communal responsibility*, mass media exposure*, subjective poverty*, village centrality*, village development*, level of occupational and educational aspiration*, external mistrust*, religious saliency*, political party knowledge*, geographical mobility*, and cognitive flexibility*.²⁸ Of these, the best predictor of land ownership was sex, which reduced uncertainty by 3.52%. In one respect, this is an unfortunate finding, since it implies some sort of error. Our samples of males and females should theoretically represent the same families with the same land ownership. It seems improbable that the male peasants would be more likely than the females to live in families which owned all their own land. What the finding does point to is something that we have already mentioned, namely, that men and women apparently have different perceptions of the land ownership positions of their families. The men report a higher degree of full ownership than do the women. As we have shown, the male reports conform better to existing census data, but that may simply be due to the fact that a male household head is the person who usually replies to the census enumerator. Which report is actually more correct and why this difference in knowledge, perception or reporting should occur cannot be answered from our survey data.

At the zero-order level (that is, taking each predictor variable singly), the next best predictors of land ownership after sex are mass media exposure (1.17), newspaper exposure (1.10), subjective poverty (1.07), cinema exposure (1.05), and literacy (1.05). It can be seen that none of the "independent" variables is a very powerful predictor of land ownership, including one of our best economic indicators -- subjective poverty. The respondent's reports of familial deprivations of food, shelter and clothing are not a very potent guide to his land ownership status.

If, instead of considering these "independent" variables one at a time, we follow a procedure of selecting the best predictor, allowing for its effects and selecting the next best predictor, and so on for as long as statistical significance at the .05 level is maintained, we can inspect the cumulative predictive power of this set of factors. Thus, when the relationship between sex and land ownership is partialled out, and considering only those respondents for whom we have information on all variables (N-1, 997), we find the following order among our predictors.

Table. 6. Cumulative Reductions of Predictive Uncertainty
Regarding Land Ownership

<u>Predictor Variable</u>	<u>Total Cumulative Uncertainty Reduction</u>
Sex	3.756%
Subjective Poverty	4.457
Village Centrality	5.257
Age	6.140
Village Development	7.223
Household Size	9.294
External Mistrust	12.844
Cognitive Flexibility	18.838

What Table 6 indicates is the best cumulative ordering of predictors. In other words, it says that in order to predict a peasant's reported land ownership status on our survey the most useful information one can have is knowledge of the sex of the respondent. Once one knows the sex of the respondent, then the next best information to have is his score on our Subjective Poverty Index. Knowing both of those, then one would want to know the relative centrality or isolation of his village, and so on. Altogether, if one had information about the eight factors listed on the table he could reduce his error in predicting the land ownership reports of our respondents by nearly nineteen per cent.

After examining eight variables our analysis becomes statistically unreliable at the .05 level of confidence because the degrees of freedom, which in this case rise as 2^n where n (the number of cumulative predictors), becomes 256 and higher. These data suggest that while no single factor is a very good predictor of a respondent's land ownership report, a profile of factors -- some economic, some ecological, some social background, and some psychological -- can provide a moderately effective prediction. Certainly, it seems clear that a report of owning all the land farmed is not strongly related to the economic status of the peasant nor to the level of development of his village.

Land Ownership as a Predictor of Other Attributes

The obverse side of this analysis is to ask whether knowledge of a peasant's reported land ownership status enables us to improve any of our predictions regarding his other characteristics, and if so, which characteristics. We can compare the predictive power of land ownership with that of the other "independent" variables previously enumerated. When we do so, the essential result is that land ownership is a very weak or poor predictor of other peasant attributes. Knowledge of whether or not a peasant has reported that his family owns all the land it farms does not contribute much to an understanding of peasant orientations and behavior.

Land ownership as defined is the best predictor of only one item on our survey--marital status. Land owners are more likely than others to be married. Even in that case it is a feeble association, since the reduction of uncertainty is only 0.07%. Land ownership is a predictor of intermediate strength of the length of time the respondent has lived in the village (landowners have resided there longer), of whether the respondents speak a language other than Turkish (landowners are less likely to do so), of the size of the respondent's household and the number of rooms in the

house (landowners live in larger households and houses), of the frequency with which the respondent prays (landowners pray more often), of the preference for authority and strength versus participation and consultation in government (landowners are more likely to stress strength and authority), and of the perception of the family's relative economic status (landowners are more likely to see their families as better off than other village families). Although the zero-order uncertainty reduction was very weak (1.49%) landownership was the best predictor after age of whether a peasant said he had used government credit and it remained the second best cumulative predictor after age was partialled out. Again, although very weak as a zero-order predictor, it was the third best cumulative predictor after cognitive flexibility and language of whether the peasant reported that he had sometime received agricultural supplies from the government.

