insan & toplum
the journal of humanity and society
Research Article

Class, Family, Income and Wealth: Farming and Non-Farming Landowners in the Occupational and Social Class Orders in Turkey

Abdulkerim Sönmez

Abstract: This study presents the trajectory of changes in land ownership and land use and of the differences observed since the mid-1990s in the average amount of annual disposable income (and of wealth) within and between farming and non-farming landowning households in Turkey. The study makes use of the data sets of the *Household Budget Surveys* conducted by the Turkish Institute of Statistics (TUIK) in 1994, 2002, 2005, 2010, 2015 and 2017. The data sets have been analysed in connection with four main themes: (i) the patterns of structural change in landownership and land use, (ii) the patterns of structural change in the locations of farming and non-farming landowners in the occupational and social class orders, (iii) the patterns of changes and the persistence of differences in the average amounts of annual disposable incomes and wealth within and between the social classes of farming and non-farming landowners and (iv) the effect of family type on the differences of income and wealth. The results indicate that Turkish agrarian structures have undergone significant structural changes in the last quarter of a century, and there are persisting and significant differences of income (and of wealth) at the national level as well as among farming and non-farming landowning households. However, the same kind of differences do not hold true for differences in the average amount of farm land owned. On the contrary, these differences have strong associations with family type among farming as well as non-farming households.

Keywords: Landownership, land use, land abandonment, income differences among landowners, differences of wealth among landowners, peasant poverty, social class.

Öz: Bu çalışma 1990'ların ortasından beri Türkiye'de toprak sahipliği, toprak kullanımı ve çiftçilikle uğraşan ve uğraşmayan toprak sahibi hane halklarının yıllık kullanılabilir ortalama gelirleri (ve servetleri) arasında gözlemlenen farklılıkların seyri hakkındadır. Çalışmada TUİK tarafından yapılmış olan 1994, 2002, 2005, 2010, 2015 ve 2017 *Hane Halkı Bütçe Araştırması* verileri kullanılmakta olup, bunlar dört ana tema ile ilişkili olarak analiz edilmektedir. Bunlar: (i) toprak sahipliği ve kullanımındaki yapısal değişme örüntüleri, (ii) toprak sahibi olup, çiftçilik yapan ve yapmayan hane halklarının mesleki ve toplumsal sınıf mevkilerinde meydana gelen değişme örüntüleri, (iii) toprak sahibi olup, farklı toplumsal sınıf konumlarında bulunan çiftçilik yapan ve yapmayan hane halklarının yıllık kullanılabilir ortalama gelir ve servet miktarı ve farklılıkları ile ilgili örüntülerde gözlemlenen değişmeler ve (iv) aile biçiminin bu farklılıklar üzerindeki etkisi. Analiz sonuçları, Türkiye'deki tarımsal yapıların geçen son çeyrek yüzyılda önemli yapısal değişmeler geçirmiş olduklarını ve hem ulusal düzeyde toplumsal sınıflar arasında hem de toprak sahibi olup tarımsal geliri olan ve olmayan hane halkları arasında önemli ve devamlılık gösteren gelir ve servet farklılıkları olduğunu göstermektedir. Ancak, analiz sonuçları, bu iki toplumsal kategori arasında sahip olunan toprak miktarı bakımından aynı türden anlamlı ve önemli farklılıklar olmadığını, aksine bu farklılıklar ile aile biçimi arasında önemli bir birlikte değişme ilişkisi olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Toprak sahipliği, toprak kullanımı, toprağı terk etme, toprak sahipleri arasında gelir farklılıkları, toprak sahipleri arasında servet farklılıkları, köylü fakirliği, toplumsal sınıf.

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University. ksonmez@hacettepe.edu.tr

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8288-2240

10.12658/M0694
insan & toplum, 2023; 13(2): 84-159.
insanvetoplum.org

Received: 12.12.2021
Revision: 10.08.2022
Accepted: 26.08.2022
Online First: 21.09.2022

Introduction

This study presents the trajectory of changes in land ownership and land use, and makes a comparative analysis of differences observed since the mid-1990s in the average area of farm land owned and the annual disposable income (and of wealth) within and between farming and non-farming landowning households in Turkey. The basic argument of the paper is that differences of income and wealth within and between landowning households cannot simply be analysed by limiting our attention to the divides between the size of owned farmland. On the contrary, these differences seem to be closely connected with occupational and social class differences, and therefore a social class-based approach provides a much better perspective for understanding these issues. Furthermore, the need for this kind of approach seems to have become more of an imperative as a result of the growing reliance of family farms on income derived from off-farm sources and activities, which are giving a new shape to their location in the occupational and social class orders. In this process, patterns of differences and the degree and direction of change in the amount of household income and wealth between identical social classes of farming and non-farming landowners act as proxies and reflect the outcomes of these processes of structural change. The main question that this paper tries to answer is how rich or poor landowning farmers or peasants are when they are compared to non-farming landowners as well as national averages of income and wealth among all households. As such, this paper intends to be a prelude for the next paper in this issue (that is, "Class, Family, Income and Wealth: Farming and Non-Farming Households in the Occupational and Social Class Orders in Turkey") which makes an analysis of the Household Budget Survey data related to the trajectory of changes in the structural locations of farming and non-farming households in occupational and social class orders, and the patterns of differences of income and wealth among them in Turkey.

Data, Class Categories, and Methods and Techniques of Analyses

The Data

The analyses made in this (and the next paper mentioned above) are based on the nationally representative quantitative data of *Household Budged Surveys* (*Hanehalkı Bütçe Araştırması*) (henceforth HBS) conducted by the Turkish Institute of Statistics (TUİK) (formerly State Institute of Statistics, SIS). These are nationally representative diachronic surveys, carried out first in 1987, later in 1994 and annually since the year 2002, collecting information about income distribution and household welfare

in the country.[1] This study utilizes the data sets for 1994, 2002, 2005, 2010, 2015 and 2017.[2] These data sets consist of three separate electronic data files: two for households and one for individuals, and they can be linked to each other by a common identifier in the household data files.

In order to explain how certain critical classificatory variables of the analyses have been produced out the existing ones, it is necessary to introduce the kind of variables each data set contains. The first type of "household data" sets- to give the files their TUIK name - include variables concerning household size, family type, ownership of various types of moveable property in the form of cars, boats (and forms and the estimated market value of immoveable property for 2002 and 2005) and household goods (the full lists of which change in every survey), type and size of residence and facilities available in the residence (type of heating and flooring, etc.) and total income with or without being grouped as income in cash, kind and in the form of relative and/or unearned incomes. In addition to these, they also contain information about land ownership, area of land rented out, and income obtained from the sale and domestic consumption of agricultural produce as well as from hiring of farm machinery and income support payments received from the state. The second type of household data sets are about household expenditure and they are not analysed in this study.

The HBS data files on individuals contain information about the age, sex, and educational level of the household members, their current occupation and employment status, employability if they are unemployed, and their annual/monthly income from jobs and activities other than as farmers. However, both sets of electronic files have been stripped of information about the armed forces as an occupational group, and also removed are variables referring to the place (rural-urban) and region of residence of the households in the data files from 2010 onwards.[3] In addition, these

1 An earlier and probably the first national survey on income distribution in the country was conducted in 1968 by Bulutay, Timur & Ersel (1971).

2 The author has been granted permission to access to these data as well as the data sets of Income and Living Conditions (ILCS) (Gelir ve Yaşam Koşulları Araştırması) for the years of 2006, 2010, 2015 and 2017 by TUIK via an official document dated 04.07.2019, document number: 27964695-622.03-E.15933. All calculations and analyses have been made by the author on the raw data sets which have been provided in the form of excel and/or SPSS files.

3 It seems that this is not due to any policy of secrecy but because of a granting several major cities, by law and since the 2010s, the status of metropolitan municipalities and expanding their administrative boundaries to include all rural districts and villages in the entire province. This resulted in the redundancy of former population size-based conceptions and classifications of administrative units as rural (population less than 20 thousand) or urban (population more than 20 thousand) that is employed by TUIK. Hart (2018, p. 73) mentions the same issue and calls this process an erasing of the very identity and nature of the village through bureaucratic redefinition of these spaces as urban neighbourhoods.

data sets contain no information about the last occupation and occupational status of unemployed individuals and of those over the age of employment (that is 65).

Variables concerning the current occupation and occupational status of the household members have been coded in the data sets according to ISCO- 68 procedures in the case of 1994 HBS and according to ISCO-88 in the rest of the surveys. ISCO-68 and ISCO-88 categories and coding procedures are not completely different from each other. However, since some of the separate major occupational groups in the ISCO-88 classifications are coded together in the 1994 survey data file, it has not been possible to disaggregate and recode this data set in accordance with the categories of this latter scheme of classification. The basic understanding behind both classifications is related to two main concepts and these are jobs or the kind of work performed, and the type and level of skills involved in the performance of the work. These are explained in the web page of ILO (see at https://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/isco88/) as follows:

> The framework necessary for designing and constructing ISCO-88 has been based on two main concepts: the concept of the kind of work per-formed or job, and the concept of skill.
>
> Job - defined as a set of tasks and duties executed, or meant to be executed, by one person - is the statistical unit classified by ISCO-88. A set of jobs whose main tasks and duties are characterised by a high degree of similarity constitutes an occupation. Persons are classified by occupation through their relationship to a past, present or future job.
>
> Skill - defined as the ability to carry out the tasks and duties of a given job - has, for the purposes of ISCO-88 the two following dimensions:
>
> (a) Skill level - which is a function of the complexity and range of the tasks and duties involved; and
>
> (b) Skill specialization - defined by the field of knowledge required, the tools and machinery used, the materials worked on or with, as well as the kinds of goods and services produced.
>
> On the basis of the skill concept thus defined, ISCO-88 occupational groups were delineated and further aggregated.

ISCO-88 defines ten major occupational groups and four skill levels. The major occupational groups are named and listed in a hierarchical fashion, and refer to their location in the social division of labour and thus in the system of socio-economic classes based on occupation. These socio-economic or occupational classes (as they will be called in this work) consist of the following: (1) legislators, senior officials and managers, (2) professionals, (3) technicians and associate professionals, (4) clerks,

(5) service workers and shop and market sales workers, (6) skilled agricultural and fishery workers, (7) craft and related trades workers, (8) plant and machine operators and assemblers, (9) those with elementary occupations and (10) the armed forces. The skill levels are defined by the age, length, type of education and the kind of expertise that the incumbents of these positions are required have for the performance of their jobs. The first skill level combines jobs that can be done with no more than a primary school education. The second level refers to jobs mostly belonging to occupations listed from the 4th to the 8th class of occupations, the third level refers to jobs belonging to occupational class 3, and the fourth refers to jobs that require a university or postgraduate degree in a given specific field or discipline. However, no specific skill levels have been defined for the 1st and 10th major occupational groups.[4] The coding procedures define five employment statuses; these are: (1) on a salary or regular wage, (2) on a daily wage or according to the amount of work performed, (3) being an employer (of one or more regular workers), (4) working on one's own account and (5) being an unpaid household worker. Individuals with more than one job are allocated to the occupations and occupational status of that from which they earn most of their individual income.

It is possible to consistently apply three different definitions of "a farming household" to the *HBS* data sets. These are: (1) a household which has at least one member whose main occupation is agriculture (that is occupational category 6) and whose employment status is other than a salaried or daily wage worker, that is not a farm worker, but a farmer, (2) a household headed or identified by a farmer by (main) occupation (that is the very occupation from which an individual earns the greater amount of his/her income), and (3) a household which earns agricultural income in cash (profit from the sale of the farm's produce, support payments received from the state, and payments from the hiring-out of farm machinery), and in kind (i.e., cash equivalent of farm produce consumed directly) as specified separate variables in the household data sets. These different definitions yield different proportions of households in the samples, and their criterion validity is not identical. In the case of the first definition there is a very noticeable increase in the proportion of farming households because of their inclusion in the surveys (especially for 2010 and 2015) of those individuals who work as unpaid household workers on farms or in the premises of households of which they are not a member. These individuals are most likely unemployed close kin and family members, including even retired

4 See Elias (1997) for a critical examination of ISCO-88's method, reliability, validity and cross-national comparability.

parents, helping their relatives with farm work. In the case of the second definition, the main problem stems from the identification of households by reference to individuals whose positions in the organization of the households are not clear. In addition, given the higher than national average presence of extended families among farmers, households headed by retired or unemployed senior persons are not included while they are in fact farming households. This paper adopts the third definition which makes a much more direct and precise reference to involvement in agriculture, but remains less clear about identity (that is whether it is a subsistence, commercial, capitalist, corporate or family farm) and type (crop, animal husbandry, poultry, etc.) of farming as a source of income.

A household is defined in the variable lists of the data sets as an individual or individuals who is/are living together, without necessarily being kin by blood or marriage, in a separate residential unit and who provide for their basic needs together and take part in the running and administration of the unit. A family however refers to those members of this domestic unit who are connected to each other by ties of blood or marriage. The types of families are classified by reference to how these members are related to each other through the medium of a marriage unit. Thus, a nuclear family household refers to those units consisting of a married couple and their (unmarried) children, an extended family to those which contain more than one full or divided/broken marriage unit and relatives by blood or marriage, and finally a one-adult family refers to those units which either consist of one person or to those units in which one of the married couples is absent for reasons of work, divorce or death. In the analyses reported in this paper, all the households in the variable lists have been coded, using these definitions, into four types, which are: (i) nuclear family, (ii) extended family, (iii) one-adult family and (iv) "other" which refers to households consisting of workers, students, friends or some relatives sharing accommodation.

Class Categories

The social class approach adopted in this study has been inspired by but is not identical with Goldthorpe's (1987) seven social class scheme. For the assignment of individuals (in employment) and households to class positions, a class map was designed that takes into consideration Goldthorpe's definitions in his seven-social-class scheme (1987, pp. 40-42). His conception of social class has some close parallels with but is not a direct expression of the occupational classes or groups that are identified in employment statistics coded according to ISCO-88 procedures, as has been done in the survey data utilized in this work: It can be said that ISCO-88 considers social classes resting on the occupational division of labour based on skill

levels (acquired though education and training) and thus as the main mechanisms attaching individuals to distinct rewards packets (that is income at least) in the market. Contrary to this, Goldthorpe's conception of class considers class positions arising from causal articulation of market situation, employment status, workplace authority of the employees as well as type and specificity of their assets, the ways in which jobs or occupations are subjected to employers' control, and the types of contracts (labour or service) on the basis of which workers are employed (see Goldthorpe, 2007, pp. 106-118).

In the present research, Goldthorpe's definitions of social classes were transposed, with some modifications and caution, on to already coded data along with nine major occupational classes by five different employment status. The first modification concerns the class location of farm workers. Instead of assigning farm workers coded as belonging to occupational class 6 (in accordance with ISCO-88 coding procedures) to class VII, as Goldthorpe does, they have been assigned to social class VI (skilled manual workers), since the skill level of these workers is coded not as level 1 (which is appropriate for Goldthorpe's class VII) but 2. The second modification concerns the threshold he sets for the number (25 or more) of employees identifying a proprietor's establishment as "large". Instead of these criteria, this paper adopts the organizational criteria (those organizations with more than 3 sub-unit directors headed by a chief one) that ISCO-88 defines for the assignment of managers to occupational Class 1 (that is legislators, senior officials and managers). Caution is needed, however; firstly, because we do not know if all large proprietors (be they industrial, commercial, service or agricultural) work at all; and secondly because when not working but living off rent from their large commercial, industrial and agricultural estates, or off the interest or dividends from savings and investments they are necessarily included among the unemployed and find no place among the occupational classes. The result of these modifications is a list of seven social classes, each of which include groups of individuals in employment as follows:

Class I: Upper service class: All individuals in employment, regardless of their employment status, in the occupational classes 1 and 2 (that is: (1) Legislators, senior officials and managers, and (2) Professionals).

Class II: Lower service class: All individuals, regardless of their employment status, in the occupational class 3, (that is, technicians and associate professionals).

Class III: Routine non-manual class: All workers employed on regular salary or wage in the occupational classes 4 and 5 (that is: (4) Clerks, and (5) Service workers and shop and market sales workers).

Class IV: Petty bourgeoisie: All employers, own account workers and unpaid family workers in the occupational classes of 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 (that is: (4) Clerks, (5) Service workers and shop and market sales workers, (6) Skilled agricultural and fishery workers, (7) Craft and related trades workers, and (8) Plant and machine operators and assemblers).

Class V: Technicians and supervisors: All workers employed on regular salary or on daily wage in occupational class 8 (that is, technicians and supervisors).

Class VI: Skilled manual class: All workers employed on regular salary or on daily wage in the occupational classes 6 and 7 (that is: (6) Skilled agricultural and fishery workers, and (7) Craft and related trades workers).

Class VII**:** Nonskilled manual class: All workers, regardless of their employment status, in the occupational class 9 (that is: Elementary occupations).

Households were assigned social class positions in two steps. First, individuals in employment were assigned to class positions by considering their occupational class and employment status, according to ISCO-88 coding. At the second step, each household was assigned to a social class position by referring to the highest-class position observed among its members in employment. This was done by a method of elimination starting with Class I positions and moving down to the other class positions. This formulation was tested to see the connection between the class location of the households and of their heads that can only be identified in the data sets of the years 2002 and 2005. The result is that the occupational class position of the heads of the household determine, for these two years of surveys respectively, the class position of all of the households assigned to Class I; 98,4% and 97,7% of the households assigned to Class II; 96,0% of the households assigned to Class III; 95,2% and 96,0% of the households assigned to Class IV; 94,9% and 95,9% of the households assigned to Class V; 94, 0% and 93, 0% of the households assigned to Class VII and 96, 3 % and 95, 6% of the households assigned to Class VII. This pattern of representation might have changed in the later surveys, but this high rate of representation nevertheless lends credibility to the expectation that the allocation process adopted in this study would produce result very similar to the outcomes of Goldthorpe's procedure of assigning households to class positions on the basis of the class position of their heads. Depending on the promise of these rates, it would not be unrealistic to assume that, in this study and in the majority of cases, the class positions of the households must be referring to the social class position of their heads.

It is important to mention here that the definition of social classes adopted in this paper is the result of a compromise that had to be made when dealing

with a set of already coded quantitative data of which collection rests on different conception of class. The author is in the opinion that there are several conceptual and methodological problems, mostly revolving around the question of class location as an emergent social position in the social structure of a given society, that have to be addressed when identify class locations of the individuals and the households for both qualitative and quantitative studies. A long section addressing these problems has been removed from this paper due to space constraints and it has already appeared as a separate article in the online-first version in this journal (i.e, "Pluriactivity, Identity of Farming and Their Relation to the Question of Class Location of Farming Households"). However, within the confines of this study, it should be pointed out that the relational conceptions of class, be they in the form of relations of production (as in Marxist tradition) or in the form of market positions (as in the Weberian tradition), suffer from one essential problem and that is the exclusion of the individuals not in gainful employment (including children, retired, disabled, aged, prisoners etc.) as if they are not a part of a society and its class structure. Goldthorpe's assignment of retired individuals to class positions based on their pre-retirement job is an attempt to redress the problem, but this option could not be used in this study because of lack of variables in the data sets. Therefore, the households with no member in employment at the time of surveys have been coded as Class 0, as a convenient shorthand enabling their inclusion in the tables.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the criteria for the definition of social class positions and the procedures followed in the allocation of individuals and households to these class positions have been subjected to a reliability test by using nationally representative data sets of *Income and Living Conditions*-ILCS) (*Gelir ve Yaşam Koşulları Araştırması*, conducted annually by TUIK since 2006) for the years of 2010, 2015 and 2017. The test results have indicated that these definitions and procedures produce very close (usually less than 2 % in absolute terms) distributions (in percent) of households by social class positions in both data sets. The only noticeable exception is a 5,0% difference in absolute terms of overestimation for class 4 (26,6% in HBS against 21,5% in ILCS) for the year of 2015. However, even when the absolute rates of distributions in percent are very close, they may result in significant differences when comparing the rates of change in relative terms and therefore caution is needed when interpreting the significance of relative rates.

Methods and Techniques of Analyses

The main method of analysis adopted in this and the next paper is known as the comparative method, which enables researchers to make within-case and between-case comparisons in a systematic fashion in order: (i) first to identify the nature of

differences within the same unit (that is among farming or non-farming households in this study), along its subunits (that is class locations and family type in this study) and (ii) to observe via using between-case comparisons if these differences hold true for the control group as well (see Perry 6 and Bellamy, 2012, p. 78). These two types of analyses are expected to help make sense of data and the interpretation of the emerging patterns, or what Dalton (2021, p. 1) calls the processes of sense-making and meaning-making, in answering the leading research question stated in the introduction.

The statistical techniques employed for the analysis of data are the very conventional ones consisting of percentage distributions, rates of relative change, disparity ratios, X2 analyses to observe the significance of associations and t-tests to observe if the differences in the mean values of the variables (basically income, wealth and the area of farm land owned) are significant and persistent in all years of surveys and hence indicating that the boundaries between classes are clear enough. The level of significance is set at 95%.

