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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

There appears to be a need for information on the type of land ownership in this country, so that lending agencies, tax officials, policy makers, and private enterprisers can make decisions which would be more compatable with general public goals and objectives.

In the latter part of 1957 and early 1958 a survey was made of land ownership in the ten Great Plains states--North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Texas, New Mexico and Oklahoma. The principal purpose of the survey was to determine the personal and legal characteristics of land owners and to reveal trends, if any, taking place in land ownership patterns in the Great Plains.

Purpose of This Study

The survey report ${ }^{1}$ indicated ownership characteristics for states as a whole and for the Great Plains region. The purpose of this report is to analyze the data and to study ownership patterns as they apply to the state of Oklahoma and economic areas within this state. The discussion and analysis in this report are concerned only with the data as they apply to Oklahoma and conclusions drawn here will not be considered as applicable to the other states.

[^0]
## Previous Research in Land Ownership in Oklahoma

The 1957-58 Great Plains survey was the first study of land ownership patterns in Oklahoma in over twenty years. Randall T. Klemme ${ }^{2}$ in 1938-39 made a series of county studies of land ownership to evaluate the influence of corporate ownership on the patterns of land ownership in the State. His study, based on a tax study by the Public Works Administration in 1936, indicated that out of $44,308,006$ total acres in Oklahoma, 84.4 percent was privately owned; 8.6 percent was tax exempt; 4.5 percent was owned by corporations; and 1.8 percent of the land was unclassified as to ownership. According to Klemme, the highest proportion of private ownership occurred in the southwestern cotton section and in the northern and north central cash grain and livestock region of the State.

Tax exempt lands, excluding the land areas of manicipalities, Klemme found could be roughly divided into two groups. The first was land owned by Federal, State, and local governments such as the Wichita National Forests, and Fort Sill Military Reservation, and the Oklahoma School Land Commission holdings. The second group of tax exempt land was Indian tribal land allotted by headright.

The third type of ownership listed by Klemme was that land owned by corporations. The areas ${ }^{3}$ where corporate ownership was greatest were generally those of lower assessed values and smaller tracts. Included in this group of counties were several that had at one time or another

[^1]relatively greater exploitation of mineral resources. The general tendency for this type of ownership to concentrate its holdings in fairly well defined areas suggested the need for further study in land ownership.

Klemme found that several forces were important in determining the nature and extent of Oklahoma land ownership. First, there was the matter of the original patent, or more specifically, whether the land was homesteaded or acquired through Indian allotment of land grants, etc. Secondly, the physical environment limited the use for which the lands may be employed. The third problem related to social and economic characteristics in any locality. To distinguish cause and effect in these major forces was practically impossible, but the direct and indirect effects that these forces had upon the nature and distribution of land ownership were observed.

During the depression in the 1930 's, mortgage and loan institutions were repossessing farms and ranches and could not or did not resell the properties. Researchers and the public alike were becoming alarmed at the increasing amount of corporate holdings. Klemme's study was seeking to discover the influence and extent of corporate holdings on land owsership in Oklahoma.

## Scope of This Study

It was not until 1957 and 1958 that any further study was given to the question of ownership in Oklahoma. Late in 1957, the Agricsltural Research Service began a survey of land ownership in the Great Plains to study the characteristics of land ownership in the area. The data for Oklahoma were taken from the information compiled for the survey, and will be analyzed by type and legal characteristics of owners, personal
characteristics of owners, and methods of acquisition and holding of land. The description and analysis of the relationship begins in Chapter III. Here will be discussed the types of owners, the distribution of owners by legal forms of ownership, and the distribution of cropland and grazing land by ownership type, A brief discussion on average size of ownershlp units and the distribution of surface and subsurface rights in Oklahoma is also included.

Chapter IV will be concerned primarily with the personal charactero istics of land ownexs. These characteristics are the occupational purw suits, the entrepreneurial status, and the age of the owners. The relam tive distribution of each of the personal characteristics of owners will be analyzed for oklahoma in general; then the differences in the distribus tion of ownership by economic areas will be discussed. The distribution of the amount of land and its value will be compared with the distribution of owners.

Chapter $V$ is an analysis of methods of acquisition and holding distributed by entrepreneurial status of the owners. Methods of acquisition and methods of holding will be discussed in terms of the state as a whole: then, differences between areas will be pointed out.

The final chapter will sumaxize the findings and draw any wayeanted conclusions.

## CHAPTER II

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

## Sampling and Survey Methods

One problem of the Great Plains survey was to design a procedure for sampling ownership in the ten Great Plains states which would provide estimates of several items (characteristics) reasonably accurate at the state level. This problem was met by taking a stratified random sample of 172 of the 824 counties in the Great Plains. ${ }^{1}$ Two counties in each of the 81 economic areas in the Great Plains were selected (Figure 1). The method of selection and design of the sample was such that it not only provided geographic dispersion but increased the probability that counties with large numbers of owners would be selected (assuming, of course, that the number of owners was roughly proportional to the number of operators as shown in the 1954 Census of Agriculture).

After the sample counties were obtained, a sample of owners within each of the counties was drawn. Each owner within the sample county had an equal chance of being selected.