All in all, however, this analysis supports the conclusion reached by the other analyses that land ownership as defined is not strongly associated with many peasant attitudes and behaviors. It ranked in the bottom half overall of the twenty two "independent" variables examined in the uncertainty analysis. The general implication of our findings would seem to be that the burden of proof should rest upon those who assert that land ownership makes a big difference to peasant incentives in rural Turkey.

NOTES

¹Wolf Ladejinsky, "Land Reform", in David Haggood and Max F. Millikan (eds.), Policies for Promoting Agricultural Development, Report of a Conference on Productivity and Innovation in Agriculture in the Underdeveloped Countries; Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1965), p. 295.

²Ibid., p. 296 (Emphasis Added.)

³Ibid., p. 298.

⁴Eugene Staley, The Future of Underdeveloped Countries (New York: Praeger, Revised edition, 1961), p. 251.

⁵Walt W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, reprinted 1960), p. 24.

⁶Staley, op. cit. pp. 252-253.

⁷Theodore W. Shultz, Transforming Traditional Agriculture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 19.

⁸Eric R. Wolf, Peasants (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 92, notes that "The Russian practitioners of Marxism -- Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin -- realized the potentialities of peasant support in an overthrow of the social order; but they also knew all too well that what the peasantry desired was land. Hence the peasantry might rise up to fight for land; but once it had occupied land, it would cease to be a revolutionary force." In the Far East, South East Asia, and Latin America, however, land for the landless has been a major component of the appeal of more recent communist movements.

⁹Ladejinsky, op. cit. p. 301.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 302. (Emphasis added.)

¹¹William and Paul Paddock, Hungry Nation, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), p. 240.

¹²Op. cit. p. 316.

¹³Kalkinma Planı, İkinci Bes Yıl 1968-1972 (Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teskilatı, 1967), p. 72.

¹⁴For a brief description of the project, see Appendix A. For a fuller description, see Report No. 1 of this series.

Notes p. 2

¹⁵Note that Paul Stirling, in his anthropological study of Sakaltutah and Elbesi villages in Kayseri "...did not attempt in either village to measure holdings, and ... found people unwilling and often genuinely unable to give accurate figures of their extent." Turkish Village (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Science Editions, 1965), p. 52. See also, John Kolars, Tradition, Season and Change in a Turkish Village (Chicago: Department of Geopgraphy Research Paper no. 82, University of Chicago, 1963), pp. 52, no. 1.

¹⁶See, for example, the interesting discussion of this problem in Michael Chrisholm, Rural Settlement and Land Use (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Science Editions, 1967), especially Chapter 3, where studies are cited indicating that the gross and net return per hectare seem respectively to decline anywhere from 10 to 20% and 20 to 40% with an average distance of the plots from the main plot of one kilometer -- by no means a great distance. Sixty per cent of the 356 holdings in a survey of forty villages in the Punjab of West Pakistan, for example, had average distances greater than one kilometer. In Scandinavia and Northern Europe, where most research has been done, the overall average distance is roughly one kilometer.

¹⁷Table 232, p. 220.

¹⁸See, e.g., Kolars, op. cit., p. 101, 97-104. Local cadastral surveys, of course, have been and are being taken. By the time the entire nation is covered through a series of such local surveys, however, the results obtained in the earliest surveys of such a series are quite out of date.

¹⁹For one presentation of relevant figures, see the Symposium on Agricultural Production (Ankara: Central Treaty Organization, 1962) Table 7, "Land Use Patterns in Turkey 1949-1963).

²⁰These data were calculated from those presented in the 1950 and 1963 Tarim Istatistik Ozetleri (Ankara: Devlet Istatistik Enstitusu, 1950 and 1963).

²¹Ibid.

²²Ladejinsky, op. cit., p. 303.

²³The Coefficient of Concordance, W , which measures the similarity of several rank orderings, is for the first four items 0.64, yielding a χ^2 of 20.48 with 4 degrees of freedom, and $p = .001$. For the first five items, W is 0.65, $\chi^2 = 26.00$ with 5 degrees of freedom, and $p = .001$. For presentation of the Coefficient of Concordance, see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 229-238.

²⁴This change is reflected in a drop in the Coefficient of Concordance from $W = 0.65$ for the rankings of the first five items of Table 3 to $W = 0.44$ for all six items.