However, making sense of and deriving meaning from the results of data analyses require a broader framework, or what is known as "contextualizing statistics", which can only be stated here very briefly. The following section makes this contextualization and focuses mostly on the nature and historical development of private land ownership in Turkey and trajectory of developments since mid-1990s in size of farmland owned, land use and of exit from farming (or land abandonment).

Landownership and the Trajectory of Land Use and Exit from Farming

Landownership and Social Class

Landownership has been one of the pivotal issues in debates on class as well as on the trajectory of transformations taking place among farmers in three respects. Firstly, the amount of land and/or the number of animals owned co-determines the economic standing and class location of farming households, especially in agrarian societies. But the legal and customary forms in which these resources are owned and transferred between generations have shown great variation within and between societies. Second, the predominant view in theories of capitalist modernization in agriculture has been that a linear and irreversible tendency towards concentration of landownership in the hands of a small number of farmers is inevitable. This is usually attributed to a horizontal concentration of productive resources (particularly land) in the hands of a smaller number of farmers due to the structural imperative or tendency of capitalist development in agriculture. Therefore, peasant and/or

family farming or any pre-capitalist form of agricultural production is considered to be destined to disappear as (capitalist) modernity progresses, a tendency which has been predicted in fact on the very basis of ideal-typical conceptions of capitalism or modernity. Contrary to this view, however, as Hebinck (2018, p. 231) states, "[p]rocess[es] of change do not proceed along pre-set, linear trajectories, are not homogeneous and are not predictable. Instead, development unfolds as chaotic, many-sided, heterogeneous and often contradictory."

In the case of Turkey, a non-linear trajectory of agrarian change has also been noticed, earlier, by Keyder (1983) and there seems to be no sign of concentration of landownership that could be confirmed by national statistical data as well as by local case studies (see also Atasoy, 2017; Sevgili-Canpolat 2022; Sönmez, 1993) although land abandonment and exit from farming has been on the rise. In fact, land abandonment and farm exit in Turkey is quite strong and perhaps comparable to what has been observed in the last couple of decades in EU countries (Terres, et al., 2015; Lasanta, et al., 2017; Renwick, et al., 2013) and in Australia (Peel, et al., 2016).[5] Land abandonment is surely a multi-faceted phenomena caused by natural as well as social, demographic, economic, legal, political and institutional factors regardless of whether it is voluntary or forced. Renwick, et al. (2013: 447) seem to be right in arguing that it is "largely [a] result of declines in the viability of extensive (low input) and small-scale farming". However, once started, land abandonment may further destabilize rural communities and intensify the process in an irreversible way. For instance, Murataj's (2020) case study on intercultural marriages between Albanian women and Serbian men rests on a story of rural exodus and land abandonment in the Serbian mountain villages which has led Serbian men to cross the border with Albania to find marriage partners who would accept to live in a rural setting.

Thirdly, theories of modernization have shown a vibrant interest in the interconnections between modernity, family types and the economic conditions supporting particular types of families in both agrarian and industrial societies. In a classic example, Wolf (2000, p. 110-121) has argued that the extended family in peasant societies is both an instrument of pooling resources and labour as well as a defence mechanism against the economic decline resulting from the partition of land. The same issue was taken up by Timur (1972) in her study on the structure of the family in Turkey. She observed that the extended family is supported by large landownership and that the differences in the average area of land owned per

5 Lasanta, et al., (2017, p. 813) provide a list of studies concerned with and reporting the rates of land abandonment in the European mountains. The rates range from 11,7 % to 97 %.

household between nuclear and extended families are statistically significant: at the national level the nuclear families owned on average 35,4 da of land whereas patriarchal extended families owned 123,5 da of land (Timur, 1972, p. 58). In addition, her study indicates (p.60) that there are manifest differences between family types concerning the average annual income per head and these differences point mostly to the disadvantage of the members of the extended family: the average annual income per head of temporarily extended families (*geçici geniş aile*) was equal to 63,2% of nuclear families set up at the beginning of marriage (*kuruluşta* çekirdek *aile*) in three major cities, to 79,7% in cities, to 41,2% in towns and to 123,1% in villages. Likewise, the annual average income per head of patriarchal extended families was equal to 48,6% of the nuclear families set up at the beginning of marriage in three major cities, to 102,4% in cities, 38,5% in towns and 146,5% in villages. However, she seems to have preferred not to test the statistical significance of these aspects of differences between nuclear and extended families, neither at the national level nor at the level of types of place of residence of the households in what were, at the time of her research, classified as the three major cities (İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir), cities (with population more than 15,000), towns (places of residences with populations between 2,000 and 15,000) and villages (places of rural residences with populations less than 2,000) (p. 156). It is in this context that landownership and especially the size of land owned and the amount of annual income earned per household or per head become a matter of family type as well as a matter of social class. The HBS data provide a good opportunity to reassess if what Timur observed in her 1968 research still holds true for the 2020s in Turkey.

However, the world of contemporary farming and the over-extension of the concept of farming beyond its customary usage (that is its strict association with cultivating land) make it rather difficult to consider farmers simply as cultivators and their class locations resting only on landownership even if their only source of income is farming. As will be seen in this paper, an important portion of farmers appearing in the statistical information are not cultivators but are owners of animal farms or fish farms, or they are fishermen, etc. Furthermore, the size of arable land owned (or cultivated, farmed) without any further qualification, is not a uniform measure nor is it a proxy variable by means of which social class location of the landowners can be gauged easily. On the contrary it is one of the factors to be considered when other conditions affecting economic standing and viability are known and specified; and it is only on the basis of equality of all of these other factors that size/scale becomes an important component of comparison. In that sense, the size of land owned can fruitfully be employed as an important factor only in community studies since, as Timur's study indicates, there is a very significant variation in the average area of land

owned by types of families between the regions of the country as well. The data sets analysed in this study allow us to monitor how the interconnections between land ownership, class and family types unfold after half a century has passed in Turkey since Timur's study, although it is not possible to monitor changes at regional levels.

Historical Background and the Current State of Landownership in Turkey

Turkish agrarian structure has historically been characterized by the predominance of owner-occupied small farms and a partible land regime. This predominance exited side by side with large landownership in all parts of the country, especially in the East and South-east. In the 1990s these large holdings (5,6% of all farms) controlled 35% of all agricultural land privately owned in the country (SIS, 1994, 2004; Sönmez 2001, p. 71). In historical terms, several measures have been taken by the governments in Turkey to help create and maintain small scale landownership and farming. Very briefly put, these included the following: During the Ottoman period (1299-1922), the state gave the peasants almost unalienable rights for farming and residence on the *miri* lands they bought from the state and the transfer of their property to their descendants. This system coexisted with a system of private land ownership which granted the owners absolute legal rights, in the modern sense, of private ownership in land. These legal practices found their first codified form in 1858 in the law known as the *Kanunnamei Arazi Defteri,* that is the Land Law (see T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Müdürlüğü, 2014, p. 101-177).[6] In the Republican period (1922—), one of the major steps taken in the legal sphere was to convert peasant property rights on state lands (*miri lands*) to private property rights in 1926. This was achieved by making amendments to the Land Law of 1858 (by law no: 837) and setting a legal framework for how to make a transition from all Ottoman laws in force in matters pertaining to the precepts of the new *Civil Code* (by law no: 864).[7] These legal arrangements were supported by other legal and policy measures including allocation/selling of more than 33,5 million da of arable lands (belonging mostly to the treasury and partly bought from large landowners during the implementation the land reform laws[8]) to a total number of 747,474 peasant farmers with no or

6 This new publication by the General Directorate of State Archives includes all the amendments made to this law in later years as well as an Introduction to Ottoman land regime in the period of Restructuring (Tanzimat) in the mid-nineteenth century.

7 That is *Arazi Kanununun Bazı Mevaddının İlgasına Dair Kanun* (No: 837, Resmî Ceride 29.5.1926, Sayı: 384) and Kanunu *Medeninin Sureti Meriyet ve Şekli Tatbiki Hakkında Kanun* (No: 864, Resmi Ceride 19.6.1926, Sayı: 402).

8 See Kaya (2014) for an examination of debates on land use and land reform in the early years of republican period.

not enough land[9], allocating another 34 million da of pastures (that is commons) to villages to be used as a common pastures by the farmers (in accordance with the provisions of Law No: 4753 known as Law for Providing Land to Farmers (that is Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanunu which was put in force in 1945), organizational and financial supports given to farmers in the forms of subsidies and support purchases (through farmers' cooperatives and Office of Soil Produces, TMO) from mid-1930s onwards, exemption of small peasant farmers from the payment of income tax in the 1960s and income support payments (that is the equivalent of CAP payments) at the present time (see Sönmez 1993, p. 137-150; 2007, p. 271-279).

There is no statistical information about the actual distribution of the arable lands among the farmers in the Ottoman period. In the republican period, the rate of farmers with no access to land was never more than 6%. According to statistical data available, sole owner-occupier farming continued to be the dominant form and even increased from 74,1% in 1950 to 92, 6% in 1991 and then decreased to 85,9% in 2001. The combined rates of sole sharecroppers and tenant farmers were 3,6%, 1,5% and 3,1% in the same years, respectively. Between 1970 and 2001, the average area of farms stayed within the range of 52 and 61 da among sole owner-occupier farms, 33 and 61 da among sole sharecroppers and tenant farmers, and 88 and 108 da among farms renting extra land in addition to their own.[10] The total number of faming households increased from 1,750,240 in 1927 to a historical peak of 4,068,430 in 1991 and started to decline after that.[11] This tendency has been confirmed to some extent by the declining number of farmers registered on the Farmers Information System run by the Ministry of Agriculture. According to the Ministry's records (T.C. Gıda Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığı Bitkisel Üretim Genel Müdürlüğü, 2018), the number of farmers was 2,588,666 in 2002 and went down by 17,6% to 2,132,491 in 2017. Meanwhile the average area of farms increased from 63,7 da in 2002 to 69,7 da in 2017.

Private land ownership combined with a partible land regime has the structural tendency to result in the emergence of an agrarian structure in which each successive generation of households own on average less than the previous ones, as Wolf (2000, p.

9 Author's calculations based on figures cited by Barkan (1980, p. 455) and Taraklı (1976, p. 110).

10 No data set is available relating to the actual area of land owned or farmed for the years before 1970.

11 Author's calculations based on Barkan (1980, p. 476-77, footnote 35), SIS (1937, p.4), SIS (1956, p. 1), SIS (1965, p. 1-2), SIS (1970, p. 1-4), SIS (1979, p.3, 8-9), SIS (no date, p. 1,16-17,36-37), SIS (1994, p.16, 28), SIS (2003a, p. 181), SIS (2003b, p. 46), SIS (2004, p. 34-35, 82-83). TUIK has not published the results of Agricultural Surveys conducted after 2001, presenting only percent distribution of farms by size. Therefore, it has not been possible to cite exact figures about the number of all types of farms. The information about the number of farmers registered on the Farmers Registration System should not be taken as the actual number of farms either. This is because shareholders may be registered separately while they run the farm collectively.

121-126) mentions when commenting on such regimes of land ownership in peasant societies. In the Turkish case, demographic pressure on arable lands has been eased by a combination of factors consisting of: (i) the state's allocation or selling of farm land to farmers, (ii) the turning of the pastures, bushes and woodlands privately owned by households into farmland, (iii) reduction of the area of lands lying fallow, (iv) massive land reclamation projects and (v) a massive rural migration starting in the early 1950s without the migrants necessarily and immediately selling of the lands they owned or were to inherit.

The impacts of these arrangements and processes find their concrete expressions in the figures (presented in Table 1) concerning the trajectory of the Turkish households' relation with land ownership and farming since the mid-1990s. Thus, contrary to a general decline in the average area of land owned by households in successive years of the surveys (see Table 2), the proportions of households earning farming income with or without owning land shows a non-linear trajectory. The percent of land owners has gone up from 25,0% in 1994 to 27, 9% in 2017. Likewise, the proportion of households earning farming income shows a non-linear trajectory starting with 16,1% in 1994, going down to 10,8% in 2002, then up to 23, 6% in 2005, down to 12,7% in 2010, then up again to 18,6% in 2017. On the other hand, the proportion of households which own arable land but are not earning agricultural income decreased from 14,4% in 1994 to 13,3% in 2017, again with a nonlinear trajectory. And the proportion of households earning farming income but not owning land also shows fluctuation and yet decreased by 30,3% from 5,6% in 1994 to 3,9% in 2017. These non-landowning farming households must be composed mostly of sharecroppers and tenant farmers as well as owners of dairy and animal farms, poultry farms, bee keepers, fish farms and fishermen, etc. This noticeable decrease in the proportion of farming households with no land must have been related in part to a drastic decrease in sharecropping after the turbulent years of internal displacement in the 1990s in the eastern provinces (see Sönmez 2007, 2008).

An interesting category of households (in Table 1) are those which have no agricultural income and yet have at least one member whose main occupational code is agriculture and whose employment status is other than a salaried or wage worker, that is a farmer as conceptualized in this paper. The proportions of households whose members are classified as farmers but have no agricultural income show an irregular trajectory (5,4% in 2002, 18,6% in 2010 and 13,0 5 in 2017). A great majority of these households (90,4%, 94,8%, 68,2%, 72, 8% and 85,6% in respective years of surveys from 2002 onwards) do not own arable land either. It is very likely that these unpaid workers are in fact close kin (children, grandchildren and other close relatives) working on the farms of their relatives. Some case studies conducted in Turkey report such

practices as an important component of family solidarity and resilience in small family farms (Sevgili-Canpolat, 2022; Sönmez, 2000). Furthermore, information sheets accompanying the data sets mention that some of the unpaid household workers may not be working on the farms or in workplaces belonging to the households of which they are a member, and this can be taken as further confirmation of the assumption that is being made about this kind of labour. In addition, some of these individuals may even own the actual farm in partnership (as in the case of siblings) either for considerations of efficiency or because of legal restrictions on the actual-physical divisions of crop lands below a certain limit (20 da). However, the network of unpaid family labour is probably much wider than these figures imply. One limited piece of evidence for this is that there is an extra 2,7% and 5,3% of all households in 2002 and 2010 respectively which have no farming income and yet have members whose second occupation is again farming. Individuals employed in agriculture in this fashion (that is as farmers-individuals employed as employers, own account and unpaid household workers) constitute a not insignificant and yet irregular proportion of the total workforce employed in agriculture: 5,9% in 2002, 0,5% in 2005, 20, 0% in 2010, 10,7% in 2015 and 0,7% in 2017. When checked against their specific employment status, only some (98,8% in 2002, 11,5% in 2005, 49,2% in 2015 and 69,5% in 2017) of the individuals falling within this category have been coded as unpaid household workers. Therefore, it is very likely that the individuals who are classified as own account farmers or even employer farmers without earning any agricultural income must be those individuals who are employed on farms belonging to themselves in legal terms, doing the farm work with other shareholders but allocating the income to one of the shareholders. Sevgili-Canpolat, (2022, Ch. 6 & 8) reports that this type of arrangement, put in place to help aged or disabled family members, is not unusual among siblings or offspring. However, given that most of the unpaid labour derived from close family members and kin is both seasonal and very short term, especially employed for doing the harvest, a significant portion of this type of employment would not appear on the data and therefore these figures should not be taken as an exact ratio of unpaid labour from kin and relatives.

The Trajectory of Land Ownership and Land Use Emerging from HBS Data

The trajectories concerning the percent distribution of landowners, the average area of arable land owned[12] and the use of land in their ownership among households earning

12 In the data sets, these lands are classified as cropland, orchards and vineyards, and green houses. Since any farming household would need and own land for building houses and other farm buildings, threshing floors and land not suitable for farming, the actual area of land owned would be larger than what these figures indicate.

or not earning farming income (see Table 2) indicate that landowners earning farming income constituted in the successive years of surveys not less than 42,4% (in 1994) and not more than 84,7% (in 2005) of all landowning households and their relative percent has increased by 24,4% between the years of 1994 and 2017. Landowners without farming income, on the other hand, have constituted in the successive years of surveys not less than 15,3% (in 2005) but mostly around from two-fifth to three-fifth (57,8% in 1994, 42, 5% in 2002, 60,8% in 2010, 53,1% in 2015 and 47, 5 in 2017) of the national total number of households owning arable land. The average area of land owned in general has decreased with a non-linear trajectory from 37,5 da in 1994 to 29,5 da in 2017. Likewise, it has decreased from 40,0 da to 38,6 da among landowning households earning farming income and from 35,7 da to 21,6 da among those that are not earning farming income. While the relative rate of decrease is -21,5% among all landowning households, it is -8,5% among households earning farming income and -39,5% among land owning households that are not earning farming income.

In both categories of households some have rented out some or all of their land to tenant farming. The rates are higher among the households not earning farming income (ranging between 1, 0% (in 2005) and 20, 9% (in 2017) than that observed among the households earning farming income (ranging between 1,9% (in 2015) and 11,7% (in 2005)). The average area of land rented out by households earning farming income ranges between 13,9 da (in 2002) and 31,0 da (in 2015). The households that rented out some land among the earners of farming income owned on average slightly less than the general average owned by all households earning farming income from 1994 to 2005, and slightly more in the rest of the survey years and especially in 2015, in which year they owned more than double the general average (46,0 da vs 96,3 da).

The average areas of land owned and rented out by households with no farming income also show a fluctuating pattern: In the case of ownership, it ranges between 31,0 da (in 2015) and 87,3 da (in 2005), and in the case of rented out land, it ranges between 23,6 da (in 2017) and 87,3 da (in 2005). The most striking points about land use are, however, twofold: Firstly, the area of land *not rented out* by households which do not earn farming income have constituted, with a fluctuating pattern, a very significant proportion (ranging between 5,5% (in 2005) and 47, 5% (in 2010)) of total area of land owned by all households in the country. Secondly, the total area of land rented out to tenant farming constituted between 4,3% (in 2005) and 9,0% (in 1994) of the total area of land owned by all the households in the country.

These rates and percentages pose, then, a serious question about the nature of land use in the country. The general tendency in studies on rural migration and

modernization of peasant farming has been to assume that migration would leave behind enough land to be used by the farmers (see for instance Wolf, 2000) and the lands left over by the migrants would/could be acquired by means of both purchase and tenancy arrangements. Since there is no information in the data sets about the actual use and regional and geographical location of land not rented out by the non-farming households, a tentative explanation would be that some parts of these lands might be completely deserted and located in remote and mountainous villages, and they may partly be in villages or in areas deserted and never fully regained by their farming population after a massive process of internal displacement in the late 1980s and early 1990 in the eastern and south-eastern provinces (see Sönmez 2007, 2008). But, when assessed in line with the cases of unpaid family labour and forms of family solidarity among close relatives as mentioned above, it is very likely that a great portion of these unrented lands must be left to the care and use of relatives engaged in farming. The relatives farming these lands may not be paying any rent to the owners but it would not be unusual that a symbolic payment is made in the form of gift giving, which would involve, in most cases, sending some of the produce as a gift to the owner.

Size of Farmland Owned

The distribution of households by the size of arable land they own (see Table 3), is a good indication of the impact of the partible land regime and as a rough indication of the patterns of exit from farming or of land abandonment. Tentatively, one could assume that a great majority of the households not farming their lands must be those who have abandoned their lands and thus made an exit from farming. These would include not only former farmers but also their descendants who might have inherited the land but have never been full-time farmers in the first place. This interpretation would also be more in line with what Bulutay, Timur & Ersel (1971, p. 183, 186) had observed about the intergenerational occupational mobility of the offspring of farmers in late 1960s: In terms of their origins, 99, 5% of all farmers' fathers were also farmers and that of the remaining 0,5% were farm workers. However, in terms of destination, only 70,2% of farmers' offspring were again farmers and the rest mostly were non-skilled workers (9, 6%), craftsmen and shop owners (petty bourgeoise) (8, 4%), low ranking office clerks (4,5%) and skilled manual workers (3,4%).