The names and addresses of owners of rural land were obtained either from district (usually county) Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation offices or from records of the county clerks, assessors, or registrars of deeds.

[^2]

Figure 1. The Great Plains States Sampled in the Survey, 1958

The steps followed in compiling the list were:

1. The names of all rural landowners owning tracts of 2.5 acres or more were listed.
2. The list was checked to eliminate duplications and to insure that it included all individuals, estates, and partnerships. Partnerships, estates, and corporations were treated as individually owned units.

Thus, the basic list from which the sample(s) of owners was taken contained the names of all owners of 2.5 acres or more of rural land. When a county had an insufficient number of names for a sample, it was combined with an adjacent county or counties and the two or more counties were treated as a unit.

To make reliable estimates for the State it was necessary to obtain 1,800 usable schedules in Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, a 25 percent response was anticipated. ${ }^{2}$ The expected response rate required that out of each of the 20 counties selected in the State, approximately 400 owners were to be sampled.

The total number of owners in a county, as determined by actual count, ${ }^{3}$ was recorded and used later in expanding the sample data for estimation purposes.

Schedules ${ }^{4}$ were mailed by a contractor who had been selected by openbid procedures to edit, code, and process the data obtained on the schedules. The total first mailing was 8,129 schedules in Oklahoma. After a lapse of about two weeks, a follow-up schedule exactly the same as the

[^3]
# first was sent to nonrespondents. From the two mailings, about 2,936 schedules that were returned fell within the following definition of "usable": 

1. For a schedule to be usable it must contain a valid reply to Question 1-a and 1-b. ${ }^{5}$
2. Replies regarding at least four of the following characteristics must be usable: age, sex, legal status, occupation, size of holdings and tenure. At least two of questions 2 through 9 must be usable.

A sample questionnaire for the Great Plains survey is reproduced in the Appendix.

Although it is impossible to judge exactly the separate effects of the two mailings, a review of the day-to-day record of returns indicated that the rate of returns on the second mailing was at least equal to that of the first. A nonrespondent check performed by three successive mailIngs of the questionnaire to a sample of the nonrespondents suggested that as many as four or five mailings in the original survey instead of two mailings would have provided a worthwhile yield. In retrospect, then, it appeared that a smaller sample with more mallings would have been more efficient. Contrary to what might be expected, manifestations of annoyance tended to decrease rather than increase with successive mailings.

Neither the Census nor any other enumeration gives the universe of land owners. Estimates of owners and their holdings in the Great Plains states were obtained by expanding the sample data. The two-stage sample with counties as primary sampling units, which was designated for economy in collection of names and addresses, added to the complexity of the