The trajectory of the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned among farming and non-farming households is not a linear one. And yet, when compared to 1994 figures, there has been, in general, a very significant decrease in the proportion of farms larger than 20 da and conversely a very noticeable increase in the proportion especially of farms smaller than this size. This pattern is much

stronger, with almost double rates, among the non-farming landowners: In relative terms the farms larger than 200 da have decreased by 66,7% and the rate is 6,0% among farms between 10-19 da, and 37,6% and 38,5% among the farms between 5-9 da and smaller than 5 da respectively. However, a rather complicated pattern is seen among the farming households: The proportions of households owning farmland smaller than 5 da and between 20-49 da have decreased but of the rest have increased. In relative terms this increase is very noticeable (roughly 25%) among households owning farmlands between 5-9 da and larger than 200 da. Since these figures are not about the size of actual farms or the area of land farmed but about the area of land owned, these non-linear relative rates must be a reflection of both partition among the heirs and purchase of the shares mostly again by one of the heirs or co-owners in line with the legal principles provided in the Civil Code and in the Laws No: 5403 and 6537, which grant them the rights of priority in purchase.[13]

As mentioned above, the size of arable land owned (or cultivated, farmed) without any further qualification is not a uniform measure nor is it a good proxy variable by means of which viability of farming and the social class location of farmers can be gauged easily. We could however argue that viability needs larger areas of land when the main crops are cereals and the farming depends on rainfall rather than on irrigation, which is the general feature of farming in large parts of interior Anatolia. Contrary to this, where the main crops are fruits, nuts, and vegetables, which is the case along the coastal areas of Turkey, then a small farm may still prove to be viable one (see Keyder & Yenal, 2011). A good example is greenhouses along the Mediterranean and Aegean coasts, and tea and hazelnut farms along the Blacksea coast. In these parts of the country farms are usually much smaller in size and yet the legal restrictions put on the partition among the heirs of pieces of lands smaller than 5 da is still relaxed.[14] Nevertheless, it seems that when viability is possible one way or another, this reinforces the tendency for partition rather than selling of the land and making a full exit from farming. There is also no legal restriction on keeping one's share of a piece of land in one's possession and on running the farm together. Furthermore, in studies on rural migration in Turkey, migrants report a strong emotional attachment not to farming but to ancestral land. Therefore, land is kept as the ancestral property but the task of farming is allocated to others with

13 Law No: 6537 (Amendments to Law of Soil Preservation and Land Use), amends the provisions of the Turkish Civil Code and Soil Preservation and Land Use Law (No: 5403) regarding the rights of transfer of farm land among heirs. It requires either voluntary transfer between heirs or to the heir who makes the highest bid or to third parties by sale by a court decision. For details, see Kavasoğlu and Sayın (2018) and Kartal (2019).

14 See Law No: 6537, article 4.

or without any payment in return, or done from a distance by employing seasonal wage labour. However, some migrants may also return to their farms after retirement (Beyaz, 2020, pp. 154-159; 2022, ch. 4 & 5; Karpat, 2016, p. 214-226, Öztürk, et al., 2014; Öztürk, et al., 2018a, p. 518; 2018b, p. 248; Sönmez, 2001, p. 91-93).

It must be pointed out, however, that exit or non-exit from farming is not an option that landowners can easily take without there being any costs and constraints. On the contrary it depends on conditions both external and internal to them. One interesting example is the very low (15,3) percent of non-farming landowners in the year 2005. This was probably a reaction to the economic crises of the early 2000s during which many rural migrant workers living in towns were made redundant and had to go back to their villages to survive. Five years later, we observe that the proportion of non-farming landowners has risen to 60,8% and this percentage is more in line with the proportions observed in other survey years.[15] A similar tendency is now the case in the country, under conditions of rising rates of unemployment caused by the 2020 covid-19 pandemic, although we will not be able to see the actual rates until the results of the annual surveys are released. This indicates that having land makes it easy to make a return to farming at times of crises but, on the whole, making a definite return to farming and ancestral land is more of a dream under the conditions of fluid modernity rather than being a strong probability, as Beyaz (2020, 2022) observes on the actual conduct of the rural migrants he has interviewed.

Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households in the Class Order

Survey data indicate that, between 2002 and 2017, farming and non-farming landowning households seem to have experienced a mixed pattern of structural social mobility in the occupational class location of their members and of themselves (see Table 4): Members of the non-farming landowning households have concentrated, in the period covered here, mostly in: (1) crafts and related trades, (2) skilled agricultural and fishery works, (3) legislator, senior officials and managers, (4) service workers and (5) plant and machine operators. Members of the landowning farming households, on the other hand, have concentrated mostly in: (1) skilled agricultural and fishery works and to some extent in (2) craft and related works, (3) elementary occupations, and (4) legislators, senior officials and managers. The pattern of structural change in relative terms indicates however that members of the non-farming households have

15 It would be interesting to see how land use will change under the conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic which seems to have caused, at the time of writing, the worst slow down seen since the 1929 world economic crises and the loss of jobs on a global scale.

made a very significant exit from agriculture (by -86,3%), from the occupational class of legislators, senior officials and managers (by -60,3%) and craft and related works (by -26,4%). They have moved mostly and with almost equal rates into elementary occupations (by 93,3%) and into "professionals" class (91,2%). The relative rates of exit from agriculture and crafts among the members of the landowning farming households, however, are more limited (16,7% and 15,1% respectively) but the rates of their move into the occupational classes of professionals (433, 3%), service and sales workers (284,6%), elementary occupations (165, 9%), plant and machine operators (100%), technicians and associate professionals (71,4%) are much more impressive.

In order to make sense of these figures and their implications for the social class location of both categories of the landowning households, it is necessary to introduce first the trajectory of changes at the national level in the occupational distribution of workforce in employment (see Table 5): The period under investigation is characterized by a predominance of employment in four occupational classes, namely: 6. skilled agricultural and fishery works, 7. craft and related trades, 5. service and sales works and 9. elementary occupations. Very significant changes in relative terms occurred, however, from 2002 to 2017 in the general structure of the distribution of the workforce across occupational classes. The relative weight of two occupational classes (namely 1. Legislators, senior officials and managers and 7. Craft and related trades) shows a very drastic decrease by 53,5% and 35,8% respectively. The relative weight of plant and machine operators also shows a noticeable relative decrease by 5,7%. Contrary to this, relative proportions of three occupational classes (namely 2. professionals, 5. service and sales workers and 4. clerks) show much more noticeable increases, by 61, 8%, 47,9% and 20,8% respectively. In comparison to these three occupational classes, the relative increases in the proportion of three other occupational classes (namely 6. skilled agricultural and fishery works, 9. elementary occupations and 3. technicians and associate professionals) have been much more modest (9,4%, 8,6% and 1,8% respectively). Nevertheless, these relative changes have not changed the predominance of the four occupational classes mentioned in the overall distribution of work force across occupational classes, but the new occupational class structure has become more squeezed from both ends and expanded in its middle. This type of development in the occupational structure is considered to be the hallmark of service economies, although Turkey has been making transition into such an economy not from a predominantly industrial but an agrarian one. For instance, in terms of the sectoral distribution, the workforce employed in agriculture constituted 89,9% of the total workforce (above the age of 15) in 1927, 84,5% in 1950, 35,4% in 2000 and 25,6% in 2017. In the same years, the workforce employed in the manufacturing industry, on the other hand, constituted only 3,1%, 5,5%, 17,

2% and 15,8% of the total workforce in employment (SIS 2003: 156-157, Household Budget Survey 2017)[16].

When relative rates of changes that have taken place in the landowning households are compared to the relative rates of change at the national level, we obtain the following odd-rates (that is the rates between relative rates in %) of movement in terms of more or less entry into and exit from occupational classes in landowning households and their subcategories (see Table 5): First, the members of all landowning households as a single category, have made less exit, in relative terms, from occupational class 7 (Crafts, 38,0%) and occupational class 1 (Legislators, (13, 5%), but they have made more exit from occupational class 6 (Skilled agricultural work, 314, 9%). Their members have, on the other hand, very high relative rates of entry into occupational class 3 (Technicians, 1844,4%), occupational class 9 (Elementary occupations, 1450, 0%), occupational class 8 (Plant and machine operators, 654,4%), occupational class 4 (Clerks, 182, 7%) occupational class 5 (Service and sales workers, 146, 7%) and occupational class 2 (Professionals, 102,2%). This general pattern of exit and entry holds true, secondly, for both farming and non-farming landowning households, save for two main differences: One is that there has been no change in the relative position of farming land owners in occupational class 1, and the other is that while non-farming landowning households have made a relative exit from class 8 (Plant and machine operators) of 1018,1%, farming households have made in relative terms 1854,4% more entries into the same occupational class. There are however significant differences in relative (odds) rates of the exit and entry among them. For instance, farming households have made more entry than non-farming landowners into occupational class 2 (12,8 times), class 3 (2,2 times), class 5 (9,2 times), class 7 (2.2 times) and into occupational class 9 (1,8 times). The relative rate of their entry into class 2 is almost identical. However, when compared to farming ones, non-farming landowners have made 3,7 times more exit from class 6, that is skilled agricultural work and fishery.

The trajectory of these changes in the occupational class locations of the members of farming and non-farming households indicates (see Table 6) that the dominant social class location of the non-farming landowning households was upper service class in 2002 and 2005 (35,9% and 34,8% respectively), petty bourgeoisie in 2010 (28,0%), routine non-manual class (24, 6%), again petty bourgeoisie in 2015, and again routine non-manual class (25,1%) in 2017. The dominant social class location of the farming landowners, on the other hand, remained as petty bourgeoisie but it

16 Author's calculations.

shows a fluctuating pattern (89,1% in 2002, 93, 3% in 2010 and 79, 2% in 2017). The combined total percent of non-farming landowners in the first three and as well as in the first four class locations remained almost unchanged in the period (57,9% and 71,7% in 2002 and 57, 1% and 71,1% in 2017). The combined percent of farming landowners in the first three class locations increased from 10,9% in 2002 to 16,8% in 2017 but decreased in the first four class locations from 100% in 2002 to 95,8 in 2007. As such, in structural terms, the dominant class locations of both types of landowning households are concentrated in the upper layers of stratification. However, while farming households seem to have had a manifest advantage over non-farming households with their presence in petty bourgeoisie, the non-farming households had an advantage especially in upper service class locations. In relative terms, the most noticeable changes from 2002 to 2017 have been the following: (i) a 117,4% relative increase in the total rate of all landowning households in class VII (with 87,3% among non-farming ones), (ii) 55,7% total relative increase in class 3 (47,6% among non-farming and 100% increase among farming landowners), (iii) a total of 26,1% decrease in class I locations, and (iv) a total of 25,9% decrease in class VI.

Differences of Income and Wealth within and between Farming and Non-Farming Landowners

Both in common daily discourse as well in the current literature, small-scale peasant or family farming is associated with poverty, and its persistence is considered to be an anomaly under conditions of capitalist modernization and farming. Boltvinik and Mann's volume (2016) brings together a list of essays dealing with the issue (see also Mann 2018). The same kind of association has also been made recently by a couple of authors dealing with the case of Turkey (see Öztürk 2012; Öztürk, et al., 2018a), especially in connection with rural migration and exit from farming or land abandonment. Surely this argument has to be given serious consideration and there is some ground to argue that, in the case of Turkey, farming households are relatively poorer than non-farming ones. For instance, as will be examined later, their average annual disposable income per household and per head have remained significantly below the national averages of income per household and per head in the period covered in this study. However, where exactly farming households stand in comparison to non-farming households is more complicated than what this broad comparison suggests and this also applies to the differences of income, average size of farm land and average amount of wealth owned between farming and non-farming landowners.

The average annual disposable household income of farming landowners (see Table 7) remained significantly lower than that of non-farming landowners and it was lower than the national average income per household and per head between 1994 and 2010, equalling roughly between three quarters to four-fifths of the incomes of non-farming households and all households in the country. Their average household income was, however, almost equal (98,8%) to that their counterparts in 2015 and exceeded the latter in 2017. Conversely, the average household incomes of non-farming households were higher than that of farming landowners for all years surveyed, except 2017. In contrast, the differences between farming and non-farming landowners in the total amount of wealth in immoveable property were not statistically significant, but significant differences prevailed between them along the sub-categories of their property. Thus, farming households were much richer (almost 100%) in their wealth in land, while non-farming ones were richer with regard to the value of their houses and other non-residential property. However, both categories of households were much richer property owners than all households in the country in general: The mean values of the total wealth of farming landowners in 2002 and 2005 were respectively 80,6% and 54,4% larger than the national averages, and likewise the mean values of immoveable property owned by non-farming landowners were respectively 62,5% and 55,1% larger than the national averages. These differences, working to the disadvantage (in the case of income) or the advantage (in the case of wealth in immoveable property) for both categories of landowning households, should not lead us immediately to conclude that they are really poorer or richer than each other or than the general levels prevailing in the country. This is because: (i) the patterns are fluctuating, (ii) immoveable property is only one form of property and we have no data about savings in bank accounts, stocks and shares and moveable property, especially in the form of savings in precious metals (gold for instance), and (iii) differences of income and wealth have a class dimension and they are also affected by family type.

It is clear from these results that the destination of exit from farming is not straight into poverty but into a trajectory of occupational mobility leading mostly to a better income and good amount of wealth. How this process unfolds can be described in four steps: (i) in terms of the mean values of income per household and per head as well as of the values of wealth in immoveable property by class among farming and non-farming landowners (see Table 8), (ii) how distant the other social classes are to the upper service class (in terms of the ratio of their income and wealth) (see Table 9), (iii) in terms of period averages (see Table 10) and (iv) in terms of t-test results to identify the years in which differences have been significant or not significant between the classes among farming and non-farming households separately (see Table 11).

The actual values (as presented in Table 8) can be used to make several comparisons in terms of ratios when the average income and wealth of the upper service class households are taken to be equal to 100 in each year of survey (see Table 9). What these ratios suggest is that no class of households, except class II in 2002 and in terms of income per head, has ever exceeded upper service class households in the amount of income per household and per head, or in the amount of wealth among both farming and non-farming landowners separately and among all landowners in general. In all cases of comparisons, these ratios show a fluctuating pattern from one survey to the next and the distance between classes could also be expressed in terms of general average ratios (that is the averages of the percent) for the period. Accordingly, among both categories of landowners, a clear pattern of distances emerges in which social class hierarchy is also an income and wealth hierarchy and the gap between upper service class households and the rest is relatively narrower among the farming landowners than it is among the non-farming landowners in terms of income and wider in terms of wealth.

Thus, among the farming landowners, the ratios of the income per household and per head, and wealth of the lower service class to that of the upper service class were 77,2% 74,3% and 62,7% respectively, 62,9%, 56,9% and 49,0% for the routine non-manual class, 47,2%, 55,9% and 50,5% for the petty bourgeoisie, 28,3%, 44,5% and 27,9% for the technicians, 28,3%, 50,6% and 29,8% for the skilled manual class, 20,2%, 35,0% and 14,2% for the non-skilled manual class; and 22,2%, 43,9% and 37,9% for the class 0. Among non-farming landowners, the ratios were as follows: 71,7%, 63,3% and 64,3% for the lower service class, 54,6%, 46,7% and 47,1% for the routine non-manual class, 47,9%, 40,5% and 41,1% for the petty bourgeoise, 50,2%, 42,3% and 49,3% for the technicians, 44,1%, 37,4% and 40,8% for the skilled manual class, 34,9%, 31,5% and 31,3% for the non-skilled manual class, and finally 30,3%, 48,0% and 69,0% for households with no member in employment. As indicated in the last section of the same Table 9, the income gap between each of the first four identical classes of farming and non-farming landowners (that is in terms of between case comparisons) is much narrower and the ratios are not less than 90% and 74,7% respectively of the income per household and per head of the non-farming landowners. There is however a large gap between other identical classes which puts the classes among the farming landowners at least 30% behind their counterparts.

In the case of wealth, the first four classes of farming landowners own at least 30% more wealth than their counterparts, going up to 64,2% among the petty bourgeoisie households. The rest of the social classes among farming landowners,

however, lag behind their counterparts with ratios not less than 25%. What all these ratios suggest is that among farming households belonging to class V, VI and VII are the most disadvantaged in terms of both income and wealth in all respects.

As such, there seem to be four income and wealth groups among both farming and non-farming landowners. These are: (1) the upper service class, (2) the lower service class, (3) class 3 to class 6 households together and (4) the non-skilled manual class households. On close scrutiny, however, differences of income per household and per head in farming households have never been statistically significant (see Table 10) between upper and lower service class households, and has only been so in 2015 and 2017 (in terms of income per household) among non-farming ones. Among the farming landowners, the differences between the upper service class and routine non-manual class and petty bourgeoisie households stayed persistently significant with very few exceptions. However, the differences between lower service class and routine non-manual class households were not significant in most cases, and the same can be said of the differences between routine non-manual class and petty bourgeoisie households among farming landowners. For the rest of cases of comparison there are either no farming households belonging to other classes or their numbers are too small to make any sound judgement about the persistence of differences between them.

Among the non-farming landowners, there are clear and persistent boundaries first of all between class 0 households and households of classes I-III and class V in terms of income per household. However, the boundaries between these households become fuzzy in terms of income per head, with the exception of the class I and to some extent class VII. Second, there are clear and persistent differences between class I and class VII households in terms of both income per household and per head, and class II households and class VII households in terms of only income per household. For the rest of the comparisons, the differences are not persistent.

In the case of differences of income per household and per head by family types (see Table 11), t-test results indicate that there exist clear boundaries between extended and nuclear families as well as extended and one-adult families among the farming landowners, and between extended and one-adult families among the non-farming landowners. These differences translate into clear and persistent differences between nuclear and one-adult families on the one hand and extended and one-adult families on the other at the national level among all landowning households in terms of both income per household and per head. There exist also clear and persistent differences in the average income per head between nuclear and extended families. It seems therefore necessary to further examine the interconnections between class, family type, income, wealth and the landownership.

The Interconnections between Family Type, Class, Income, Wealth and Landownership

The association between family type, class and landownership also shows a fluctuating pattern and yet the differences in the amount of land owned display a relatively much more persistent association with family type than with class location. The dominant form of family among both farming and non-farming households is the nuclear family, as it is among all households in the country (see Table 12). It is however relatively more dominant and on the rise among the farming ones, as seen by its rate of increase from 61,5% in 2002 to 66,5% in 2007. Contrary to this, its rate decreased among non-farming landowners (from 68,9% to 67,1%) and at the national level (74,1% to 68,8%). The major differences among farming and non-farming landowners as well as landowners and the general national patterns, however, result from: (1) a relatively high percent (roughly one-third) of extended family among farming landowners and (2) a fast-rising percent of one-adult families among non-farming landowners (from 9,7% in 2002 to 17,1% in 2017) and at the national level (from 9,5% to 14,7%).

The average household size among all types of families (see Table 13) has been decreasing in a constant fashion among farming (from 4,9 to 3,9), non-farming landowners (4,1 to 3,0) as well among all households (from 4,3 to 3,5) at the national level, and the rate of decrease through the years studied is roughly by 20%. This tendency is much stronger among one-adult families and goes over 30% at the national level. Extended families command, in statistical terms, significantly and persistently larger amounts of income per household than both nuclear and one-adult families, and significantly smaller amounts of income per head than these two other forms of family. The differences of income per household and per head between nuclear and one-adult families are not however always clear and persistent. This lack of clear and persistent boundaries applies to the differences in the amount of wealth between all types of families (see Table 14).

The differences in the average area of farmland owned by different classes of farming and non-farming landowners also display a fluctuating pattern, and the general period averages seem to point to a divide between the first four classes (class I to class IV) and the rest: the former own on average larger amounts of farmland per household and per head than the second category of households (see Table 15). However, the differences and the range of distances (as expressed in percent) arising from these differences do not proceed in a linear fashion and this non-linearity contradicts what we have observed in the case of income per household and per head especially among classes of the farming landowners. In addition, they

do not lead to clear and persistent boundaries between different classes among both farming and non-farming households separately, and among all landowning households in general (see Table 16). On the contrary, according to t-test results, statistically significant differences are rare (see Table 17) and this is in spite of a pattern of statistically significant and on the whole persistent association existing between the size of farm owned and class (see Tables 18.1-18.5). The same applies to the statistical significance of differences in the mean values of farmland owned by identical classes of farming and non-farming landowners (see Table 19).

In the case of the average area of farm land owned by family type (see Table 20), there seems to be a kind of linear order among the farming landowners, putting extended families at the top (51,6 da) and then proceeding to nuclear families (40,7 da), then to one-adult families (28,6 da) in terms of the area of land owned per household. But in terms of the area of land owned per head, this linear order is completely reversed, putting one-adult families at the top (18,1 da), followed by nuclear families (14,0 da), and then extended families (8,8 da). The same kind of order prevails among the non-farming landowners but the mean values are much closer to each other, especially in the case of the area of land per household. The association between family type and the size of farm-land owned is also statistically significant among both categories of landowners as well as all land owners as single group (see Tables 21.1 -21.5), and clear boundaries seem to exist: (i) between nuclear and extended families and extended and one-adult families in terms of average area of land owned per head rather than per household among the farming landowners, (ii) between extended and one-adult families among non-farming landowners in terms of area of land per head, (iii) among nuclear and extended family households among all landowners in terms of land per head and, finally, (iv) between extended and one adult families in terms of average area of land per household and per head, again among all landowning households (see Table 22). As far as between-case comparisons are concerned, there seem to be also clear and persistent differences between extended families of farming and non-farming households in the mean values of the area of farm land owned per household as well as per head. The differences between nuclear families tend also to be statistically significant, but there seems to be no statistically significant and persistent difference between two other forms of families (see Table 19).