[^4]```
weighting procedure. }\mp@subsup{}{}{6}\mathrm{ Estimate of State totals were obtained by adding expanded totals for economic areas. \({ }^{7}\)
```


## Nonrespondent Bias

In any survey there is always some uncertainty about the possible bias entering the survey through the procedure used to obtain the information. Did the respondents, in fact, represent the universe of owners? Did the estimates and percentage distributions provide an accurate picture of the ownership pattern? To answer these questions, a nonrespondent bias evaluation was made. ${ }^{8}$ There were no important differences found to exist between respondent and nonrespondent owners in terms of the owner characteristics used in this study.

Problems of the Design
The major limiting factor in a land ownership study is cost. Due to the great variation in types of owners and kinds of ownership, the cost must be apportioned equivalent to the importance of the needed information. Also, processing and tabulation of the data must be limited to relevant and economically feasible trends and relationships. Due to the

[^5]


#### Abstract

high cost involved in counting and tabulating the universe of owners, a sample was drawn to represent the universe. ${ }^{9}$


Nomogram and Its Use
While the percentages shown in this report were calculated from the sample, it is assumed they represent the universe. And, although the percentages were calculated from the sample data, all numerical totals shown are sample data expanded to represent an estimate of the total population. An expansion factor was calculated for each of the counties in the survey. The counties in an economic area were combined and an arithmetic average calculated to represent the expansion factor for the area. By combining the counties in an area one step was left out of the tabulation process. ${ }^{10}$ The sample data expanded by the expansion factor represents the area population. The sum of the area populations resulted in an estimate of the state population of the ownership characteristic in question.

When sample data are used to represent a population, some criterion must be formulated to give the researcher some basis for supporting his decisions concerning the data. Also, data presented as percentage distributions are frequently used in comparing percentages within a total or in comparing percentages from two independent totals. It is desirable to know whether or not a difference between two percentages is due to errors in sampling and in obtaining the data, or whether there is a "real" difference

[^6]between the percentages of the two groups under observation. A set of graphs called nomograms ${ }^{11}$ is included in this atudy to aid in determining whether the difference between two percentages is significant.

The use of theae nomograms provides an approximate measure of the real difference for determining the least significant difference. ${ }^{12}$ A more precise measure wowld require the calculation of the "standard error of the percentage" for each comparison. The only information needed in the graphic method is the two percentages $\left(P_{1}\right.$ and $\left.P_{2}\right)$ and the number of respondents (N) that represent 100 percent. ${ }^{13}$

## Groupings

The groupings used in this analysis of land ownership were established by the Agricultural Research Service. The characteristics covered in the analysis, both owner and land characteristics, are self-explanatory except entrepreneurial status and occupational pursuits of owner growpings. The groupings under entrepreneurial status and occupational pursuits of owner are defined to avoid possible confusion.

Entrepreneurial Status

## Operators:

Full-owners-oThose who own all the land they operate and operate all the land they own.

[^7]Part-owners--Those who operate all the land they own and operate additional land rented from others.
Operator Landlords:
Full-owners--Those who rent to others and operate part of their own land.
Part-owners--Those who rent to and from others in addition to operating part of their own land.
Occupational Pursuits of the Owner

## Nonretired:

Farmersworm and ranch operators who are responsible for the management decisions of their farm.
Howsewives-Women who keep house for their families or themselves and who do not claim another occupation.
Business and professional people--Those who are in business for themselves or are members of trained profession.
Others--Includes skilled and unskilled workers (such as mechanics, factory workers, clerks, and typists) and students.
Retired:
Farmers--Farm and ranch operators who classified themselves as retired.
Nonfarmers-A1l others who classified themselves as retired.

## CHAPTER III

## LEGAL FORM OF OWNERSHIP

The ownership of Oklahoma's farm and ranch land is as varied as the topography of the land itself. Accordingly, the different legal forms of ownership are widely varied. These forms of ownership, individual and nonindividual, will be analyzed and then the relationship between the owner, the amount of land he occupies, and the value of his holdings will be developed. Land use, average size of ownership unit and mineral rights will follow in the given order.

## Individual and Nonindividual Owners

State. --There were approximately $38,369,000$ acres of privately owned farm and ranch land in Oklahoma. These 38 million acres of land were owned by 108 thousand owners of which 0.4 percent was corporate and institutional ownership.(Table 1). The remaining 99.6 percent of farm and ranch owners consisted of individuals and partnerships, ${ }^{1}$ although a substantial number failed to indicate their classification within this category.

Individuals who comprised 99.6 percent of all owners owned 97.3 percent of the privately owned farm and ranch land in the state (Table 1). Consequently the percentage of land held by corporate and institutional

[^8]owners was relatively small in Oklahoma, although it was greater than a proportional share when compared to the number of owners in this category.

TABLE 1. PERGENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FARM AND RANCH LAND OWNERS, AMOUNT AND VALDE OF LAND OWNED, BY LEGAL IORM OF OWNERSHIP, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Type of Owner |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Omers | Iand | Value |
| Single man | 6.1 | 5.8 | 6.1 |
| Single woman | 7.5 | 5.5 | 5.0 |
| Man and wife | 53.6 | 49.6 | 54.9 |
| Partnerships ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.1 | 19.1 | 15.8 |
| Type unknown | 22.1 | 17.3 | 17.4 |
| Agricultural corporation | .2 | 2.1 | .6 |
| Other corporations and <br> institutions | .2 | .6 | .2 |

${ }^{a}$ Included all types of partnerships--single man partnership individeals, single woman partnership individuals, man and wife and partnership of individuals and all other individual partnerships.

Source: Table 2.

Economic Aress. --The predominance of individual ownership extended to all economic areas. Nonindividual owners were relatively unimportant in the State and only two economic areas showed an appreciable amownt of land under this type of ownership. Area 7 a had 12.9 percent of the land owned by nonindividusls and Area 9 had 4.4 percent. In the other areas these percentages ranged from 0 to 2.4 percent of the total land in the area (Table 2 and Appendix Table 4).
table 2. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FARM AND RANGH LAND OWNERS, AMOUNT and value of land owned by legal form of ownership, oklahoma, 1958

| Area | Single |  | Man and Wife | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Partner- } \\ & \text { ships } \end{aligned}$ | Ag. | Other Corp. \& Insti. | Status Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Woman |  |  | Corp. |  |  |
| Percent of Amount of Land |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3.6 | 9.7 | 46.8 | 20.0 | . 5 | . 1 | 19.4 |
| 2 | 7.6 | 10.0 | 46.8 | 14.5 | - | . 1 | 21.0 |
| 3 | 7.5 | 3.8 | 46.8 | 23.4 | - | 2.4 | 16.1 |
| 4 | 7.6 | 5.5 | 57.3 | 9.4 | . 8 | - | 19.4 |
| 5 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 58.5 | 10.9 | . 3 | . 8 | 20.1 |
| 6 | 8.6 | 3.8 | 45.3 | 30.2 | - | - | 12.1 |
| 7a | 7.2 | 1.2 | 47.6 | 21.8 | 12.9 | - | 9.4 |
| 7b | 3.6 | 4.4 | 49.0 | 29.3 | . | - | 13.7 |
| 8a | 4.8 | 2.5 | 43.0 | 23.4 | - | - | 26.1 |
| 8b | 2.5 | . 2 | 51.9 | 7.9 | - | - | 30.2 |
| 9 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 59.1 | 11.4 | - | 4.4 | 15.9 |
| State | 5.8 | 5.5 | 49.6 | 19.1 | 2.1 | . 6 | 17.3 |

Percent of Number of Owners

| 1 | 4.5 | 10.9 | 53.0 | 8.1 | .5 | .3 | 22.7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 9.4 | 10.9 | 47.8 | 10.9 | - | .3 | 20.6 |
| 3 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 58.9 | 8.6 | - | .7 | 21.2 |
| 4 | 5.4 | 7.5 | 60.5 | 8.1 | .3 | - | 18.1 |
| 5 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 54.1 | 10.9 | .3 | .6 | 21.6 |
| 6 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 48.1 | 13.8 | - | - | 25.0 |
| 7a | 7.1 | 7.1 | 50.5 | 12.2 | .5 | - | 22.6 |
| 7b | 5.4 | 6.9 | 58.9 | 9.2 | - | - | 21.5 |
| 8a | 6.3 | 7.0 | 47.2 | 13.5 | - | - | 25.9 |
| 8b | 5.6 | 1.6 | 58.7 | 6.4 | - | - | 27.8 |
| 9 | 7.0 | 5.6 | 58.2 | 8.9 | - | .5 | 19.7 |
| State | 6.1 | 7.5 | 53.6 | 10.1 | .2 | .2 | 22.1 |

Percent of Value of Land owned

| 1 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 60.7 | 10.7 | .3 | .4 | 17.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 49.2 | 13.6 | - | -1 | 22.8 |
| 3 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 55.0 | 18.7 | - | - | 15.4 |
| 4 | 9.9 | 5.7 | 59.3 | 8.0 | .7 | - | 18.4 |
| 5 | 4.0 | 5.2 | 59.5 | 12.4 | .7 | .1 | 18.1 |
| 6 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 43.7 | 36.0 | - | - | 10.3 |
| 7a | 12.3 | 1.6 | 56.9 | 14.8 | 4.0 | - | 10.4 |
| 7b | 6.4 | 2.1 | 48.2 | 26.9 | - | - | 16.4 |
| 8a | 1.5 | 2.5 | 47.0 | 29.3 | - | - | 19.6 |
| 8b | 2.9 | .2 | 52.1 | 9.4 | - | - | 35.4 |
| 9 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 60.0 | 15.4 | - | 2.5 | 12.9 |
| State | 6.1 | 5.0 | 54.9 | 15.8 | .6 | .2 | 17.4 |

In general, the Northeastern and Southeastern Areas of Oklahoma had the larger percentages of nonindividual ownership, and areas in the East Central had no nonindividual ownership units sampled. Central and Western Oklahoma showed a scattering of nonindividual ownership, but with no apparent pattern.

Legal Forms of Individusal Ownership
State. --The legal forms of individual owners were classified as man and wife, single women, single man, individual partnerships and all other individual owners. As one might expect, there was a wide difference in the number in each of the owner groups. In view of the fact that most farms are family farms, a majority of the owners were man and wife. The amount of land owned by the various groups and the value of their holdings were fairly proportional to the number of owners in each group.

More than one-balf (54 percent, Table 1) of all farm and ranch land owners in Oklahoms were married couples. The other groups of individual owners--partnerships (10 percent), single women (eight percent) and single men (six percent)--contributed 24 percent to the total number of owners of farm and ranch land. Twenty-two percent of the individual owners cousld not be classified as to type. ${ }^{2}$

Economic Areas. --There was no discernable pattern between areas in the variations in percentages of the man and wife owners (Table 2). However, Area 4, a cotton and cash grain region, had the highest proporiow

[^9]of married couples ( 60 percent) as owners while Area 8 a had the smallest proportion ( 47 percent) as owners of farm and ranch land in Oklahoma. ${ }^{3}$

While there was some tendency for partnerships to concentrate in North Central and Central Oklahoma, the concentration was not significant and there is nothing to suggest why this tendency prevailed.