These results require us to reassess the interconnections observed between family type and the average area of land owned in Timur's (1972) study, as well as general assumptions about the same issue made in the literature of the 1950s and 1960s about family types and the modernization process in agrarian societies that

she examines in her study. Firstly, Timur observes (1972, p. 58), as mentioned earlier, that the general national average area of land owned by all landowning households was 59,6 da and nuclear, temporarily extended and patriarchal extended families owned on average 35,4 da, 100,1 da and 123,5 da of land respectively. Since the *HBS* data does not allow us to re-define families in the same fashion as Timur did, a full comparison of the results is not possible. However, even if we use the period averages presented in Table 20, it seems that the general national average area of land (36,5 da) owned by all landowning households has decreased by 38,7%, that owned by nuclear families only by 1,6% and that owned by patriarchal extended families (compared to extended families) by 65%. In this sense it may be argued that it is not the extended but the nuclear family which seems to have a secure base in landownership or has preserved an average amount that persistently supports it. Contrary to this, the extended family does not seem to be resting at present on a pattern of landownership that is distinctly different from what nuclear family does, insofar as area of land per household is concerned. However, secondly, when the area of land per head (and income and wealth as well) is taken into consideration as a basis of comparison, the extended family does not seem to be a site of material prosperity in land, wealth and income but is perhaps a site to eclipse poverty, though this type of family is present among all classes and relatively more wide spread among petty bourgeoise (22,9%) households than the national average (16,0%) in 2017.

Conclusion

The results of the foregoing analyses indicate that the common historical-social image depicting Turkish agrarian space as dominated by small farms still seems to be the case, but the partible land regime that has historically been the norm in Turkish agrarian space seems to be pushing the landowners to rely on much smaller pieces of farmland or to make an exit from farming. This process is prevalent among all categories of landowners but it is much stronger among the households owning smaller pieces of farmland. This in turn has given rise to an agrarian scene in which nearly half of all landowners have now become non-farming households. It seems that neither staying in nor making an exit from farming leads straight into poverty among landowners but into a trajectory of occupational mobility leading mostly to a better income and good amount of wealth. However, this process produces significant differences in the average amount of annual income per household and per head along the class lines and thus the hierarchy of social classes turn into hierarchical differences of income and wealth between different social classes of both farming and non-farming landowners. On the other hand, contrary to this hierarchical order,

differences in the average amount farmland owned associate not so much with class differences but with differences in the types of families in which these households live their lives. However, the direction and the nature of association between social class resting on land ownership and family type have now changed. The extended family households are no longer supported by large landownership and no longer are they the sites of material prosperity, as found to be the case half a century earlier; they seem now to have become shelters against poverty.

Acknowledgement

I want to thank TUIK for permission to use their data sets, and Enver Güneş (of Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters) for his help in exporting and downloading the data. I am very grateful to my colleagues Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Eryurt, Prof. Dr. İsmet Koç and Research Assistant Faruk Keskin (of Hacettepe University, Institute of Population Studies) for the technical assistance that they have given me. I am indebted to them for the algorithmic formulation of a common syntax to be applied to all data sets. I am also very grateful to my son Yusuf for proofreading this work.

References | Kaynakça

Atasoy, Y. (2017). Repossession, re-informalization and dispossession: The "Muddy Terrain" of land commodification in Turkey. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 17(4), 657-679.

Barkan, Ö. L. (1980). *Türkiye'de toprak meselesi. Toplu eserler 1*. Gözlem Yayınları.

Beyaz, C. (2020). Son durağı olmayan hayatlar: Kırsal göçmen, geriye göç ve çoklu mekân pratiği. *İnsan ve Toplum*, 10 (1), 145-175.

Beyaz, C. (2022). *Göç ve aidiyet. Kırsal göçmenin memleketine bağlılığını sürdürme mücadelesi.* Matbu Kitap.

Boltvinik, J. & Mann, S. A., (Eds.), (2016). *Peasant poverty and persistence in the twenty-first century: Theories, debates, realities and policies.* Zed Books.

Bulutay, T., Timur, S. & Ersel, H. (1971). *Türkiye'de gelir dağılımı-1968*. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi.

Dalton, C. (2021). Metephor as useful jump from sense-making to meaning making in management education. *Academia Letters*, Article 348. https://doi.org/10.20935/AL348.

Goldthorpe, J. H. (1987). *Social mobility and class structure in modern Britain.*. Oxford University, Clarendon Press.

Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). *On sociology, volume II: Illustration and retrospect*. (2nd ed.), Stanford University Press.

Hebinck, P. (2018). De-/re-agrarianisation: Global perspectives. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 61, 227-235.

Karpat, K. H. (2016). *Türkiye'de toplumsal dönüşüm. Kırsal göç, gecekondu ve kentleşme* (*The Gecekondu: Rural migration and urbanization)*. A. Sönmez (Trans.), Timaş Yayınları.

Kartal, B. (2019). 6537 sayılı kanun ile 5403 sayılı toprak koruma ve arazi kullanımı kanunu'na getirilen değişikliklerin medenî usûl hukuku bakımından incelenmesi. *Selçuk* Üniversitesi *Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi,* 27(3), 845-884.

Kavasoğlu, İ. İ. & Sayın, C. (2018), Tarımsal arazilerin miras ve satış yoluyla devrinde anlaşmazlık durumları ve çözüm önerileri. *KSÜ Tarım ve Doğa Dergisi*, 21 (Special Issue), 133-145.

Kaya, S. Y. (2014). *Land use, peasants and the republic: Debates on land reform in Turkey, 1923-1945.* [Doctoral dissertation], The Middle East Technical University.

Keyder, Ç. (1983). Paths of rural transformation in Turkey. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 11(1), 34-49.

Keyder, Ç., & Yenal, Z. (2011). Agrarian change under globalization: Markets and insecurity in Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 11(1), 60-86.

Lasanta, T., Arnaez, J., Pascual, N., Ruiz-Flano, P., Errea, M. P., & Lana-Renault, N. (2017). Space-time process and drivers of land abandonment in Europe. *Catena,* 149, 810-823.

Mann, S. A. (2018). (Book review) Peasant poverty and persistence in the twenty-first century: Theories, debates, realities and policies. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 18, 214-224.

Murataj, O. (2020). *Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri üzerine kurulmuş kültürlerarası evlilikler: Sırbistan'da yaşayan Arnavut-Sırp çiftlerin evlilikleri üzerine bir vak'a çalışması* [Doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University.

Öztürk, M. (2012). *Agriculture, peasantry and poverty in Turkey in the neo-liberal age*. Wageningen Academic Publishers.

Öztürk, M., Hilton, A., & Jongerden, J. (2014). Migration as movement and multiplace life: Some recent developments in rural living structures in Turkey. *Population, Space and Place*, 20, 370-388.

Öztürk, M., Jongerden, J., & Hilton, A. (2018a). The (re)production of the new peasantry in Turkey. *Journal of Rural Studies,* 61, 244-254.

Öztürk, M., Topaloğlu, B., Hilton, A. & Jongerden, J. (2018b). Rural-urban mobilities in Turkey: Socio-spatial perspectives on migration and return movements. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 20 (5), 513-530.

Peel, D., Berry, H. L., & Schirmer, J. (2016). Farm exit intention and wellbeing: A study of Australian farmers. *Journal of Rural Studies,* 47, 41-51.

6, P., & Bellamy, C. (2012). *Principles of methodology. Research design in social science*. Sage Publications.

Renwick, A., Jansson, T., Verburg, P. H., Revoredo-Giha, C., Britz, W., Gocht, A., & McCracken, D. (2013). Policy reform and agricultural land abandonment in the EU. *Land Use Policy*, 30, 446-457.

Sevgili-Canpolat, E., (2022). *Aile çiftçiliğinde beka stratejileri: Nazilli'de incir üreticiliği örneği* [Doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (1937). *Tarım istatistikleri 1928-36.* (Yayın no: 93), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (1956). *1950 Tarım sayımı sonuçları.* (Yayın no: 371), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (1965). *1963 Genel tarım sayımı örnekleme sonuçları.* (*Yayın* no: 477), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (no date). 1980 *Genel tarım sayımı hanehalkı anketi sonuçları.* (Yayın no: 1028), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (1994). *1991 Genel tarım sayımı tarımsal işletmeler (hanehalkı) araştırma sonuçları*. (Yayın no: 1691), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (2003a). *İstatistik göstergeler 1923-2002*. Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü,

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (2003b). *2000 Genel nüfus sayımı. Nüfusun sosyal ve ekonomik nitelikleri.* (*Yayın* no: 2759), Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS). (2004). *2001 Genel tarım sayımı. Tarımsal işletmeler (hanehalkı)*. (Yayın no: 2924) Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

Sönmez, A. (1993). *Peasant household survival strategies: Rural transformation in the heartland of Turkey's hazelnut production belt* [Doctoral dissertation]. The University of Durham (UK).

Sönmez, A. (2000). Aile dayanışması ve kırsal ekonomi: Orta Karadeniz bölgesinde fındık üretimiyle bağlantılı aile dayanışması üzerine niteliksel bir inceleme. *Hacettepe* Üniversitesi *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,* 17(1), 61-88.

Sönmez, A. (2001). Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesi fındık üretim kuşağında toprak ağalığı, köylülük ve kırsal dönüşüm. *Toplum ve Bilim,* 88, 69-104.

Sönmez, A. (2007). Türkiye tarımında yapısal değişme örüntüleri, terör ve yerinden olmuş nüfusun yeniden kırsal alana dönüş koşulları. *Kebikeç,* 23, 263-317.

Sönmez, A. (2008). The effects of violence and internal displacement on rural-agrarian change in Turkey. *Rural Sociology,* 73 (3), 370-413.

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü. (2014). *Tanzimat sonrası arazi ve tapu.* T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü.

T.C. Gıda Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığı Bitkisel Üretim Genel Müdürlüğü. (2018). Bitkisel üretim verileri, (https://www.tarim.gov.tr/sgb/Belgeler/SagmenuVeriler/BUGEM.pdf, accessed on 03.08.2018).

Taraklı, D. (1976). *Çiftçiyi topraklandırma kanunu ve uygulama sonuçları.* ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi.

Terres, J.-M., Scacchiafichi, L. N., Wania, A., Ambar, M., Anguiano, E., Buckwell, A., & Zobena, A. (2015). Farmland abandonment in Europe: Identification of drivers and indicators, and development of a composite indicator of risk. *Land Use Policy*, 49, 20-34.

Timur, S. (1972). *Türkiye'de aile yapısı.* Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü.

Wolf, E. R. (2000). *Köylüler* (*Peasants*). A. Sönmez (Trans.), İmge Kitabevi.

Tables

Table 1

Turkish Households and Their Place in the Turkish Agrarian Scene Between the Years 1994 and 2017 According to HBS Data

Features defining the households	Survey Years						% of relative change (a)
	1994	2002	2005	2010	2015	2017	
Total number of households covered in survey samples	26186	9555	8559	10082	11491	12166	-
% of households not earning agricultural income	83,9	89,2	76,4	87,3	83,7	81,4	-2,98
% of households earning agricultural income	16,1	10,8	23,6	12,7	16,3	18,6	15,53
% of households which neither own arable land nor earn agricultural income	69,4	82,8	75,0	71,1	68,9	67,9	-2,16
% of households which own arable land but earn no agricultural income	14,4	6,4	3,4	16,2	14,8	13,3	-8,2
% of households owning no arable land	75,0	85,0	77,5	73,4	72,1	72,1	-3,87
% of households owning arable land	25,0	15,0	22,5	26,6	27,9	27,9	11,6
% of the households which earn agricultural income but own no arable land	5,6	2,1	4,5	2,2	3,1	3,9	-30,35
% of the households which have at least one member working in agriculture as "farmer"	-	13,9	34,4	31,4	26,6	29,9	115,11
% of households which have at least one member whose second employment status is a "farmer"	-	3,2	5,3	6,3	-	-	-
% of the households which own neither arable land nor earn income from agriculture but have at least one member whose main occupation is an unpaid family worker in agriculture	-	5,4	14,6	18,6	12,2	13,0	144,4

Notes: (a) % of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 1994 according to the following formula: ((time2-time1) /time1 X 100).

Table 2

Trajectory of Land Ownership and of the Forms of Land Use

Features defining the households	Survey Years						% of relative change (a)
	1994	2002	2005	2010	2015	2017	
Total number of households owning arable land	6542	1436	1926	2684	3204	3398	-
Total number of households owning land and earning agricultural income	2759	825	1631	1051	1504	1784	-
% of households owning land and earning agricultural income	42,2	57,5	84,7	39,2	49,9	52,5	24,4
Total number of households owning land but not earning agricultural income	3783	611	295	1633	1700	1614	-
% of households owning arable land but not earning agricultural income	57,8	42,5	15,3	60,8	53,1	47,5	-17,8
% of households renting out land among households earning agricultural income	3,9	3,6	11,7	3,9	1,9	4,0	2,6
% of households renting out land among households not earning agricultural income	17,8	19,8	1,0	17,2	15,4	20,9	17,4
% of households not renting out land among households not earning agricultural income	84,9	83,5	99,0	85,3	86,6	82,7	-2,6
National total % of households not renting out land	89,6	90,9	89,9	89,5	92,0	89,7	0,1
National % of the area of land not rented out	91,0	95,7	93,2	93,2	93,9	91,8	0,9
National % of the area of land rented out	9,0	4,3	6,8	8,5	6,1	8,2	-8,9
National total % of households renting out land	10,4	9,1	10,1	10,5	8,0	10,3	-1,0
National average area of land owned (da) by all households (b)	37,5	39,6	41,9	37,3	34,1	29,5	-21,3
National average area (in da) of land owned by all households earning agricultural income	40,0	47,4	46,6	42,2	46	36,6	-8,5
National average area (in da) of land owned by households not earning agricultural income	35,7	29,0	15,9	34,2	23,6	21,6	-39,5

Average area (in da) of land owned by all households earning agricultural income and renting out land	38,0	36,7	34,0	42,7	96,3	44,8	17,9
Average area (in da) of land rented out by households earning agricultural income and renting out land	25,2	13,9	27,2	21,8	31,0	23,3	-7,5
Average area (in da) of land owned by households earning neither agricultural income nor renting out land	35,4	28,1	15,1	34,2	22,4	20,2	-42,9
National % of land owned but not rented out by households not earning agricultural income	46,3	25,2	5,5	47,5	30,3	26,9	-41,9
Within category % of land owned by but not rented out by households not earning agricultural income	84,1	81,0	94,4	85,2	82,4	77,2	-8,2
Average area (in da) of land owned by households not earning agricultural income but renting out land	37,6	33,3	87,3	34,5	31,0	28,5	-24,2
Average area (in da) of land rented by households not earning agricultural income but renting out land	34,0	20,0	87,3	24,7	25,4	23,6	-30,6
Average area (in da) of land owned by the households renting out some or all of their land	37,6	34,0	34,8	35,7	38,4	31,8	-15,4
Average area of land (in da) rented out by all households which renting out land	32,6	18,6	28,1	24,3	26,0	23,5	-27,8
National average area (in da) of land rented out per household owning land	3,4	1,7	2,8	2,5	2,1	2,4	-28,4
National average area (in da) of land renting out per household not earning agricultural income	5,1	3,3	0,9	3,6	3,4	4,1	-19,6

Notes: (a) % of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 1994 according to the following formula: ((time2-time1) /time1 X 100). (b) Includes the area of greenhouses owned.

Table 3

Percent Distribution of Land-Owning Households by the Size of Arable Land They Own

Categories of households by the size of land owned	Year of Survey						% of relative change (a)
	1994	2002	2005	2010	2015	2017	
Landowners earning agricultural income							
< 5 da	19,4	13,1	13,3	13,6	18,6	16,4	-15,5
5-9 da	12,3	11,4	13,9	13,8	14,8	15,4	25,2
10-19 da	19,4	15,5	17,4	19,5	19,5	21,4	10,3
20-49 da	29,6	29,9	25,4	27,1	23,5	26,2	-11,5
50-99 da	12,7	18,9	16,1	15,6	13,6	13,3	4,7
100-199 da	4,5	8,1	9,4	6,9	6,8	4,8	6,7
≥ 200 da	2,1	3	4,5	3,5	3,3	2,6	23,8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	0,0
Land owners not earning agricultural income							
< 5 da	30,9	30,0	42,7	30,9	40,6	42,8	38,5
5-9 da	13,3	17,2	15,9	19,0	17,3	18,3	37,6
10-19 da	16,8	20,0	17,6	20,0	15,7	15,8	-6,0
20-49 da	21,9	20,9	15,6	17,6	16,8	15,1	-31,1
50-99 da	9,6	6,1	5,4	7,2	5,9	5,4	-43,8
100-199 da	4,9	2,9	1,7	3,2	2,5	1,8	-63,3
≥ 200 da	2,7	2,9	1,0	2,1	1,1	0,9	-66,7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	0,0
All land-owning households							
< 5 da	26,0	20,3	17,8	24,1	30,2	28,9	11,2
5-9 da	12,9	13,9	14,2	17,0	16,1	16,8	30,2
10-19 da	17,9	17,4	17,4	19,8	17,5	18,7	4,5
20-49 da	25,1	26,1	23,9	21,3	19,9	20,9	-16,7
50-99 da	10,9	13,4	14,5	10,5	9,5	9,5	-12,8
100-199 da	4,7	5,9	8,2	4,6	4,6	3,4	-27,7
≥ 200 da	2,4	3,0	3,9	2,7	2,1	1,8	-25,0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	0,0

Notes: (a) The rate of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 2002 and according to the following formula: ((time2-time1)/time1 X 100)).

Table 4

Distribution of the Members of Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households by Occupational Class

Categories of landowning households	Survey years										% of relative change (a)
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
Non-farming landowners											
Farming landowners											
1.Legislators, senior officials and managers	40	1,8	123	3,3	17	0,7	43	1,4	65	1,8	0,0
2.Professionals	6	0,3	39	1,0	8	0,3	35	1,1	59	1,6	433,3
3.Technicians and associate professionals	16	0,7	35	0,9	16	0,7	23	0,7	42	1,2	71,4
4.Clerks	17	0,8	44	1,2	10	0,4	27	0,8	48	1,3	62,5
5.Service workers and shop and market sales workers	29	1,3	130	3,5	38	1,6	195	6,1	182	5,0	284,6
6.Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	1864	84,0	2911	77,7	2052	85,3	2197	69,0	2531	70,0	-16,7
7.Craft and related trades workers	117	5,3	166	4,4	57	2,4	135	4,2	163	4,5	-15,1
8.Plant and machine operators and assemblers	40	1,8	115	3,1	28	1,2	115	3,6	129	3,6	100
9.Elementary occupations	91	4,1	182	4,9	179	7,4	412	12,9	395	10,9	165,9
Total	2220	100	3745	100	2405	100	3182	100	3614	100	0,0
Non-farming landowners											
1.Legislators, senior officials and managers	122	15,6	55	18,6	235	11,8	99	5,9	76	6,2	-60,3
2.Professionals	53	6,8	22	7,4	111	5,6	127	7,6	159	13	91,2
3.Technicians and associate professionals	44	5,6	10	3,4	73	3,7	79	4,7	90	7,4	32,1
4.Clerks	33	4,2	15	5,1	83	4,2	76	4,6	84	6,9	64,3
5.Service workers and shop and market sales workers	104	13,3	29	9,8	228	11,4	338	20,3	282	23,1	73,7
6.Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	126	16,1	7	2,4	492	24,7	300	18,0	27	2,2	-86,3
7.Craft and related trades workers	154	19,7	58	19,6	235	11,8	239	14,3	177	14,5	-26,4
8.Plant and machine operators and assemblers	75	9,6	43	14,5	221	11,1	167	10	113	9,3	-3,1

9.Elementary occupations	70	9	57	19,3	314	15,8	242	14,5	213	17,4	93,3
Total	781	100	296	100	1992	100	1667	100	1221	100	0,0
All landowners											
1.Legislators, senior officials and managers	162	5,4	178	4,4	252	5,7	142	2,9	141	2,9	-46,3
2.Professionals	59	2,0	61	1,5	119	2,7	162	3,3	218	4,5	125,0
3.Technicians and associate professionals	60	2,0	45	1,1	89	2,0	102	2,1	132	2,7	35,0
4.Clerks	50	1,7	59	1,5	93	2,1	103	2,1	132	2,7	58,8
5.Service workers and shop and market sales workers	133	4,4	159	3,9	266	6,0	533	11,0	464	9,6	118,2
6.Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	1990	66,3	2918	72,2	2544	57,9	2497	51,5	2558	52,9	-20,2
7.Craft and related trades workers	271	9	224	5,5	292	6,6	374	7,7	340	7,0	-22,2
8.Plant and machine operators and assemblers	115	3,8	158	3,9	249	5,7	282	5,8	242	5,0	31,6
9.Elementary occupations	161	5,4	239	5,9	493	11,2	654	13,5	608	12,6	133,3
Total	3001	100	4041	100	4397	100	4849	100	4835	100	0,0

Notes: (a) The rate of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 2002 and according to the following formula: ((time2-time1)/time1 X 100)).