The single women owner group was the third largest group of owners constituting about eight percent of all farm and ranch owners. Comparison of the single women ownership group by economic areas in the State showed that a variation from above the average for the State (eight percent) to below the average was evident from Northwest to East Central Oklahoma (Table 2). The cash grain and livestock areas (Areas 1 and 2) in Northwestern Oklahoma each had 11 percent single women ownership compared to about two, five and six percent single women owners in Areas $8 \mathrm{~b}, 3$, and 9, respectively, in Eastern Oklahoma.

Single women owners were found to be somewhat more numerous than single men owners ${ }^{4}$ (Table 2). Single women owners also varied from a larger percentage in the Northwest to a smaller percentage in the East Central areas. The pattern for single men was virtually reversed. That is, ownership by single men showed a larger percentage in the East Central areas and a smaller percentage in the Northwestern areas. It may be that the relatively low farm income in certain areas of the state influenced

[^10]widows to sell their holdings to apply for old age pension whereas in Western areas sufficiently higher incomes could be had by renting out holdings so that there was a smaller incentive to get on old age assistance rolls.

Amount of Land and Value of Holdings
State. --In general there was a proportional relationship between the various types of owners and the amount and the value of the land owned in Oklahoma. Fifty-four percent of all owners were classed as man and wife and they owned 50 percent of the land and 55 percent of its value. Single men in Oklahoma constituted about six percent of all owners and these owners owned about six percent of all the land and about the same amount of the total value of the farm and ranch land.

Ten percent of all owners were individual partnerships. These various individual partnerships owned 19 percent of the land and 16 percent of its value. All other types of owners (about 0.4 percent of the owners), owned 2.7 percent of the acres and 0.8 percent of its value. This was one of the larger groups of owners owning less than its proportional share of the land and less than a proportional share of its value.

## Average Size of Ownership Unit

State. --According to data in the Census of Agriculture, the average size of the farm unit in Oklahoma has been increasing over the past 25 years. In 1950 the average farm unit was 219 acres, 300 acres in 1955, and 372 acres in 1960. The data from the 1958 ownership survey showed that the average size of ownership unit was 359 acres (Table 3), a figure which would appear to correspond well with what might have been expected had a census of farms been taken in 1958.
table 3. AVERAGE SIZE OF UNITS BY ECONOMIC AREA, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | Average | Area | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 544 | 7 a | 571 |
| 2 | 346 | 7 b | 380 |
| 3 | 354 | 8 a | 253 |
| 4 | 278 | 8 b | 163 |
| 5 | 290 | State | 341 |
| 6 | 420 |  | 359 |

Source: Appendix Table 6.

Economic Areas. --The two areas (Area 8a and 8b) in the East Central and Area 4 in the Southwest were the areas with the smallest average size unit. Areas with the largest average size unit showed no particular pattern of ownership.

Average Size Units by Legal Form of Ownership
Legal form of ownership was divided into nine groups for the calculation of average size ownership unit. These groups are listed in Table 4 which includes the average for the State. Since a number of the groups were not included in the sample from individual economic areas, the analysis will be limited to the State as a whole.

State. --Man-wife and partnership of Individuals ${ }^{5}$ owned the largest average individual ownership unit ( 1,131 acres). In general, among individual owners, the various types of partnerships held the largest average size units in Oklahoma. Married couples owned a smaller average size ownership unit ( 342 acres) than the average size for the State in general (359 acres, Table 4). Single women owners possessed the smallest average size unit compared with all other forms of ownership.

[^11]table 4. average size of ownership unit gy legal form OF OWNERSHIP, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Owners | Average <br> (Acres) |  | Average <br> (Acres) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Man-wife and partnership <br> of individuals | 1,131 | Man and wife <br> All other types of <br> owners | 342 |
| Partnership of individusls <br> Single man and partnership <br> of individuals | 495 | Single woman <br> Corporations and <br> institutions | 289 |
| Single woman and partnership <br> of individuals | 460 | 369 | Average for State |

Source: Appendix Table 7.

## Surface and Subsurface Ownership

State. --In the Great Plains states and predominately in Oklahoma it is well known that a considerable amount of separation of surface and subsurface interests exists. However, the amownt of separation shown by the survey was considerably greater than previows estimates had sbowa. Forty-one percent of the owners of farm and ranch land owned both surface and subsurface rights. Surprisingly, ${ }^{6} 54$ percent of the individesi owners in the State reported they held only the surface interests in the laxd. Moreover, only the swrface interests were held in 67 percent of all individually owned acres (Table 5).

Economic Aress. --The number of owners who owned surface rights only by economic area seem to be greater in the Central (Aress 5 and 6) and

[^12]table 5. percentage distribution of owners of farm and ranch land, AND OF LAND OWNED, BY OWNERSHIP OF SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE RIGHTS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