Table 5

Distribution of National Workforce in Employment by Occupational Class as Indicated by HBSs Data

Occupational classes	Survey years										% of relative change (a)
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
1.Legislators, senior officials and managers	1214	10,1	1060	9,3	1140	8,8	695	4,8	712	4,7	-53,5
2.Professionals	667	5,5	601	5,3	839	6,5	1236	8,5	1346	8,9	61,8
3.Technicians and associate professionals	668	5,6	470	4,1	729	5,6	676	4,7	854	5,7	1,8
4.Clerks	574	4,8	523	4,6	736	5,7	807	5,6	868	5,8	20,8
5.Service workers and shop and market sales workers	1435	11,9	1215	10,7	1451	11,2	2565	17,7	2658	17,6	47,9

6.Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	2429	20,2	3360	29,6	3144	24,2	3169	21,9	3337	22,1	9,4
7.Craft and related trades workers	2452	20,4	1727	15,2	1801	13,9	1966	13,6	1975	13,1	-35,8
8.Plant and machine operators and assemblers	1045	8,7	987	8,7	1246	9,6	1289	8,9	1244	8,2	-5,7
9.Elementary occupations	1545	12,8	1406	12,4	1917	14,7	2090	14,4	2090	13,9	8,6
Total	12029	100	11349	100	13003	100	14493	100	15084	100	0,0

Notes: (a) The rate of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 2002 and according to the following formula: ((time2-time1)/time1 X 100)).

Table 6

Distribution of Non-farming and Farming Landowning Households by Social Class Positions

Categories of landowning households	Survey year										% of relative change (a)
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
I. Non-farming landowners											
1. Upper service class	165	35,9	72	34,8	319	27,7	188	17,8	198	23,9	-33,6
2.Lower service class	32	7,0	7	3,4	49	4,3	62	5,9	67	8,1	15,9
3.Routine non-manual class	78	17,0	26	12,6	181	15,7	260	24,6	208	25,1	47,6
4.Petty bourgeoisie	54	11,8	13	6,3	322	28,0	261	24,7	116	14,0	18,9
5.Technicians and supervisors	32	7,0	27	13,0	76	6,6	84	7,9	60	7,2	3,8
6.Skilled manual class	69	15,0	29	14,0	102	8,9	113	10,7	82	9,9	-34,2
7.Non-skilled manual class	29	6,3	33	15,9	101	8,8	90	8,5	98	11,8	87,1
Total	459	100	207	100	1150	100	1058	100	829	100	0,0
II. Farming landowners											
1.Upper service class	42	5,1	150	9,8	24	2,3	68	4,5	111	6,3	22,8
2.Lower service class	13	1,6	24	1,6	14	1,3	21	1,4	37	2,1	32,3
3.Routine non-manual class	35	4,2	118	7,7	32	3,0	150	10,0	149	8,4	97,9
4.Petty bourgeoisie	735	89,1	1162	76,3	981	93,3	1155	77,2	1406	79,2	-11,1
5.Technicians and supervisors	0	0,0	14	0,9	0	0,0	27	1,8	18	1,0	No comp.
6.Skilled manual class	0	0,0	21	1,4	0	0,0	44	2,9	21	1,2	No comp.
7.Non-skilled manual class	0	0,0	34	2,2	0	0,0	32	2,1	33	1,9	No comp.

Total	825	100	1523	100	1051	100	1497	100	1775	100	0,0
III. All landowners											
1.Upper service class	207	16,1	222	12,8	343	15,6	256	10,0	309	11,9	-26,4
2.Lower service class	45	3,5	31	1,8	63	2,9	83	3,2	104	4,0	14,0
3.Routine non-manual class	113	8,8	144	8,3	213	9,7	410	16,0	357	13,7	55,8
4.Petty bourgeoisie	789	61,4	1175	67,9	1303	59,2	1416	55,4	1522	58,4	-4,9
5.Technicians and supervisors	32	2,5	41	2,4	76	3,5	111	4,3	78	3,0	20,2
6.Skilled manual class	69	5,4	50	2,9	102	4,6	157	6,1	103	4,0	-26,4
7.Non-skilled manual class	29	2,3	67	3,9	101	4,6	122	4,8	131	5,0	122,7
Total	1284	100	1730	100	2201	100	2555	100	2604	100	0,0

Notes: (a) The rate of relative change has been calculated for the year 2017 by reference to 2002 and according to the following formula: ((time2-time1)/time1 X 100)). The X^2 association between distribution to class positions by categories of households (farming and non-farming) is significant at %95 level of confidence in all years of surveys.

Table 7

A Comparison of the Mean Values of the Annual Disposable Income and of the Immovable Property (in ₺) Among Farming and Non-Farming Landowner Households

Income and wealth by survey years	Farming landowners				Non-farming landowners				General national averages			
	N	Mean	Ratio (1)	Ratio (2)	N	Mean	Ratio (3)	Ratio (4)	N	Mean	Ratio (5)	Ratio (6)
1994												
Inc.per hhold (*)	2759	9670	83,5	86,4	3783	11586	119,8	103,6	26186	11187	115,7	96,6
Inc. per head (ns)	2759	2490	93,9	86,1	3783	2651	106,5	91,6	26186	2893	116,2	109,1
2002												
Inc. per hhold (*)	825	7609	82,4	89,0	609	9238	121,4	108,1	9545	8548	112,3	92,5
Inc. per head (*)	825	1835	71,4	74,4	609	2570	140,1	104,1	9545	2468	134,5	96,0
Immoveable property per household												
Land (*)	825	30029	180,3	820,8	609	16659	55,5	455,4	9545	3658	12,2	22,0
House (*)	825	16119	70,0	79,0	609	23015	142,8	112,8	9545	20408	126,6	88,7
Other (ns)	825	890	126,6	30,4	609	703	79,0	24	9545	2931	329,4	417,0
Total wealth (ns)	825	48752	111,1	180,6	609	43866	90,0	162,5	9545	26997	55,4	61,5

2005												
Inc. per hhold (*)	1631	11517	85,3	95,3	295	13503	117,2	111,8	8559	12079	104,9	89,5
Inc. per head (*)	1631	2894	70,5	81,9	295	4107	141,9	116,2	8559	3535	122,1	86,1
Immoveable property per household												
Land (*)	1631	41354	210,4	483,2	295	19653	47,5	229,7	8559	8558	20,7	43,5
House (*)	1631	26184	58,5	78,3	295	44793	171,1	134	8559	33429	127,7	74,6
Other (*)	1631	2401	41,3	72,7	295	5815	242,2	176	8559	3305	137,6	56,8
Total wealth (ns)	1631	69939	99,5	154,4	295	70262	100,5	155,1	8559	45291	64,8	64,5
2010												
Inc. per hhold (*)	1051	18704	78,0	80,5	1633	23990	128,3	103,2	10082	23249	124,3	96,9
Inc. per head (*)	1051	5490	70,4	72,9	1633	7801	142,1	103,6	10082	7532	137,2	96,6
2015												
Inc. per hhold (ns)	1504	35167	98,8	93,4	1700	35599	101,2	94,5	11491	37664	107,1	105,8
Inc. per head (*)	1504	10398	81,5	79,6	1700	12760	122,7	97,7	11491	13063	125,6	102,4
2017												
Inc. per hhold (*)	1784	50219	113,3	105,6	1614	44333	88,3	93,2	12166	47562	94,7	107,3
Inc. per head (ns)	1784	15273	93,0	92,6	1614	16417	107,5	99,5	12166	16494	108,0	100,5

Notes: (*) Significantly different at 95 % level of confidence, comparisons are made between farming and non-farming landowners; ns = not significant. Mean values are rounded automatically to fit into the cells. **Ratio (1)** = Ratio of the mean to that of the non-farming households; **Ratio (2) =** Ratio of the mean to the national average; **Ratio (3)** = Ratio of the mean to that of the farming households; **Ratio (4) =** Ratio of the mean to the national average; **Ratio (5)** = Ratio of the mean to that of the farming households; **Ratio (6)** = Ratio of the mean to that of the non-farming households.

Table 8

Mean Annual Disposable Income and Wealth (in ₺) of Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households by Social Class (a)

Households by social classes	Survey years												% of change in income since 2002	
	2002			2005			2010		2015		2017			
	Income		Wealth	Income		Wealth	Income		Income		Income			
	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head
Farming														
Class I	12580	2129	100242	24640	6219	115642	33556	8888	68359	19836	116500	31752	826,1	1391,5
Class II	11161	2259	36758	15494	3730	102700	29357	8185	58491	11320	71482	17807	540,5	688,4
Class III	8348	1607	40768	13559	2774	66189	27355	6298	39716	10065	62326	13570	646,6	744,6
Class IV	7226	1822	46403	9922	2436	63271	17906	5342	32332	9861	43802	14287	506,1	684,3
Class V	0	0	0	13049	2893	64429	0	0	41120	9839	44135	11865	0	0
Class VI	0	0	0	12830	3090	68810	0	0	35391	12612	43935	12189	0	0
Class VII	0	0	0	6895	1528	32774	0	0	27794	8605	36584	11760	0	0
Class 0	0	0	0	8339	3538	87658	0	0	22447	8149	24220	10707	0	0
Total	7609	1835	48752	11517	2894	69939	18704	5490	35167	10398	50219	15273	560	732,3
Non-Farming														
Class I	15261	3986	66759	24405	7059	107487	44315	14267	78744	29262	96648	31162	533,3	681,8
Class II	12599	3149	50134	15046	3113	57500	32097	9259	56482	15867	67730	22953	437,6	628,9
Class III	8110	2127	29183	14044	3522	54215	24424	6252	43470	12415	50439	13737	522	545,9
Class IV	7446	1770	34763	10070	2844	32462	20108	4987	35771	9681	56525	15475	659,1	774,3
Class V	7059	1666	32341	12498	3087	53870	23184	6117	40076	11786	48817	13382	591,5	703,2
Class VI	7971	1907	26166	11190	2891	45638	19312	4897	30117	8203	39099	11160	390,5	485,1
Class VII	5666	1245	21824	8317	1999	32120	14574	4272	23603	7885	39152	12802	591,1	928,3
Class 0	4935	2173	43279	7821	3634	78593	15252	7456	19750	10631	26573	14221	438,5	554,4
Total	9238	2570	43866	13502	4107	70262	23990	7801	35599	12760	44333	16417	379,9	538,8
All landowners														
Class I	14715	3607	73585	24564	6491	112997	43562	13890	75985	26758	103779	31374	605,3	769,7
Class II	12184	2892	46270	15393	3591	92494	31488	9020	56990	14717	69065	21122	466,9	630,4
Class III	8184	1966	32771	13647	2909	64027	24865	6259	42096	11555	55400	13667	577,0	595,3
Class IV	7241	1818	45606	9923	2441	62930	18450	5254	32966	9828	44772	14377	518,3	690,8
Class V	7059	1666	32341	12686	3021	57476	23184	6117	40330	11313	47736	13032	576,2	682,2
Class VI	7971	1907	26166	11879	2975	55370	19312	4897	31595	9438	40085	11370	402,9	496,1
Class VII	5666	1245	21824	7596	1760	32451	14574	4272	24702	8074	38505	12539	579,6	907,2
Class 0	4935	2173	43279	8106	3581	83588	15252	7456	19779	10605	26546	14181	438,0	552,6
Total	8301	2147	46677	11821	3080	69988	21920	6896	35396	11651	47424	15816	471,3	636,6

Notes: (a) Numbers are rounded automatically in order to fit into the cells.

Table 9

Ratio (in %) of the Average Income and Wealth of the Social Classes to that of the Upper Service Class and of the Farming Landowners to that of the Non-Farming Landowners by Social Class

Households by social classes	Survey years												% of change in income since 2002	
	2002			2005			2010		2015		2017			
	Income		Wealth	Income		Wealth	Income		Income		Income			
	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head
Farming														
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	88,7	106,1	36,7	62,9	60,0	88,8	87,5	92,1	85,6	57,1	61,4	56,1	65,4	49,5
Class III	66,4	75,5	40,7	55,0	44,6	57,2	81,5	70,9	58,1	50,7	53,5	42,7	78,3	53,5
Class IV	57,4	85,6	46,3	40,3	39,2	54,7	53,4	60,1	47,3	49,7	37,6	45,0	61,3	49,2
Class V	0,0	0,0	0,0	53,0	46,5	55,7	0,0	0,0	60,2	49,6	37,9	37,4	0,0	0,0
Class VI	0,0	0,0	0,0	52,1	49,7	59,5	0,0	0,0	51,8	63,6	37,7	38,4	0,0	0,0
Class VII	0,0	0,0	0,0	28,0	24,6	28,3	0,0	0,0	40,7	43,4	31,4	37,0	0,0	0,0
Class 0	-	0,0	0,0	33,8	56,9	75,8	0,0	0,0	32,8	41,1	20,8	33,7	0,0	0,0
Total	60,5	86,2	48,6	46,7	46,5	60,5	55,7	61,8	51,4	52,4	43,1	48,1	67,8	52,6
Non-Farming														
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	82,6	79,0	75,1	61,7	44,1	53,5	72,4	64,9	71,7	54,2	70,1	73,7	82,1	92,2
Class III	53,1	53,4	43,7	57,5	49,9	50,4	55,1	43,8	55,2	42,4	52,2	44,1	97,9	80,1
Class IV	48,8	44,4	52,1	41,3	40,3	30,2	45,4	35,0	45,4	33,1	58,5	49,7	123,6	113,6
Class V	46,3	41,8	48,4	51,2	43,7	50,1	52,3	42,9	50,9	40,3	50,5	42,9	110,9	103,1
Class VI	52,2	47,8	39,2	45,9	41,0	42,5	43,6	34,3	38,2	28,0	40,5	35,8	73,2	71,1
Class VII	37,1	31,2	32,7	34,1	28,3	29,9	32,9	29,9	30,0	26,9	40,5	41,1	110,8	136,2
Class 0	32,3	54,5	64,8	32,0	51,5	73,1	34,4	52,3	25,1	36,3	27,5	45,6	82,2	81,3
Total	60,5	64,5	65,7	55,3	58,2	65,4	54,1	54,7	45,2	43,6	45,9	52,7	71,2	79,0
All landowners														
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	82,8	80,2	62,9	62,7	55,3	81,9	72,3	64,9	75,0	55,0	66,6	67,3	77,1	81,9
Class III	55,6	54,5	44,5	55,6	44,8	56,7	57,1	45,1	55,4	43,2	53,4	43,6	95,3	77,3
Class IV	49,2	50,4	62,0	40,4	37,6	55,7	42,4	37,8	43,4	36,7	43,1	45,8	85,6	89,7
Class V	48,0	46,2	44,0	51,6	46,5	50,9	53,2	44,0	53,1	42,3	46,0	41,5	95,2	88,6

Class VI	54,2	52,9	35,6	48,4	45,8	49,0	44,3	35,3	41,6	35,3	38,6	36,2	66,6	64,5
Class VII	38,5	34,5	29,7	30,9	27,1	28,7	33,5	30,8	32,5	30,2	37,1	40,0	95,8	117,9
Class 0	33,5	60,2	58,8	33,0	55,2	74,0	35,0	53,7	26,0	39,6	25,6	45,2	72,4	71,8
Total	56,4	59,5	63,4	48,1	47,5	61,9	50,3	49,6	46,6	43,5	45,7	50,4	77,9	82,7
Farming vs non-farming landowners														
Class I	82,4	53,4	150,2	101,0	88,1	107,6	75,7	62,3	86,8	67,8	120,5	101,9	154,9	204,1
Class II	88,6	71,7	73,3	103,0	119,8	178,6	91,5	88,4	103,6	71,3	105,5	77,6	123,5	109,5
Class III	102,9	75,6	139,7	96,5	78,8	122,1	112,0	100,7	91,4	81,1	123,6	98,8	123,9	136,4
Class IV	97,0	102,9	133,5	98,5	85,7	194,9	89,0	107,1	90,4	101,9	77,5	92,3	76,8	88,4
Class V	-	-	-	104,4	93,7	119,6	0,0	0,0	102,6	83,5	90,4	88,7	-	-
Class VI	-	-	-	114,7	106,9	150,8	0,0	0,0	117,5	153,7	112,4	109,2	-	-
Class VII	-	-	-	82,9	76,4	102,0	0,0	0,0	117,8	109,1	93,4	91,9	-	-
Class 0	-	-	-	106,6	97,4	111,5	0,0	0,0	113,7	76,7	91,1	75,3	-	-
Total	82,4	71,4	111,1	85,3	70,5	99,5	78,0	70,4	98,8	81,5	113,3	93,0	147,4	135,9

Table 10

General Period (2002-2017) Average Ratios (in %) of the Income, Wealth and of the Size of Farmland Owned by Other Social Classes to that of the Upper Service Class and of the Classes of Farming Landowners to that of the Non-Farming Landowners

Households by social classes	Income Per hhold	Income per head	Wealth per hhold	Size of land in da) per hhold	Size of land in da) per head
Farming					
1. Upper service class	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
2. Lower service class	77,2	74,3	62,7	263,8	313,1
3. Routine non-manual class	62,9	56,9	49,0	73,6	64,9
4. Petty bourgeoisie	47,2	55,9	50,5	114,2	133,1
5.Technicians and supervisors	50,3	44,5	27,9	85,4	73,6
6. Skilled manual class	28,3	50,6	29,8	64,1	87,5
7. Non-skilled manual class	20,0	35,0	14,2	63,6	69,4
0.No member in employment	22,2	43,9	37,9	56,3	108,3
Total	51,5	59,0	54,6	111,4	129,5
Non-Farming					

1. Upper service class	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
2. Lower service class	71,7	63,2	64,3	71,1	55,2
3. Routine non-manual class	54,6	46,7	47,1	82,2	63,9
4. Petty bourgeoisie	47,9	40,5	41,1	78,8	56,8
5.Technicians and supervisors	50,2	42,3	49,3	48,7	40,0
6. Skilled manual class	44,1	37,4	40,8	43,3	34,7
7. Non-skilled manual class	34,9	31,5	31,3	48,6	46,1
0.No member in employment	30,3	48,0	69,0	79,0	130,7
Total	52,2	54,7	65,5	78,7	89,3
All landowners					
1. Upper service class	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
2. Lower service class	71,9	64,6	72,4	118,5	109,8
3. Routine non-manual class	55,4	46,2	50,6	66,6	52,1
4. Petty bourgeoisie	43,7	41,7	58,8	111,0	108,5
5.Technicians and supervisors	50,4	44,1	47,4	48,2	40,0
6. Skilled manual class	45,4	41,1	42,3	41,7	38,9
7. Non-skilled manual class	34,5	32,5	29,2	45,8	44,5
0.No member in employment	30,6	50,8	66,4	69,8	122,3
Total	49,4	50,1	62,7	93,5	98,3
Farming vs non-farming landowners					
1. Upper service class	93,3	74,7	128,9	124,4	100,0
2. Lower service class	98,4	85,8	126,0	461,3	567,4
3. Routine non-manual class	105,3	87,0	130,9	111,3	101,5
4. Petty bourgeoisie	90,5	98,0	164,2	180,2	234,2
5.Technicians and supervisors	59,5	53,2	59,8	218,2	184,0
6. Skilled manual class	68,9	74,0	75,4	184,2	252,4
7. Non-skilled manual class	58,8	55,5	51,0	162,9	150,4
0.No member in employment	-	49,9	55,8	88,7	82,9
Total	91,5	77,4	105,3	176,1	145,0

Table 11

The Years in Which Average Annual Disposable Income Per Head and Per Household of the Social Classes Are Significantly Different or Not Different from Each Other Among Farming and Non-farming Landowners

Households by social class	Income per	Households by social class location						
		Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII
Farming								
Class 0	Hhold	nc, *nc,15,17	nc, *nc, *, *	nc,*nc,*,*	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,,*,nc,*,*	nc,*nc,*,*	nc,05, nc,15, *
	Head	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,*	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17
Class I	Hhold	-	02,05,10,15,17	*,*,10,*,*	*,*,*,*,*	nc,05,nc,*,17	nc,,*,nc,*,17	nc,*,nc,*,*
	Head	-	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,*,*,*	02,*,*,*,*	Nc,05,nc,15,17	Nc,*,nc,15,17	Nc,*,nc,*,17
Class II	Hhold		-	02,05,10,*,17	nc,*,*,*,*	nc,05,nc,15,*	nc,05,nc,*,*	nc,*,nc,*,*
	Head		-	02,05,10,15,*	02,*,*,15,17	Nc,05,nc,*,*	Nc,05,nc,*	Nc,*,nc,15,*
Class III	Hhold			-	02,*,*,*,*	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,*,*
	Head			-	02,05,10,15,17	Nc,05,nc,15,17	Nc,05,nc,*,17	Nc,*,nc,15,17
Class IV	Hhold				-	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17
	Head				-	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,*,17	nc,*,nc,15,17
Class V	Hhold					-	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,*,17
	Head					-	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17
Class VI	Hhold						-	nc,*,nc,*,17
	Head						-	nc,*,nc,*,17
Non-farming		Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII
Class 0	Hhold	*,*,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	02,*5,10,*,*
	Head	*,*,*,*,*,	*,05,10,*,*	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,17
Class I	Hhold	-	02,05,10,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*
	Head	-	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,10,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*
Class II	Hhold		-	*,05,*,15,*	*,05,*,*,17	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*
	Head		-	*,05,*,15,*	*,05,**,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*	*,05,*,*,*
Class III	Hhold			-	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*
	Head			-	02,05,*,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,17
Class IV	Hhold				-	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	*,05,*,*,17
	Head				-	02,05,*,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,*,17
Class V	Hhold					-	02,05,*,*,*	02,*,*,*,*
	Head					-	02,05,*,*,17	02,*,*,*,17
Class VI	Hhold						-	*,05,*,*,17
	Head						-	*,*,10,15,17

Notes: Class 0 refers to those households which have no member in employment, **(*)** shows the cases of comparisons, starting with the year 2002, in which the differences in the average amount of annual disposable income per household and per head are significant at 95 % level of confidence. The two-digit numbers indicate the last two digits of the years in which the differences are not significant at the level confidence set.

Table 12

Percent Distribution of Family Types among Categories of Landowning and All Households between the years of 2002 and 2017

Family types by categories of households	Survey years					% of rel. change
	2002	2005	2010	2015	2017	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Farming landowners						
Nuclear	61,5	58,6	61,1	68,7	66,5	8,1
Extended	33,5	36,7	31,7	27,5	29,4	-12,2
One-adult	4,7	4,4	4,1	3,7	4,1	-12,8
Other	0,4	0,2	3,1	0,1	0,0	-100,0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	0,0
Non-farming landowners						
Nuclear	68,9	71,5	61,1	62,7	67,1	-2,6
Extended	20,6	21,7	25,8	22	15,6	-24,3
One-adult	9,7	5,8	9,2	15,1	17,1	76,3
Other	0,8	1,0	3,9	0,2	0,2	-75,0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	0,0
All landowners						
Nuclear	64,6	60,6	61,1	65,5	66,8	3,4
Extended	28,0	34,4	28,1	24,6	22,8	-18,6
One-adult	6,8	4,6	7,2	9,7	10,3	51,5
Other	0,6	0,4	3,6	0,2	0,1	-83,3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	0,0
All households in the country						
Nuclear	74,1	72,8	69,3	71,7	68,8	-7,2
Extended	15,6	19,0	16,8	14,9	16,0	2,6
One-adult	9,5	7,5	10,1	12,1	14,7	54,7
Other	0,8	0,7	3,8	1,2	0,5	-37,5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	0,0

Table 13

Average Household Size, Annual Average Disposable Income Per Household and Per Head by Family Type and Rates of Relative Change Among Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households (a)

Households by family type	Survey year: 2002			Survey year: 2017			Rate (in %) of relative change		
	Hhold size	Inc.per hhold	Inc.per head	Hhold size	Inc.per hhold	Inc.per head	Hhold size	Inc.per hhold	Inc.per head
Farming									
Nuclear	4	6929	2009	3,2	47363	16412	-19,7	583,6	717,1
Extended	6,9	9221	1484	5,7	59174	11552	-18,3	541,7	678,3
One-adult	2,7	5387	2087	1,8	32594	23366	-35,4	505,1	1019,5
Other	2	2971	1485	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	4,9	7609	1835	3,9	50219	15273	-21,1	560	732,3
Non-farming									
Nuclear	3,8	9131	2645	3,1	46908	16207	-20,3	413,7	512,7
Extended	6	11020	1954	4,7	53638	12435	-21,9	386,8	536,3
One-adult	2,1	6504	3348	1,3	25054	20473	-38,3	285,2	511,6
Other	2,2	5557	2619	2	107103	53551	-9,1	1827,5	1945
Total	4,1	9238	2570	3	44333	16417	-26,7	379,9	538,8
All landowners									
Nuclear	3,9	7925	2297	3,2	47146	16314	-20,1	494,9	610,4
Extended	6,7	9785	1632	5,4	57377	11838	-19,5	486,4	625,6
One-adult	2,4	6059	2846	1,4	26648	21085	-40,8	339,8	640,8
Other	2,1	4587	2194	2	107103	53551	-6,1	2235	2341,2
Total	4,6	8301	2147	3,5	47424	15816	-24,2	471,3	636,6
National averages									
Nuclear	4,1	8601	2416	3,5	49597	15929	-14,7	476,6	559,4
Extended	6,3	9172	1639	5,2	52563	11723	-17,9	473,1	615,3
One-adult	2,4	7039	4101	1,6	32290	23979	-31,4	358,7	484,7
Other	2,7	9181	4089	2,6	57127	25337	-4,5	522,2	519,7
Total	4,3	8548	2468	3,5	47562	16494	-18,5	456,4	568,3

Notes: (a) Mean values are rounded automatically in order to fit into the cells.

Table 14

The Years in which Differences in the Average Annual Amount of Income Per Household and Per Head and of Wealth Per Household (in ₺) by Family Type Are Significant or Not Significant Among Family Types of Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households (t-test results)

Households by family type	Income per	Family type			
		Nuclear	Extended	One-adult	Other
1.Farming households					
Nuclear	Household	—	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,*,*,17,	02,05,10,sc,nc
	Head	—	*,*,*,*,*	02,*,10,*,*	02,05,10,sc,nc
	Wealth (a)	—	*,05	02,05	02,05
Extended	Household		—	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,sc,nc
	Head		—	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,*,sc,nc
	Wealth (+)		—	02,05	02,05
One-adult	Household			—	02,05,*,sc,nc
	Head			—	02,05,10,sc,nc
	Wealth (a)			—	02,05
2.Non-Farming households					
Nuclear	Household	—	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,*,*,*,	02,05,10,15,17
	Head	—	*,05,*,*,*	02,05,*,*,*	02,05,10,15,*
	Wealth (a)	—	02,05	02,05	02,05
Extended	Household		—	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,15,*
	Head		—	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,*,*,*
	Wealth (a)		—	02,05	02,05
One-adult	Household			—	02,05,10,15,*
	Head			—	02,05,10,15,*
	Wealth (a)			—	02,05
3. All households in Turkey					
Nuclear	Household	—	02,*, 10,*,*	*,*,*,*,*	02, 05,10,*,17
	Head	—	*,*, *,*,*	*, *,*,*,*	*, 05,*,*,*
	Wealth (a)	—	*,*,	*,05	02,05
Extended	Household		—	*,*,*,*,*	02,*,10,15, 17
	Head		—	*,*,*,*,*	*, *,*,*,*
	Wealth (#)		—	02,*	02,05
One-adult	Household			—	02, 05, *,*,*
	Head			—	02, 05,10,15, 17
	Wealth (a)			—	02,05

Notes: (**a**) data are available only for the years of 2002 and 2005. (*) Differences in income and wealth are significant at 95 % level of confidence, **nc**=no case for comparison, **sc**=there is only one case for comparison,

Table 15

Average Area of Farm Land (in da) Owned by Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Social Class

Households by social class	Average Area of Land Owned by Survey years										Period average	
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017			
	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head
Farming landowners												
Class I	27,5	4,4	50,4	12,7	14,9	3,6	54,5	12,3	49,2	15,8	39,3	9,8
Class II	30,6	4,9	31,8	6,8	28,6	7,2	398,8	128,0	28,3	6,1	103,6	30,6
Class III	24,5	4,5	26,7	4,6	41,8	11,0	24,3	6,0	27,1	5,6	28,9	6,3
Class IV	49,9	13,3	50,7	12,3	43,1	12,9	42,7	13,6	38	12,9	44,9	13,0
Class V	0	0,0	37,8	7,9	0	0,0	40,7	7,8	22,2	5,9	33,6	7,2
Class VI	0	0,0	16,9	3,9	0	0,0	44,3	17,8	14,3	4,0	25,2	8,6
Class VII	0	0,0	28,6	6,2	0	0,0	29,8	9,0	16,6	5,1	25,0	6,8
Class 0	0	0,0	35,8	16,5	0	0,0	16,4	9,4	14,1	5,9	22,1	10,6
Total	47,4	12,4	46,6	11,7	42,2	12,6	46	14,2	36,6	12,0	43,8	12,7
Non-farming landowners												
Class I	34,3	10,2	17	4,3	67,5	20,2	17,5	6,3	21,6	7,8	31,6	9,8
Class II	55,9	11,6	3,1	0,6	34,7	9,0	9,6	2,8	8,9	2,9	22,5	5,4
Class III	19,8	4,7	25,5	6,1	18,7	5,5	28,5	7,9	37,4	7,0	26,0	6,2
Class IV	28,1	5,3	19,2	3,4	37,1	8,6	29,7	7,3	10,3	3,0	24,9	5,6
Class V	12,1	3,0	13,6	3,2	24,8	5,9	13,0	3,7	13,4	3,7	15,4	3,9
Class VI	9,7	2,5	12,9	3,2	29	7,1	7,3	2,0	9,5	2,1	13,7	3,4
Class VII	23,8	5,6	15	3,5	14	4,2	13,5	5,8	10,3	3,4	15,3	4,5
Class 0	35,8	17,8	14,7	6,4	22,8	11,4	27,9	15,0	23,5	13,3	24,9	12,8
Total	29	9,6	15,9	4,6	34,2	10,9	23,6	9,4	21,6	9,1	24,8	8,7
All landowners												
Class I	32,9	9,0	39,5	10,0	63,8	19,0	27,3	7,9	31,5	10,7	39,0	11,3
Class II	48,6	9,6	25,3	5,4	33,4	8,6	108,1	34,4	15,8	4,1	46,2	12,4
Class III	21,2	4,7	26,5	4,9	22,2	6,3	26,9	7,2	33,1	6,4	26,0	5,9
Class IV	48,4	12,8	50,3	12,2	41,6	11,9	40,3	12,4	35,8	12,2	43,3	12,3
Class V	12,1	3,0	21,8	4,8	24,8	5,9	19,7	4,7	15,4	4,2	18,8	4,5
Class VI	9,7	2,5	14,6	3,5	29	7,1	17,7	6,5	10,5	2,5	16,3	4,4
Class VII	23,8	5,6	21,9	4,9	14	4,2	17,8	6,6	11,9	3,9	17,9	5,0
Class 0	35,8	17,8	26,3	11,9	22,8	11,4	27,8	14,9	23,4	13,2	27,2	13,9
Total	39,6	11,2	41,9	10,6	37,3	11,5	34,1	11,7	29,5	10,6	36,5	11,1

Table 16

Ratios (in %) of the Average Area of Farm Land Owned by Social Classes to that the Upper Service Class Among Farming and Non-Farming Landowner Households

Households by social class	Average Area of Farm Land Owned by Survey years										Period average	
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017			
	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head
Farming												
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	111,3	110,0	63,1	53,8	191,9	198,9	731,7	1036,3	57,5	38,6	263,6	313,1
Class III	89,1	102,5	53,0	36,3	280,5	302,1	44,6	48,7	55,1	35,3	73,5	64,9
Class IV	181,5	302,3	100,6	97,0	289,3	354,7	78,3	109,7	77,2	82,0	114,2	133,1
Class V	0,0	0,0	75,0	62,4	0,0	0,0	74,7	63,2	45,1	37,1	85,5	73,6
Class VI	0,0	0,0	33,5	30,7	0,0	0,0	81,3	144,3	29,1	25,1	64,1	87,5
Class VII	0,0	0,0	56,7	48,9	0,0	0,0	54,7	72,7	33,7	32,6	63,6	69,4
Class 0	0,0	0,0	71,0	129,5	0,0	0,0	30,1	76,4	28,7	37,2	56,2	108,3
Total	172,4	280,8	92,5	92,3	283,2	346,4	84,4	115,4	74,4	76,1	111,5	129,5
Non-farming												
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	163,0	113,3	18,2	14,6	51,4	44,8	54,9	44,0	41,2	37,6	71,2	55,2
Class III	57,7	46,1	150,0	140,2	27,7	27,2	162,9	126,1	173,1	89,7	82,3	63,9
Class IV	81,9	52,2	112,9	79,5	55,0	42,8	169,7	116,3	47,7	38,8	78,8	56,8
Class V	35,3	29,3	80,0	73,4	36,7	29,3	74,3	59,3	62,0	47,5	48,7	40,0
Class VI	28,3	24,5	75,9	73,1	43,0	35,4	41,7	32,3	44,0	26,9	43,4	34,7
Class VII	69,4	55,1	88,2	80,4	20,7	20,9	77,1	92,0	47,7	43,6	48,4	46,1
Class 0	104,4	174,7	86,5	147,1	33,8	56,5	159,4	237,7	108,8	169,6	78,8	130,7
Total	84,5	93,8	93,5	107,4	50,7	53,9	134,9	149,5	100	116,5	78,5	89,3
All landowners												
Class I	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Class II	147,7	106,6	64,1	54,4	52,4	45,4	396,0	435,7	50,2	38,0	118,5	109,8
Class III	64,4	51,5	67,1	48,8	34,8	33,2	98,5	91,6	105,1	60,1	66,7	52,1
Class IV	147,1	141,7	127,3	122,5	65,2	62,2	147,6	156,9	113,7	114,0	111,0	108,5
Class V	36,8	33,1	55,2	48,0	38,9	31,1	72,2	59,8	48,9	39,5	48,2	40,0
Class VI	29,5	27,6	37,0	34,7	45,5	37,5	64,8	81,6	33,3	23,3	41,8	38,9
Class VII	72,3	62,3	55,4	48,7	21,9	22,2	65,2	83,9	37,8	36,1	45,9	44,5
Class 0	108,8	197,4	66,6	119,3	35,7	59,9	101,8	188,6	74,3	123,7	69,7	122,3
Total	120,4	123,9	106,1	106,5	58,5	60,6	124,9	147,8	93,7	99,5	93,6	98,3
Farming vs non-farming landowners												

Class I	80,2	43,2	296,5	294,0	22,1	18,0	311,4	196,1	227,8	201,1	124,4	100
Class II	54,7	42,0	1025,8	1082,7	82,4	80,0	4154,2	4617,1	318,0	206,3	460,4	567,4
Class III	123,7	96,1	104,7	76,1	223,5	199,7	85,3	75,8	72,5	79,2	111,2	101,5
Class IV	177,6	250,6	264,1	358,8	116,2	149,2	143,8	185,1	368,9	424,8	180,3	234,2
Class V	0,0	0,0	277,9	249,7	0,0	0,0	313,1	209,0	165,7	157,2	218,2	184,0
Class VI	0,0	0,0	131,0	123,3	0,0	0,0	606,8	876,7	150,5	187,5	183,9	252,4
Class VII	0,0	0,0	190,7	178,9	0,0	0,0	220,7	155,0	161,2	150,4	163,4	150,4
Class 0	0,0	0,0	243,5	258,9	0,0	0,0	58,8	63,0	60,0	44,1	88,8	82,9
Total	163,4	129,5	293,1	252,7	123,4	115,7	194,9	151,3	169,4	131,4	176,6	145,0

Table 17.1

Percent Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by the size of Land Owned and the Social Class Location of the Households in 2002

Households by the size of land owned	%	Social Class Location of the Households								Total
		Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII	
Farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	-	8,3	3,7	2,8	85,2	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	21,4	30,8	8,6	12,5	-	-	-	13,1
5-9 (da)	Row %	-	8,5	2,1	9,6	79,8	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	19,0	15,4	25,7	10,2	-	-	-	11,4
10-19 (da)	Row %	-	6,3	1,6	3,9	88,3	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	19,0	15,4	14,3	15,4	-	-	-	15,5
20-49 (da)	Row %	-	4,5	1,6	5,7	88,3	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	26,2	30,8	40,0	29,7	-	-	-	29,9
50-99 (da)	Row %	-	2,6		1,3	96,2	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	9,5		5,7	20,4	-	-	-	18,9
100-199 (da)	Row %	-	3,0		3,0	94,0	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	4,8		5,7	8,6	-	-	-	8,1
200 (da) +	Row %	-		4,0		96,0	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-		7,7		3,3	-	-	-	3,0
Total	Row %	-	5,1	1,6	4,2	89,1	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	100	100	100	100	-	-	-	100
Non-farming (*)										

<5 (da)	Row %	26,8	17,5	3,3	12,0	8,7	4,9	22,4	4,4	100
	Col. %	32,2	19,4	18,8	28,2	29,6	28,1	59,4	27,6	30,0
5-9 (da)	Row %	21,9	31,4	7,6	11,4	8,6	7,6	9,5	1,9	100
	Col. %	15,1	20,0	25,0	15,4	16,7	25,0	14,5	6,9	17,2
10-19 (da)	Row %	25,4	25,4	4,9	14,8	7,4	6,6	9,0	6,6	100
	Col. %	20,4	18,8	18,8	23,1	16,7	25,0	15,9	27,6	20,0
20-49 (da)	Row %	25,8	32,8	3,9	14,1	10,2	4,7	3,1	5,5	100
	Col. %	21,7	25,5	15,6	23,1	24,1	18,8	5,8	24,1	20,9
50-99 (da)	Row %	10,8	51,4	2,7	13,5	5,4	2,7	5,4	8,1	100
	Col. %	2,6	11,5	3,1	6,4	3,7	3,1	2,9	10,3	6,1
100-199 (da)	Row %	27,8	16,7	11,1	16,7	16,7	-	5,6	5,6	100
	Col. %	3,3	1,8	6,3	3,8	5,6	-	1,4	3,4	2,9
200 (da) +	Row %	38,9	27,8	22,2		11,1	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	4,6	3,0	12,5		3,7	-	-	-	2,9
Total	Row %	24,9	27,0	5,2	12,8	8,8	5,2	11,3	4,7	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	16,8	14,1	3,4	8,6	37,1	3,1	14,1	2,7	100
	Col. %	32,2	19,8	22,2	22,1	13,7	28,1	59,4	27,6	20,3
5-9 (da)	Row %	11,6	20,6	5,0	10,6	42,2	4,0	5,0	1,0	100
	Col. %	15,1	19,8	22,2	18,6	10,6	25,0	14,5	6,9	13,9
10-19 (da)	Row %	12,4	15,6	3,2	9,2	48,8	3,2	4,4	3,2	100
	Col. %	20,4	18,8	17,8	20,4	15,5	25,0	15,9	27,6	17,4
20-49 (da)	Row %	8,8	14,1	2,4	8,5	61,6	1,6	1,1	1,9	100
	Col. %	21,7	25,6	20,0	28,3	29,3	18,8	5,8	24,1	26,1
50-99 (da)	Row %	2,1	11,9	0,5	3,6	78,8	0,5	1,0	1,6	100
	Col. %	2,6	11,1	2,2	6,2	19,3	3,1	2,9	10,3	13,4
100-199 (da)	Row %	5,9	5,9	2,4	5,9	77,6		1,2	1,2	100
	Col. %	3,3	2,4	4,4	4,4	8,4		1,4	3,4	5,9
200 (da) +	Row %	16,3	11,6	11,6		60,5	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	4,6	2,4	11,1		3,3	-	-	-	3,0
Total	Row %	10,6	14,4	3,1	7,9	54,9	2,2	4,8	2,0	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence.