|  | Surface $\delta_{6}$ | Surface |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Area | Subsurface | Only | Uncertain | Unknown |


| Acres |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 39.9 | 53.9 | . 8 | 5.3 |
| 2 | 44.4 | 54.2 | . 8 | . 6 |
| 3 | 43.0 | 53.6 | 2.1 | 1.3 |
| 4 | 39.9 | 58.2 | 1.2 | . 7 |
| 5 | 25.0 | 71.6 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| 6 | 12.7 | 84.3 | 2.8 | . 2 |
| 7 a | 10.7 | 89.0 | . 1 | . 2 |
| 7b | 9.8 | 84.7 | 4.8 | . 7 |
| 8 a | 32.3 | 63.9 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| 8 b | 76.7 | 21.1 | 2.2 | . 0 |
| 9 | 21.7 | 74.1 | 3.9 | . 2 |
| State | 29.7 | 67.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 |

## Owners

| 1 | 43.3 | 50.7 | .8 | 2.5 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 56.3 | 41.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| 3 | 58.9 | 35.8 | 6.0 | 2.8 |
| 4 | 44.6 | 53.0 | 1.5 | .9 |
| 5 | 23.7 | 71.7 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| 6 | 15.8 | 81.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 7 a | 25.9 | 70.3 | .9 | 2.8 |
| 7 b | 26.2 | 60.0 | 12.3 | 1.5 |
| 8 a | 50.7 | 45.5 | 1.7 |  |
| 8 b | 74.6 | 17.5 | 7.9 | .0 |
| 9 | 37.1 | 50.7 | 11.3 | .9 |
| State | 41.3 | 53.5 | 3.5 | 1.7 |

South Central (Areas 7a and 7b) areas of Oklahoma compared to Northeastern areas (Areas 3, 8a, and 8b) where a greater number of owners owned both surface and subsurface rights (Table 5 and Figure 3). In one area (Area 7a) the surface interests only was held in nearly 90 percent of the land. But in another area (Area (8b) 75 percent of the land was held in full ownership. Area 8 b is in the Northeast, which has had practically no mineral development.

## Summary

Individual owners owned about 97 percent of the farm and ranch land in Oklahoma. Married couples, the largest group of individual owners, owned land of greater value than the other forms of owners.

Married couples owned a greater proportion of farm and ranch land in the Western areas of $0 k 1 a h o m a$ than in the other areas. In the Central areas which had greater proportions of grazing land than the Western areas, partnerships owned a greater proportion of farm and ranch land.

Partnerships seem to have had the larger ownership units and single women had the smaller units in Oklahoma. The largest number of owners, man and wife owners, owned units smaller than the average for the State.

It appears that the separation of surface and subsurface rights in Oklahoma has increased over the past decade, since a high proportion of the owners do not own the subsurface rights in their land (Figure 3).


## CHAPTER IV

## PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OWNERS

Personal characteristics of the owners in this study refer to the occupational pursuits, entrepreneurial status, and age of farm and ranch land owners. These characteristics are considered as applicable to the 108,333 owners of the $38,369,000$ acres ${ }^{1}$ of farm and ranch land in Oklahoma.

In this chapter the distribution of owners by occupational pursuits will be analyzed first. This will be followed by a discription of the distribution of the land and its value and finally the chapter will describe the distribution of cropland and grazing land, and the average size of ownership unit according to the various personal characteristics of the owners. Entrepreneurial status and age of the owners will be analyzed in the order given, and a summary combining all three personal characteristics will be given at the end of the chapter.

## Occupational Pursuits of Landowners

Oklahoma was one of the last of the states to be settled. Time and economic change have influenced the occupational pursuits of both active and retired farm and ranch owners in Oklahoma. In this study, the active or nonretired owners were classifed by type of primary occupation, i.e., farmers, housewives, business or professional men, and all other occupations. The retired owners groups were classified by farmer and nonfarmer.

[^13]State, --In 1958 about four out of five farm and ranch owners were still actively employed. About 43 percent of the owners were active or nonretired farmers, 11 percent active business and professional owners, six percent were housewives, 18 percent were in all other occupations, and four percent were active, but occupation unknown (Table 6). About five percent of all owners were retired farmers, four percent retired nonfarmers, and about four percent of the retired owners did not state a previous occupation.

TABLE 6. PERGENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, AMOUNT AND VALUE OF LAND OWNED, BY OCCUPATIONAL PURSUITS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

|  | Percent |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Occupation | Owners | Land | Value |
| Nonretired: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Farmer | 42.9 | 48.9 | 54.1 |
| Housewife | 5.7 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| Business and professional | 11.2 | 14.0 | 13.3 |
| Other | 18.4 | 14.3 | 12.8 |
| Unknown | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Subtotal | 82.1 | 84.0 | 86.0 |

Retired:

| Farmer | 5.1 | 4.0 | 4.8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Nonfarmer | 4.2 | 3.7 |  |
| Unknown | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.5 |
| $\quad$ Subtotal | 13.8 | 3.6 | 11.0 |
| Corporation and institution | .4 | 11.0 | .8 |
| No response | 3.7 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 2.7 | 100.0 |

Source: Table 7.

Economic Areas. --The larger proportions of nonretired farmers occurred in the Northwestern and Southern areas of Oklahoma, particularly, ownership
table 7. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, and amount and valde, by occupation of pursuits, oxiahoma, 1958


Percent of Acres