Table 17.2

Percent Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by the size of Land Owned and the Social Class Location of the Households in 2005

Households by the size of land owned	%	Social Class Location of the Households								Total
		Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII	
Farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	4,6	12,0	3,7	12,4	59,4	1,4	2,3	4,1	100
	Col. %	9,3	17,3	33,3	22,9	11,1	21,4	23,8	26,5	13,3
5-9 (da)	Row %	7,0	11,0	1,3	11,9	62,1	0,4	2,6	3,5	100
	Col. %	14,8	16,7	12,5	22,9	12,1	7,1	28,6	23,5	13,9
10-19 (da)	Row %	8,1	7,7	1,8	9,9	69,0	1,1	1,1	1,4	100
	Col. %	21,3	14,7	20,8	23,7	16,9	21,4	14,3	11,8	17,4
20-49 (da)	Row %	7,2	9,4	0,5	5,1	74,6	0,7	1,0	1,4	100
	Col. %	27,8	26,0	8,3	17,8	26,6	21,4	19,0	17,6	25,4
50-99 (da)	Row %	7,6	7,6	1,1	3,0	77,2	0,8	1,1	1,5	100
	Col. %	18,5	13,3	12,5	6,8	17,5	14,3	14,3	11,8	16,1
100-199 (da)	Row %	5,2	7,8	2,0	2,0	80,4	1,3	-	1,3	100
	Col. %	7,4	8,0	12,5	2,5	10,6	14,3	-	5,9	9,4
200 (da) +	Row %	1,4	8,2	-	5,5	83,6	-	-	1,4	100
	Col. %	0,9	4,0	-	3,4	5,2	-	-	2,9	4,5
Total	Row %	6,6	9,2	1,5	7,2	71,2	0,9	1,3	2,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (not.sig)										
<5 (da)	Row %	29,4	21,4	4,8	7,9	6,3	6,3	11,9	11,9	100
	Col. %	42,0	37,5	85,7	38,5	61,5	29,6	51,7	45,5	42,7
5-9 (da)	Row %	36,2	25,5		2,1	6,4	10,6	8,5	10,6	100
	Col. %	19,3	16,7		3,8	23,1	18,5	13,8	15,2	15,9
10-19 (da)	Row %	30,8	25,0	1,9	9,6	1,9	13,5	7,7	9,6	100
	Col. %	18,2	18,1	14,3	19,2	7,7	25,9	13,8	15,2	17,6
20-49 (da)	Row %	23,9	28,3	-	13,0	-	13,0	10,9	10,9	100
	Col. %	12,5	18,1	-	23,1	-	22,2	17,2	15,2	15,6
50-99 (da)	Row %	31,3	31,3	-	18,8	-	6,3	-	12,5	100
	Col. %	5,7	6,9	-	11,5	-	3,7	-	6,1	5,4

100-199 (da)	Row %	20,0	40,0	-		-	-	20,0	20,0	100
	Col. %	1,1	2,8	-		-	-	3,4	3,0	1,7
200 (da) +	Row %	33,3	-	-	33,3	33,3	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	1,1	-	-	3,8	7,7	-	-	-	1,0
Total	Row %	29,8	24,4	2,4	8,8	4,4	9,2	9,8	11,2	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	13,7	15,5	4,1	10,8	39,9	3,2	5,8	7,0	100
	Col. %	24,0	23,9	45,2	25,7	11,7	26,8	40,0	35,8	17,8
5-9 (da)	Row %	12,0	13,5	1,1	10,2	52,6	2,2	3,6	4,7	100
	Col. %	16,8	16,7	9,7	19,4	12,3	14,6	20,0	19,4	14,2
10-19 (da)	Row %	11,6	10,4	1,8	9,8	58,6	3,0	2,1	2,7	100
	Col. %	19,9	15,8	19,4	22,9	16,8	24,4	14,0	13,4	17,4
20-49 (da)	Row %	8,9	11,3	0,4	5,9	67,2	2,0	2,0	2,4	100
	Col. %	20,9	23,4	6,5	18,8	26,3	22,0	18,0	16,4	23,9
50-99 (da)	Row %	9,0	9,0	1,1	3,9	72,8	1,1	1,1	2,2	100
	Col. %	12,8	11,3	9,7	7,6	17,3	7,3	6,0	9,0	14,5
100-199 (da)	Row %	5,7	8,9	1,9	1,9	77,8	1,3	0,6	1,9	100
	Col. %	4,6	6,3	9,7	2,1	10,5	4,9	2,0	4,5	8,2
200 (da) +	Row %	2,6	7,9	-	6,6	81,6	-	-	1,3	100
	Col. %	1,0	2,7	-	3,5	5,3	-	-	1,5	3,9
Total	Row %	10,2	11,5	1,6	7,5	61,0	2,1	2,6	3,5	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence.

Table 17.3

Percent Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by the size of Land Owned and the Social Class Location of the Households in 2010

Households by the size of land owned	N and %	Social Class Location of the Households								Total
		Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII	
Farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	-	4,2	3,5	3,5	88,8	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	25,0	35,7	15,6	12,9	-	-	-	13,6
5-9 (da)	Row %	-	4,1	1,4	6,9	87,6	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	25,0	14,3	31,3	12,9	-	-	-	13,8
10-19 (da)	Row %	-	2,4	1,5	2,4	93,7	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	20,8	21,4	15,6	19,6	-	-	-	19,5
20-49 (da)	Row %	-	2,1	1,1	1,4	95,4	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	25,0	21,4	12,5	27,7	-	-	-	27,1
50-99 (da)	Row %	-	0,6		2,4	97,0	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	4,2		12,5	16,2	-	-	-	15,6
100-199 (da)	Row %	-			2,8	97,2	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-			6,3	7,1	-	-	-	6,9
200 (da) +	Row %	-		2,7	5,4	91,9	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-		7,1	6,3	3,5	-	-	-	3,5
Total	Row %	-	2,3	1,3	3,0	93,3	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	100	100	100	100	-	-	-	100
Non-farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	27,8	18,1	2,8	13,7	16,1	5,0	8,5	8,1	100
	Col. %	29,0	28,5	28,6	38,1	25,2	32,9	42,2	40,6	30,9
5-9 (da)	Row %	30,6	17,1	3,2	13,9	20,3	4,2	5,2	5,5	100
	Col. %	19,7	16,6	20,4	23,8	19,6	17,1	15,7	16,8	19,0
10-19 (da)	Row %	34,0	20,2	3,4	8,0	19,0	4,3	5,5	5,5	100
	Col. %	23,0	20,7	22,4	14,4	19,3	18,4	17,6	17,8	20,0
20-49 (da)	Row %	27,1	19,8	2,8	10,1	22,6	4,9	5,6	7,3	100
	Col. %	16,1	17,9	16,3	16,0	20,2	18,4	15,7	20,8	17,6
50-99 (da)	Row %	33,1	20,3	1,7	7,6	23,7	5,1	5,1	3,4	100
	Col. %	8,1	7,5	4,1	5,0	8,7	7,9	5,9	4,0	7,2

100-199 (da)	Row %	32,7	25,0	3,8	1,9	26,9	5,8	3,8	-	100
	Col. %	3,5	4,1	4,1	0,6	4,3	3,9	2,0	-	3,2
200 (da) +	Row %	8,6	42,9	5,7	11,4	25,7	2,9	2,9	-	100
	Col. %	0,6	4,7	4,1	2,2	2,8	1,3	1,0	-	2,1
Total	Row %	29,6	19,5	3,0	11,1	19,7	4,7	6,2	6,2	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	21,6	15,0	2,9	11,4	32,1	3,9	6,6	6,3	100
	Col. %	29,0	28,3	30,2	34,7	16,0	32,9	42,2	40,6	24,1
5-9 (da)	Row %	20,9	13,0	2,6	11,6	41,8	2,9	3,5	3,7	100
	Col. %	19,7	17,2	19,0	24,9	14,6	17,1	15,7	16,8	17,0
10-19 (da)	Row %	20,9	13,4	2,6	5,8	47,8	2,6	3,4	3,4	100
	Col. %	23,0	20,7	22,2	14,6	19,5	18,4	17,6	17,8	19,8
20-49 (da)	Row %	13,6	11,0	1,9	5,8	58,8	2,4	2,8	3,7	100
	Col. %	16,1	18,4	17,5	15,5	25,9	18,4	15,7	20,8	21,3
50-99 (da)	Row %	13,8	8,9	0,7	4,6	66,3	2,1	2,1	1,4	100
	Col. %	8,1	7,3	3,2	6,1	14,4	7,9	5,9	4,0	10,5
100-199 (da)	Row %	13,7	10,5	1,6	2,4	67,7	2,4	1,6	-	100
	Col. %	3,5	3,8	3,2	1,4	6,4	3,9	2,0	-	4,6
200 (da) +	Row %	4,2	20,8	4,2	8,3	59,7	1,4	1,4	-	100
	Col. %	0,6	4,4	4,8	2,8	3,3	1,3	1,0	-	2,7
Total	Row %	18,0	12,8	2,3	7,9	48,5	2,8	3,8	3,8	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence.

Table 17.4

Percent Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by the Size of Land Owned and the Social Class Location of the Households in 2015

Households by the size of land owned	N and %	Social Class Location of the Households								Total
		Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII	
Farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	0,7	5,4	2,2	11,8	69,2	3,9	2,9	3,9	100
	Col. %	28,6	22,1	28,6	22,0	16,7	40,7	18,2	34,4	18,6
5-9 (da)	Row %	0,9	1,8	0,9	16,6	71,7	2,7	3,6	1,8	100
	Col. %	28,6	5,9	9,5	24,7	13,9	22,2	18,2	12,5	14,8
10-19 (da)	Row %	-	4,1	1,4	11,3	77,5	1,7	2,4	1,7	100
	Col. %	-	17,6	19,0	22,0	19,7	18,5	15,9	15,6	19,5
20-49 (da)	Row %	0,6	5,7	0,8	6,2	81,6	0,3	3,1	1,7	100
	Col. %	28,6	29,4	14,3	14,7	24,9	3,7	25,0	18,8	23,5
50-99 (da)	Row %	0,5	4,4	1,0	9,3	79,4	0,5	2,9	2,0	100
	Col. %	14,3	13,2	9,5	12,7	14,0	3,7	13,6	12,5	13,6
100-199 (da)	Row %	-	2,9	1,9	2,9	87,4	1,0	2,9	1,0	100
	Col. %	-	4,4	9,5	2,0	7,8	3,7	6,8	3,1	6,8
200 (da) +	Row %	-	10,2	4,1	6,1	71,4	4,1	2,0	2,0	100
	Col. %	-	7,4	9,5	2,0	3,0	7,4	2,3	3,1	3,3
Total	Row %	0,5	4,5	1,4	10,0	76,8	1,8	2,9	2,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	30,9	13,8	4,9	17,2	11,4	6,7	9,1	5,9	100
	Col. %	33,2	50,5	54,8	45,8	30,3	54,8	55,8	45,6	40,6
5-9 (da)	Row %	41,2	10,5	3,4	17,0	11,6	3,4	6,5	6,5	100
	Col. %	18,8	16,5	16,1	19,2	13,0	11,9	16,8	21,1	17,3
10-19 (da)	Row %	41,2	10,1	3,0	12,4	16,5	4,9	6,4	5,6	100
	Col. %	17,1	14,4	12,9	12,7	16,9	15,5	15,0	16,7	15,7
20-49 (da)	Row %	45,5	7,3	2,4	12,2	21,7	3,1	4,9	2,8	100
	Col. %	20,2	11,2	11,3	13,5	23,8	10,7	12,4	8,9	16,8
50-99 (da)	Row %	42,6	7,9	2,0	16,8	23,8	3,0	-	4,0	100
	Col. %	6,7	4,3	3,2	6,5	9,2	3,6	-	4,4	5,9

100-199 (da)	Row %	41,9	9,3	2,3	7,0	25,6	7,0	-	7,0	100
	Col. %	2,8	2,1	1,6	1,2	4,2	3,6	-	3,3	2,5
200 (da) +	Row %	36,8	10,5	-	15,8	36,8	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	1,1	1,1	-	1,2	2,7	-	-	-	1,1
Total	Row %	37,8	11,1	3,6	15,3	15,4	4,9	6,6	5,3	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	22,2	11,4	4,1	15,7	28,1	5,9	7,3	5,4	100
	Col. %	33,1	43,0	48,2	37,1	19,2	51,4	45,2	42,6	30,2
5-9 (da)	Row %	23,8	6,8	2,3	16,8	37,5	3,1	5,2	4,4	100
	Col. %	19,0	13,7	14,5	21,2	13,7	14,4	17,2	18,9	16,1
10-19 (da)	Row %	19,6	7,0	2,1	11,8	48,4	3,2	4,3	3,6	100
	Col. %	16,9	15,2	14,5	16,1	19,1	16,2	15,3	16,4	17,5
20-49 (da)	Row %	20,7	6,4	1,6	8,9	54,8	1,6	3,9	2,2	100
	Col. %	20,3	16,0	12,0	13,9	24,7	9,0	15,9	11,5	19,9
50-99 (da)	Row %	14,4	5,6	1,3	11,8	61,0	1,3	2,0	2,6	100
	Col. %	6,8	6,6	4,8	8,8	13,1	3,6	3,8	6,6	9,5
100-199 (da)	Row %	12,3	4,8	2,1	4,1	69,2	2,7	2,1	2,7	100
	Col. %	2,8	2,7	3,6	1,5	7,1	3,6	1,9	3,3	4,6
200 (da) +	Row %	10,3	10,3	2,9	8,8	61,8	2,9	1,5	1,5	100
	Col. %	1,1	2,7	2,4	1,5	3,0	1,8	0,6	0,8	2,1
Total	Row %	20,3	8,0	2,6	12,8	44,2	3,5	4,9	3,8	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence.

Table 17.5

Percent Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by the Size of Land Owned and the Social Class Location of the Households in 2017

Households by the size of land owned	N and %	Social Class Location of the Households								Total
		Class 0	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII	
Farming (not.sig)										
<5 (da)	Row %	1,7	6,2	1,7	9,9	75,3	1,0	1,7	2,4	100
	Col. %	55,6	16,2	13,5	19,5	15,6	16,7	23,8	21,2	16,4
5-9 (da)	Row %	-	5,5	3,6	8,4	75,3	1,1	2,2	4,0	100
	Col. %	-	13,5	27,0	15,4	14,7	16,7	28,6	33,3	15,4
10-19 (da)	Row %	0,3	6,8	2,1	9,4	77,4	1,8	1,3	0,8	100
	Col. %	11,1	23,4	21,6	24,2	21,0	38,9	23,8	9,1	21,4
20-49 (da)	Row %	0,4	5,8	1,5	6,4	82,4	0,4	0,9	2,1	100
	Col. %	22,2	24,3	18,9	20,1	27,4	11,1	19,0	30,3	26,2
50-99 (da)	Row %	0,4	5,9	1,7	11,0	78,5	1,3	0,4	0,8	100
	Col. %	11,1	12,6	10,8	17,4	13,2	16,7	4,8	6,1	13,3
100-199 (da)	Row %	-	7,1	3,5	4,7	84,7	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	5,4	8,1	2,7	5,1	-	-	-	4,8
200 (da) +	Row %	-	10,6		2,1	87,2	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	-	4,5		0,7	2,9	-	-	-	2,6
Total	Row %	0,5	6,2	2,1	8,4	78,8	1,0	1,2	1,8	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	42,3	11,3	5,2	15,1	8,7	3,9	7,1	6,5	100
	Col. %	37,2	39,4	53,7	50,0	51,7	45,0	59,8	45,9	42,8
5-9 (da)	Row %	47,5	14,2	4,4	10,8	7,1	4,4	4,7	6,8	100
	Col. %	17,8	21,2	19,4	15,4	18,1	21,7	17,1	20,4	18,3
10-19 (da)	Row %	48,6	12,2	3,9	13,3	7,5	3,5	3,1	7,8	100
	Col. %	15,8	15,7	14,9	16,3	16,4	15,0	9,8	20,4	15,8
20-49 (da)	Row %	61,3	11,5	2,5	9,9	4,5	2,9	3,7	3,7	100
	Col. %	19,0	14,1	9,0	11,5	9,5	11,7	11,0	9,2	15,1
50-99 (da)	Row %	59,8	13,8	2,3	11,5	4,6	3,4	1,1	3,4	100
	Col. %	6,6	6,1	3,0	4,8	3,4	5,0	1,2	3,1	5,4

100-199 (da)	Row %	65,5	20,7	-	-	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	100
	Col. %	2,4	3,0	-	-	0,9	1,7	1,2	1,0	1,8
200 (da) +	Row %	64,3	7,1	-	28,6	-	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	1,1	0,5	-	1,9	-	-	-	-	0,9
Total	Row %	48,6	12,3	4,2	12,9	7,2	3,7	5,1	6,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)										
<5 (da)	Row %	30,2	9,8	4,2	13,5	28,5	3,1	5,5	5,3	100
	Col. %	37,4	31,1	39,4	37,3	18,4	38,5	52,4	39,7	28,9
5-9 (da)	Row %	24,6	10,0	4,0	9,6	40,0	2,8	3,5	5,4	100
	Col. %	17,6	18,4	22,1	15,4	15,0	20,5	19,4	23,7	16,8
10-19 (da)	Row %	19,7	9,0	2,8	11,0	49,4	2,5	2,0	3,6	100
	Col. %	15,7	18,4	17,3	19,6	20,6	20,5	12,6	17,6	18,7
20-49 (da)	Row %	21,3	7,7	1,8	7,6	55,8	1,3	1,8	2,7	100
	Col. %	19,0	17,8	12,5	15,1	26,0	11,5	12,6	14,5	20,9
50-99 (da)	Row %	16,4	8,0	1,9	11,1	58,6	1,9	0,6	1,5	100
	Col. %	6,7	8,4	5,8	10,1	12,5	7,7	1,9	3,8	9,5
100-199 (da)	Row %	16,7	10,5	2,6	3,5	64,0	0,9	0,9	0,9	100
	Col. %	2,4	3,9	2,9	1,1	4,8	1,3	1,0	0,8	3,4
200 (da) +	Row %	14,8	9,8	-	8,2	67,2	-	-	-	100
	Col. %	1,1	1,9	-	1,4	2,7	-	-	-	1,8
Total	Row %	23,4	9,1	3,1	10,5	44,8	2,3	3,0	3,9	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence.

Table 18

The Years in Which Average Area (in da) of Farm Land Owned Per Household and Per Head of the Social Classes are Significantly Different or Not Different from Each Other Among Farming, Non-Farming and All Landowning Households

Households by social class	Area of farm land owned per	Households by social class location						
		Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII
Farming								
Class 0	Hhold	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17
Class I	Hhold	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,*	02,05,10,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,*,15,*	02,05,10,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
Class II	Hhold		_	02,05,10,*,17	02,0510,*,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc, 15,17
	Head		_	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,*,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
Class III	Hhold			_	02,*,10,*,17	nc,05,nc,14,17	nc,05,nc,*,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head			_	02,*,10,*,*	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,*,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
Class IV	Hhold				_	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head				_	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,*,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
Class V	Hhold					_	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head					_	nc,05,nc,15,17	nc,05,nc,15,17
Class VI	Hhold						_	nc,05,nc,15,17
	Head						_	nc,05,nc,15,17
Non-farming		Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class VII
Class 0	Hhold	02,05,*,15,17,	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Head	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,*	02,05,*,15,*
Class I	Hhold	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Head	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17
Class II	Hhold		_	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	*,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17
	Head		_	*,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,*,17	*,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,*15,17
Class III	Hhold			_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Head			_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17

	Hhold				_	02,05,10,*,17	*,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,*,17
Class IV	Head				_	02,05,10,*,17	*,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold					_	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,*,15,17
Class V	Head					_	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold						_	02,05,10,*,17
Class VI	Head						_	*,05,10,*,17
All landowners								
	Hhold	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
Class 0	Head	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,15,17	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,15,17	02,*,10,15,*	02,*,*,15,*
	Hhold	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,*
Class I	Head	_	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold		_	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,*,*	*,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17
Class II	Head		_	*,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,*,*	02,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold			_	*,*,*,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
Class III	Head			_	*,05,*,*,	02,*,10,15,17	*,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold				_	02,*,10,*,*	*,*,10,*,*	02,*,*,*,*
Class IV	Head				_	02,*,10,*,*	*,*,10,*,*	02,*,*,*,*
	Hhold					_	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,*,15,17
Class V	Head					_	02,05,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,17
	Hhold						_	*,05,10,15,17
Class VI	Head						_	*,05,1*,15,17

Notes: (1) Class 0 refers to households which have no member in employment. (2) Each (*) shows the cases of comparisons, starting with the year 2002, in which the differences in the average amount of farm land owned per household and per head are significant at 95 % level of confidence. The two-digit numbers indicate the last two digits of the years in which the differences are not significant at the level set.

Table 19

The Years in which the Differences in the Average Area of Land Owned are Different or not Different Between Identical Classes and Family Types of Farming and Non-Farming Landowning Households

Landowning households by class and family type	Differences observed in the average area of farmland owned	
	Per household	Per head
Households by class		
0.No member in employment	nc,*,nc,15,17	Nc,*,nc,15,17
1.Upper service class	02,*,10,*,*	02,*,10,*,17
2.Lower service class	02,05,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,*
3.Routine non-manual class	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
4.Petty bourgeoisie	02,05,10,*,*	02,05,*,*,*
5.Technicians and supervisors	nc,*,nc,*,17	Nc,*,nc,15,17
6.Skilled manual class	nc,05,nc,*,17	Nc,05,nc,*,*
7.Non-skilled manual class	nc,05,nc,*,17	Nc,05,nc,15,17
All landowners	*,*,*,*,*	02,*,10,*,*
Households by family type		
Nuclear	*,*,10,*,*	02,*,10,*,*
Extended	*,*,*,*,*	*,*,*,*,*
One-adult	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
Other	02,05,10,nc,nc	02,05,10,sc,nc

Table 20

Average Area of Farm Land (in da) Per Household and Per Head Owned by Family Type and the Ratios of the Other Family Types' Average Area Farm Land to that of Nuclear Family Among Farming and Non-Farming Landowner Households

Households by family type	Survey years										Period average	
	2002		2005		2010		2015		2017			
	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head	Per hhold	Per head
Farming												
Nuclear	44,4	14,1	39,7	12,2	38,8	14,2	44,8	16,2	36,0	13,4	40,7	14,0
Extended	55,4	8,6	58,8	10,0	51,9	9,0	52,5	9,1	39,7	7,5	51,6	8,8
One-adult	31,3	16,4	37,7	19,1	29,7	18,0	20,7	16,4	23,5	20,6	28,6	18,1
Other	28,0	14,0	46,3	21,8	27,9	10,2	1,0	1,0			20,6	9,4
Total	47,4	12,4	46,6	11,7	42,2	12,6	46,0	14,2	36,6	12,0	43,8	12,6

Non-farming											0,0	0,0
Nuclear	29,2	10,1	12,9	3,8	37,7	12,0	22,7	8,8	23,5	8,4	25,2	8,6
Extended	31,7	5,1	22,5	4,0	29,9	5,6	27,8	4,8	16,8	4,1	25,7	4,7
One-adult	22,6	15,6	22,9	14,3	18,5	16,3	21,6	18,8	18,5	16,3	20,8	16,3
Other	15,2	7,5	44,7	22,3	45,5	16,5	2,8	1,3	44,3	22,2	30,5	14,0
Total	29,0	9,6	15,9	4,6	34,2	10,9	23,6	9,4	21,6	9,1	24,8	8,7
All landowners											0,0	0,0
Nuclear	37,5	12,3	34,8	10,7	38,1	12,8	33,5	12,5	30,0	11,0	34,8	11,9
Extended	47,9	7,5	55,3	9,4	39,6	7,1	40,7	7,1	32,3	6,4	43,2	7,5
One-adult	26,0	15,9	34,8	18,2	21,0	16,7	21,4	18,4	19,6	17,2	24,6	17,3
Other	20,0	9,9	45,6	22,0	39,5	14,4	2,4	1,2	44,3	22,2	30,4	13,9
Total	39,6	11,2	41,9	10,6	37,3	11,5	34,1	11,7	29,5	10,6	36,5	11,1
Other families vs nuclear fam.												
Farming												
Nuclear	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Extended	124,6	60,7	148,0	81,5	133,7	63,5	117,2	55,9	110,2	56,1	126,8	63,5
One-adult	70,4	115,7	94,8	156,1	76,5	127,2	46,2	101,1	65,2	153,6	70,6	130,7
Other	63,0	99,0	116,5	177,7	72,0	72,1	2,2	6,2	0,0	0,0	50,7	71,0
Total	106,7	87,6	117,5	95,9	108,9	88,7	102,7	87,8	101,5	89,3	107,4	89,9
Non-Farming											0,0	0,0
Nuclear	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Extended	108,4	50,7	175,0	105,7	79,3	46,7	122,5	54,8	71,5	48,2	111,4	61,2
One-adult	77,3	154,8	178,2	376,5	49,2	136,4	95,4	213,7	79,0	193,3	95,8	214,9
Other	52,1	74,3	347,0	587,5	120,7	138,3	12,1	14,7	188,9	262,8	144,2	215,5
Total	99,2	94,9	123,3	122,1	90,8	91,1	104,1	107,0	92,1	108,2	101,9	104,7
All landowners											0,0	0,0
Nuclear	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Extended	127,8	60,9	158,6	87,7	103,9	55,3	121,5	56,6	107,4	58,0	123,8	63,7
One-adult	69,4	129,4	100	169,8	55,1	130,2	63,9	147,6	65,2	155,9	70,7	146,6
Other	53,3	80,8	130,8	205,4	103,7	112,2	7,2	9,9	147,6	200,8	88,5	121,8
Total	105,4	91,0	120,3	99,4	98,0	90,1	101,6	93,8	98,1	96,3	104,7	94,1
Farming vs non-farming hholds											0,0	0,0
Nuclear	152,1	140,1	308,4	321,9	103,0	118,4	197,5	184,3	153,6	159,0	182,9	184,8
Extended	174,8	167,6	260,8	248,1	173,7	161,3	189,0	187,8	236,6	185,2	207,0	190,0
One-adult	138,6	104,7	164,1	133,4	160,2	110,4	95,7	87,2	126,7	126,4	137,0	112,4
Other	184,2	186,7	103,5	97,4	61,4	61,7	36,4	77,4	0,0	0,0	77,1	84,6
Total	163,7	129,3	293,8	252,7	123,4	115,3	194,9	151,3	169,3	131,4	189,0	156,0

Table 21.1

Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Family Type and the Size of Land Owned in the Year of 2002

Household and family type	Count and %	Size of land owned (in da) in 2002							Total
		<5	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	
Farming (not.sig)									
Nuclear	Count	76	68	79	147	86	35	16	507
	Row %	15,0	13,4	15,6	29,0	17,0	6,9	3,2	100
	Col. %	70,4	72,3	61,7	59,5	55,1	52,2	64,0	61,5
Extended	Count	23	21	44	86	63	30	9	276
	Row %	8,3	7,6	15,9	31,2	22,8	10,9	3,3	100
	Col. %	21,3	22,3	34,4	34,8	40,4	44,8	36,0	33,5
One-adult	Count	9	5	4	13	6	2	0	39
	Row %	23,1	12,8	10,3	33,3	15,4	5,1	0,0	100
	Col. %	8,3	5,3	3,1	5,3	3,8	3,0	0,0	4,7
Other	Count	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
	Row %	0,0	0,0	33,3	33,3	33,3	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,0	0,0	0,8	0,4	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,4
Total	Count	108	94	128	247	156	67	25	825
	Row %	13,1	11,4	15,5	29,9	18,9	8,1	3,0	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (not-sig)									
Nuclear	Count	135	80	69	91	25	8	13	421
	Row %	32,1	19,0	16,4	21,6	5,9	1,9	3,1	100
	Col. %	73,8	76,2	56,6	71,1	67,6	44,4	72,2	68,9
Extended	Count	32	16	32	25	10	7	4	126
	Row %	25,4	12,7	25,4	19,8	7,9	5,6	3,2	100
	Col. %	17,5	15,2	26,2	19,5	27,0	38,9	22,2	20,6
One-adult	Count	14	8	20	11	2	3	1	59
	Row %	23,7	13,6	33,9	18,6	3,4	5,1	1,7	100
	Col. %	7,7	7,6	16,4	8,6	5,4	16,7	5,6	9,7

Other	Count	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
	Row %	40,0	20,0	20,0	20,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	1,1	1,0	0,8	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,8
Total	Count	183	105	122	128	37	18	18	611
	Row %	30,0	17,2	20,0	20,9	6,1	2,9	2,9	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)									
Nuclear	Count	211	148	148	238	111	43	29	928
	Row %	22,7	15,9	15,9	25,6	12,0	4,6	3,1	100
	Col. %	72,5	74,4	59,2	63,5	57,5	50,6	67,4	64,6
Extended	Count	55	37	76	111	73	37	13	402
	Row %	13,7	9,2	18,9	27,6	18,2	9,2	3,2	100
	Col. %	18,9	18,6	30,4	29,6	37,8	43,5	30,2	28,0
One-adult	Count	23	13	24	24	8	5	1	98
	Row %	23,5	13,3	24,5	24,5	8,2	5,1	1,0	100
	Col. %	7,9	6,5	9,6	6,4	4,1	5,9	2,3	6,8
Other	Count	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	8
	Row %	25,0	12,5	25,0	25,0	12,5	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,7	0,5	0,8	0,5	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,6
Total	Count	291	199	250	375	193	85	43	1436
	Row %	20,3	13,9	17,4	26,1	13,4	5,9	3,0	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence, (not-sig) not significant

Table 21.2

Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Family Type and the Size of Land Owned in the Year of 2005

Household and family type	Count and %	Size of land owned (in da) in 2005							Total
		<5	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	
Farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	151	146	185	232	139	73	30	956
	Row %	15,8	15,3	19,4	24,3	14,5	7,6	3,1	100
	Col. %	69,6	64,3	65,1	56,0	52,9	47,7	41,1	58,6
Extended	Count	46	74	89	164	111	75	40	599
	Row %	7,7	12,4	14,9	27,4	18,5	12,5	6,7	100
	Col. %	21,2	32,6	31,3	39,6	42,2	49,0	54,8	36,7
One-adult	Count	18	7	10	17	13	4	3	72
	Row %	25,0	9,7	13,9	23,6	18,1	5,6	4,2	100
	Col. %	8,3	3,1	3,5	4,1	4,9	2,6	4,1	4,4
Other	Count	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	4
	Row %	50,0	0,0	0,0	25,0	0,0	25,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,9	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,7	0,0	0,2
Total	Count	217	227	284	414	263	153	73	1631
	Row %	13,3	13,9	17,4	25,4	16,1	9,4	4,5	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	96	35	39	29	9	2	1	211
	Row %	45,5	16,6	18,5	13,7	4,3	0,9	0,5	100
	Col. %	76,2	74,5	75,0	63,0	56,3	40,0	33,3	71,5
Extended	Count	27	6	10	12	5	3	1	64
	Row %	42,2	9,4	15,6	18,8	7,8	4,7	1,6	100
	Col. %	21,4	12,8	19,2	26,1	31,3	60,0	33,3	21,7
One-adult	Count	3	6	3	4	0	0	1	17
	Row %	17,6	35,3	17,6	23,5	0,0	0,0	5,9	100
	Col. %	2,4	12,8	5,8	8,7	0,0	0,0	33,3	5,8

Other	Count	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
	Row %	0,0	0,0	0,0	33,3	66,7	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	12,5	0,0	0,0	1,0
Total	Count	126	47	52	46	16	5	3	295
	Row %	42,7	15,9	17,6	15,6	5,4	1,7	1,0	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)									
Nuclear	Count	247	181	224	261	148	75	31	1167
	Row %	21,2	15,5	19,2	22,4	12,7	6,4	2,7	100
	Col. %	72,0	66,1	66,7	56,7	53,0	47,5	40,8	60,6
Extended	Count	73	80	99	176	116	78	41	663
	Row %	11,0	12,1	14,9	26,5	17,5	11,8	6,2	100
	Col. %	21,3	29,2	29,5	38,3	41,6	49,4	53,9	34,4
One-adult	Count	21	13	13	21	13	4	4	89
	Row %	23,6	14,6	14,6	23,6	14,6	4,5	4,5	100
	Col. %	6,1	4,7	3,9	4,6	4,7	2,5	5,3	4,6
Other	Count	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	7
	Row %	28,6	0,0	0,0	28,6	28,6	14,3	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,7	0,6	0,0	0,4
Total	Count	343	274	336	460	279	158	76	1926
	Row %	17,8	14,2	17,4	23,9	14,5	8,2	3,9	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence, (not-sig) not significant

Table 21.3

Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Family Type and the Size of Land Owned in the Year of 2010

Household and family type	Count and %	Size of land owned (in da) in 2010							Total
		<5	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	
Farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	97	102	126	177	88	31	21	642
	Row %	15,1	15,9	19,6	27,6	13,7	4,8	3,3	100
	Col. %	67,8	70,3	61,5	62,1	53,7	43,1	56,8	61,1
Extended	Count	28	33	68	87	65	36	16	333
	Row %	8,4	9,9	20,4	26,1	19,5	10,8	4,8	100
	Col. %	19,6	22,8	33,2	30,5	39,6	50,0	43,2	31,7
One-adult	Count	9	5	6	13	7	3	0	43
	Row %	20,9	11,6	14,0	30,2	16,3	7,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	6,3	3,4	2,9	4,6	4,3	4,2	0,0	4,1
Other	Count	9	5	5	8	4	2	0	33
	Row %	27,3	15,2	15,2	24,2	12,1	6,1	0,0	100
	Col. %	6,3	3,4	2,4	2,8	2,4	2,8	0,0	3,1
Total	Count	143	145	205	285	164	72	37	1051
	Row %	13,6	13,8	19,5	27,1	15,6	6,9	3,5	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	326	191	203	168	63	24	23	998
	Row %	32,7	19,1	20,3	16,8	6,3	2,4	2,3	100
	Col. %	64,7	61,6	62,3	58,3	53,4	46,2	65,7	61,1
Extended	Count	105	75	78	92	40	22	9	421
	Row %	24,9	17,8	18,5	21,9	9,5	5,2	2,1	100
	Col. %	20,8	24,2	23,9	31,9	33,9	42,3	25,7	25,8
One-adult	Count	55	30	32	17	11	3	2	150
	Row %	36,7	20,0	21,3	11,3	7,3	2,0	1,3	100
	Col. %	10,9	9,7	9,8	5,9	9,3	5,8	5,7	9,2

Other	Count	18	14	13	11	4	3	1	64
	Row %	28,1	21,9	20,3	17,2	6,3	4,7	1,6	100
	Col. %	3,6	4,5	4,0	3,8	3,4	5,8	2,9	3,9
Total	Count	504	310	326	288	118	52	35	1633
	Row %	30,9	19,0	20,0	17,6	7,2	3,2	2,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)									
Nuclear	Count	423	293	329	345	151	55	44	1640
	Row %	25,8	17,9	20,1	21,0	9,2	3,4	2,7	100
	Col. %	65,4	64,4	62,0	60,2	53,5	44,4	61,1	61,1
Extended	Count	133	108	146	179	105	58	25	754
	Row %	17,6	14,3	19,4	23,7	13,9	7,7	3,3	100
	Col. %	20,6	23,7	27,5	31,2	37,2	46,8	34,7	28,1
One-adult	Count	64	35	38	30	18	6	2	193
	Row %	33,2	18,1	19,7	15,5	9,3	3,1	1,0	100
	Col. %	9,9	7,7	7,2	5,2	6,4	4,8	2,8	7,2
Other	Count	27	19	18	19	8	5	1	97
	Row %	27,8	19,6	18,6	19,6	8,2	5,2	1,0	100
	Col. %	4,2	4,2	3,4	3,3	2,8	4,0	1,4	3,6
Total	Count	647	455	531	573	282	124	72	2684
	Row %	24,1	17,0	19,8	21,3	10,5	4,6	2,7	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence, (not-sig) not significant

Table 21.4

Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Family Type and the Size of Land Owned in the Year of 2015

Household and family type	Count and %	Size of land owned (in da) in 2015							Total
		<5	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	
Farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	212	171	202	221	134	67	26	1033
	Row %	20,5	16,6	19,6	21,4	13,0	6,5	2,5	100
	Col. %	76,0	76,7	68,9	62,6	65,7	65,0	53,1	68,7
Extended	Count	51	40	79	121	66	34	23	414
	Row %	12,3	9,7	19,1	29,2	15,9	8,2	5,6	100
	Col. %	18,3	17,9	27,0	34,3	32,4	33,0	46,9	27,5
One-adult	Count	15	12	12	11	4	2	0	56
	Row %	26,8	21,4	21,4	19,6	7,1	3,6	0,0	100
	Col. %	5,4	5,4	4,1	3,1	2,0	1,9	0,0	3,7
Other	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Row %	100	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1
Total	Count	279	223	293	353	204	103	49	1504
	Row %	18,6	14,8	19,5	23,5	13,6	6,8	3,3	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (non-sig)									
Nuclear	Count	450	192	166	168	54	27	9	1066
	Row %	42,2	18,0	15,6	15,8	5,1	2,5	0,8	100
	Col. %	65,2	65,3	62,2	58,7	53,5	62,8	47,4	62,7
Extended	Count	133	56	60	76	31	11	7	374
	Row %	35,6	15,0	16,0	20,3	8,3	2,9	1,9	100
	Col. %	19,3	19,0	22,5	26,6	30,7	25,6	36,8	22,0
One-adult	Count	103	46	41	42	16	5	3	256
	Row %	40,2	18,0	16,0	16,4	6,3	2,0	1,2	100
	Col. %	14,9	15,6	15,4	14,7	15,8	11,6	15,8	15,1

Other	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Row %	100	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
Total	Count	690	294	267	286	101	43	19	1700
	Row %	40,6	17,3	15,7	16,8	5,9	2,5	1,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)									
Nuclear	Count	662	363	368	389	188	94	35	2099
	Row %	31,5	17,3	17,5	18,5	9,0	4,5	1,7	100
	Col. %	68,3	70,2	65,7	60,9	61,6	64,4	51,5	65,5
Extended	Count	184	96	139	197	97	45	30	788
	Row %	23,4	12,2	17,6	25,0	12,3	5,7	3,8	100
	Col. %	19,0	18,6	24,8	30,8	31,8	30,8	44,1	24,6
One-adult	Count	118	58	53	53	20	7	3	312
	Row %	37,8	18,6	17,0	17,0	6,4	2,2	1,0	100
	Col. %	12,2	11,2	9,5	8,3	6,6	4,8	4,4	9,7
Other	Count	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Row %	100	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,2
Total	Count	969	517	560	639	305	146	68	3204
	Row %	30,2	16,1	17,5	19,9	9,5	4,6	2,1	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence, (not-sig) not significant

Table 21.5

Distribution of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners by Family Type and the size of Land Owned in the Year of 2017

Household and family type	Count and %	Size of land owned (in da) in 2017							Total
		<5	5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-199	200 +	
Farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	216	179	254	297	159	48	33	1186
	Row %	18,2	15,1	21,4	25,0	13,4	4,0	2,8	100
	Col. %	74,0	65,1	66,7	63,6	67,1	56,5	70,2	66,5
Extended	Count	60	82	108	152	73	37	12	524
	Row %	11,5	15,6	20,6	29,0	13,9	7,1	2,3	100
	Col. %	20,5	29,8	28,3	32,5	30,8	43,5	25,5	29,4
One-adult	Count	16	14	19	18	5	0	2	74
	Row %	21,6	18,9	25,7	24,3	6,8	0,0	2,7	100
	Col. %	5,5	5,1	5,0	3,9	2,1	0,0	4,3	4,1
Other	Count	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Row %	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Col. %	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	Count	292	275	381	467	237	85	47	1784
	Row %	16,4	15,4	21,4	26,2	13,3	4,8	2,6	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Non-farming (*)									
Nuclear	Count	465	208	165	160	54	21	10	1083
	Row %	42,9	19,2	15,2	14,8	5,0	1,9	0,9	100
	Col. %	67,3	70,5	64,7	65,8	62,1	72,4	71,4	67,1
Extended	Count	111	31	48	38	17	5	2	252
	Row %	44,0	12,3	19,0	15,1	6,7	2,0	0,8	100
	Col. %	16,1	10,5	18,8	15,6	19,5	17,2	14,3	15,6
One-adult	Count	115	55	41	45	16	2	2	276
	Row %	41,7	19,9	14,9	16,3	5,8	0,7	0,7	100
	Col. %	16,6	18,6	16,1	18,5	18,4	6,9	14,3	17,1

Other	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
	Row %	0,0	33,3	33,3	0,0	0,0	33,3	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,0	0,3	0,4	0,0	0,0	3,4	0,0	0,2
Total	Count	691	295	255	243	87	29	14	1614
	Row %	42,8	18,3	15,8	15,1	5,4	1,8	0,9	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
All landowners (*)									
Nuclear	Count	681	387	419	457	213	69	43	2269
	Row %	30,0	17,1	18,5	20,1	9,4	3,0	1,9	100
	Col. %	69,3	67,9	65,9	64,4	65,7	60,5	70,5	66,8
Extended	Count	171	113	156	190	90	42	14	776
	Row %	22,0	14,6	20,1	24,5	11,6	5,4	1,8	100
	Col. %	17,4	19,8	24,5	26,8	27,8	36,8	23,0	22,8
One-adult	Count	131	69	60	63	21	2	4	350
	Row %	37,4	19,7	17,1	18,0	6,0	0,6	1,1	100
	Col. %	13,3	12,1	9,4	8,9	6,5	1,8	6,6	10,3
Other	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
	Row %	0,0	33,3	33,3	0,0	0,0	33,3	0,0	100
	Col. %	0,0	0,2	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,0	0,1
Total	Count	983	570	636	710	324	114	61	3398
	Row %	28,9	16,8	18,7	20,9	9,5	3,4	1,8	100
	Col. %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: (*) Significant at 95% level of confidence, (not-sig) not significant.

Table 22.

The Years in which the Average Area of Farm Land Owned is Significantly Different or not Different Between the Family Types of Farming and Non-Farming Landowners

Households by family type	Area of land per	Family type			
		Nuclear	Extended	One-adult	Other
Farming					
Nuclear	Hhold	-	02,*,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,nc,nc,
	head	-	*,*,*,15,*,	02,*,10,15,17	02,05,10,sc,nc
Extended	Hhold		-	02,*,*,*,17	02,05,*,nc,nc
	head		-	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,sc,nc
One-adult	Hhold			-	02,05,10,nc,nc
	head			-	02,05,10,sc,nc
Non-farming					
Nuclear	Hhold	-	02,*,10,15,17,	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	head	-	02,05,10,15,17	02,*,10,*,*	02,*,10,15,17
Extended	Hhold		-	02,05,*,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	head		-	*,*,*,*,*	02,*,*,15,*
One-adult	Hhold			-	02,05,10,15,17
	head			-	02,05,10,15,17
All landowners					
Nuclear	Hhold	-	02,*,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17	02,05,10,15,17
	head	-	*,05,*,*,*	02,*,10,15,*	02,05,10,15,17
Extended	Hhold		-	*,*,*,*,*	02,05,10,15,17
	head		-	*,*,*,*,*	02,*,*,15,*
One-adult	Hhold			-	02,05,10,15,17
	head			-	02,05,10,15,17