| 1 | 64.8 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | .5 | 1.4 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 59.5 | 9.2 | 2.8 | 7.5 | 1.4 | 9.0 | 2.1 | 4.9 | .1 | 3.4 |
| 3 | 44.7 | 5.2 | 19.8 | 15.4 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.8 | .6 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| 4 | 58.3 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 9.3 | 5.9 | 9.5 | 2.0 | 4.6 | .8 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 38.1 | 4.1 | 13.8 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 8.7 | 3.8 | 15.2 | 1.1 | 2.8 |
| 6 | 42.5 | 2.8 | 20.3 | 21.4 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 4.6 | 1.8 | .- | 3.9 |
| 7 a | 31.4 | 3.7 | 21.4 | 22.3 | .4 | . .7 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 12.9 | 1.02 |
| 7 b | 47.7 | 2.7 | 11.8 | 33.4 | 1.7 | .2 | .8 | .4 | - | 1.5 |
| 8a | 52.7 | 2.7 | 14.8 | 15.7 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 1.9 | - | 3.6 |
| 8b | 36.3 | .4 | 10.6 | 20.8 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 10.5 | 2.6 | - | 5.8 |
| 9 | 42.2 | .7 | 28.7 | 14.9 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 1.2 |
| State | 48.9 | 4.5 | 14.0 | 14.3 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 2.7 |

## Percent of Owners

| 1 | 57.1 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 10.1 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 4.7 | .8 | 2.6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 52.8 | 10.3 | 3.8 | 10.3 | 2.2 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 5.6 | .3 | 4.7 |
| 3 | 29.8 | 3.4 | 15.4 | 28.4 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 5.5 | 3.4 | .7 | 4.1 |
| 4 | 56.9 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 15.1 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 1.5 | 3.6 | .3 | 1.2 |
| 5 | 34.3 | 5.8 | 14.3 | 18.5 | 4.0 | 7.9 | 5.2 | 5.8 | .9 | 3.3 |
| 6 | 37.7 | 6.5 | 10.0 | 20.4 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 5.8 | 5.4 | - | 5.4 |
| 7 a | 34.9 | 6.1 | 17.0 | 18.9 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 6.6 | 2.8 | .5 | 6.6 |
| 7 b | 43.8 | 6.9 | 11.5 | 24.6 | 4.6 | 1.5 | .8 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 |
| 8 a | 41.3 | 5.2 | 11.9 | 23.8 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 3.8 | - | 4.2 |
| 8 b | 34.9 | 2.4 | 9.5 | 23.8 | 4.0 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 6.3 | - | 4.0 |
| 9 | 32.4 | 2.3 | 23.0 | 20.2 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.2 | .5 | 2.3 |
| State | 42.9 | 5.7 | 11.2 | 18.4 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 4.5 | .4 | 3.7 |

Percent of Value of Land owned

| 1 | 63.8 | 3.3 | 10.3 | 6.3 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | .8 | 1.4 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 59.2 | 6.9 | 3.7 | 8.0 | 1.3 | 10.3 | 2.4 | 4.5 | .1 | 3.7 |
| 3 | 45.1 | 2.5 | 22.8 | 17.6 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 4.6 | .8 | - | 1.2 |
| 4 | 64.0 | 4.2 | 7.6 | 9.7 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 2.3 | .7 | .7 |
| 5 | 48.5 | 3.7 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 4.3 | .8 | 1.6 |
| 6 | 40.3 | 1.6 | 19.3 | 19.9 | .6 | 1.3 | 10.5 | 2.1 | - | 4.6 |
| 7 a | 45.8 | 4.4 | 15.2 | 22.5 | .8 | .7 | 5.3 | .6 | 4.0 | .8 |
| 7 b | 55.3 | .8 | 7.4 | 29.9 | 1.7 | .1 | 1.0 | .3 | - | 3.5 |
| 8 a | 55.6 | 1.5 | 15.9 | 15.5 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.0 | .9 | - | 1.9 |
| 8 b | 36.3 | .5 | 9.5 | 24.0 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 17.8 | 5.4 | - | 2.2 |
| 9 | 45.5 | .5 | 31.7 | 10.5 | 1.1 | 3.5 | .5 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| State | 54.1 | 3.6 | 13.3 | 12.8 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 2.5 | .8 | 2.0 |

by business and professional people was significantly high. Ownership by housewives was relatively unimportant in the low income areas of the Southeast and grand prairies of East Central Oklahoma. Ownership by retired owners, both farmers and nonfarmers, was high in areas in which nonagricultural influences, such as metropolitan and recreational developments, were high and in the Ozark Highland area (Table 7).

Amount of Land and Its Value by Occupational Pursuits of Owner
State. --The land the various groups owned and the value of their holdings was nearly proportional to the number of owners. However, there was a tendency for the nonretired owners to own somewhat larger acreages of land of slightly higher value (Table 6).

Economic Areas. --The west and northwest areas of 0 kl ahoma show the highest proportion of active farmers compared with the State as a whole. But in this area the proportion of land and the value of the land they own was more nearly equal to the number of owners than for the State as a whole (Table 7).

Land Use by Occupation of Owner
In 1958 0klahoma had about 38 million acres of farm and ranch land of which 24 million acres was grazing land, 11 million was cropland, and two million was other farm and ranch land (Appendix Table 7). One million acres of farm and ranch land was left unclassified by the owners in the survey.

State, --Active owners who owned 84 percent, or a total of 32.3 milifon acres of the farm and ranch land in Oklahoma owned about 82 percent of the cropland and 86 percent of the grazing land (Table 8 ).

## TABLE 8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CROPLAND, GRAZING LAND and other farm and ranch land by occupational PURSUITS IN OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Occupation | Percent |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cropland | Grazing Land | Other Land |
| Nonretired: | 82.0 | 85.7 | 84.2 |
| Farmer | 53.7 | 48.4 | 28.6 |
| Housewife | 6.4 | 3.2 | 6.2 |
| Business and professional | 8.8 | 15.4 | 32.6 |
| Other occupations | 9.6 | 16.8 | 13.7 |
| Unknown | 3.5 | 1.9 | 3.1 |
| Retired: | 14.7 | 8.8 | 9.8 |
| Farmer | 6.7 | 2.7 | 2.2 |
| Nonfarmer | 3.8 | 3.1 | 5.3 |
| Unknown | 4.2 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Occupation unknown | 2.3 | 1.7 | 4.7 |
| Corporation and institutional | 1.0 | 3.8 | 1.3 |

Source: Table 9.

Retired owners owned about four million acres of farm and ranch 1 and in Oklahoma. They owned about 15 percent of the total cropland and nine percent of the grazing land.

The remaining five percent of the farm and ranch land was owned by corporate and institutional owners and owners who did not give their occupation (Table 8).

The percentage distribution of land by type of use among the various types of owners was not proportional in most cases. Active farmers which comprise about 43 percent of all owners owned 54 percent of the cropland and 48 percent of the grazing land. Active business and professional owners, however, comprising eleven percent of all owners owned less than their proportional share of the cropland and much greater than a proportional
share of land classed as "other", owning nearly one-third of all the land in this category. However, within each the relative proportions of cropland, grazing land and other land owned by this group of owners varied widely with no apparent pattern. There seem to be no explanation for the variation (Table 8).

Economic Areas. --The ownership of cropland and grazing land varies significantly both between areas and between occupational groups. Generally, in areas where metropolitan influence, recreational influence, or influences other than agricultural production were high, active farmers owned a larger percentage of cropland and grazing land. Also in these areas where nonagricultural influences were high, business and professional owners owned greater percentages of other farm and ranch land. For example, 43 percent of the owners who were active farmers in the North Central area (Area 2) owned 57 percent of the cropland, 70 percent of the grazing land, and 35 percent of other farm and ranch land. The 11 percent who were business and professional owners owned nine percent of the cropland, 15 percent of grazing land, and 33 percent of the other farm and ranch land (Table 9). Also, in the scrub-timber area in Central Oklahoma (Area 6), active farmers owned about 35 percent of cropland, 47 percent of the grazing land, and nine percent of other farm and ranch land. Active farmers comprised 38 percent of all owners in this area. In the same area, active business and professional owners ( 10 percent of all owners) owned 17 percent of the cropland, 16 percent of grazing land and 67 percent of other farm and ranch land.

Owners who were classed as housewives owned six percent of the total cropland and three percent of total grazing land (Table 9). Housewives,

TABLE 9. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CROPLAND, GRAZING LAND AND OTHER FARM AND RANCH LAND, BY OCCUPATION OF PURSUITS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Honretired |  |  |  |  | Retired |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Farmer | Housewife | Business or Pro- <br> fessional other | Unknown | Farmer | NonFarmer | Unknown | Pro- fession Unknown | Corp. or Insti. |

Percent of Cropland

| 1 | 57.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 6.8 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 1.7 | .5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 57.0 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 1.3 | 10.1 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 3.7 | .1 |
| 3 | 45.2 | 2.1 | 9.0 | 15.3 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 9.3 | .7 | 1.9 | 4.3 |
| 4 | 59.9 | 5.3 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 6.2 | .6 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 46.0 | 4.3 | 11.0 | 7.3 | 3.0 | 14.3 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| 6 | 35.2 | 5.4 | 16.9 | 23.1 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 8.1 | 4.0 | 2.6 | - |
| 7 a | 43.3 | 4.1 | 18.3 | 19.1 | .5 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| 7 b | 61.4 | .3 | 6.2 | 15.7 | .6 | .3 | .1 | - | 15.5 | - |
| 8 a | 47.3 | 4.3 | 18.2 | 11.6 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 2.9 | - |
| 8 b | 45.9 | .6 | 10.4 | 12.7 | - | 10.2 | 16.2 | 1.1 | 2.8 | - |
| 9 | 65.1 | - | 23.1 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 3.2 | - | 2.0 | .8 | - |
| State | 53.7 | 6.4 | 8.8 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 |

## Percent of Grazing Land

| 1 | 72.5 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 5.5 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.0 | .5 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 70.1 | 5.7 | 2.7 | 6.3 | 1.6 | 6.6 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 2.2 | .1 |
| 3 | 44.6 | 6.9 | 21.7 | 16.7 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.6 | .7 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 57.0 | 2.5 | 10.7 | 12.0 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.1 | .6 |
| 5 | 33.9 | 3.5 | 16.6 | 8.9 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 3.9 | 20.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 6 | 47.4 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 22.8 | .8 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 3.7 | 1.0 |
| 7a | 30.6 | 3.3 | 20.8 | 23.5 | .4 | .6 | 4.6 | 1.0 | .7 | 14.6 |
| 7b | 45.4 | 2.3 | 12.8 | 36.5 | 1.2 | .2 | .8 | .3 | .3 | - |
| 8a | 56.6 | 1.2 | 13.5 | 18.2 | .7 | 1.2 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 4.5 | - |
| 8b | 37.9 | .4 | 11.3 | 19.1 | 9.0 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 2.8 | 4.6 | - |
| 9 | 45.4 | .5 | 25.6 | 15.2 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.3 | .6 | 5.5 |
| State 48.4 | 3.2 | 15.4 | 16.8 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 3.8 |  |

## Percent of Other Farm and Ranch Land

| 1 | 70.5 | 5.3 | 10.9 | 2.2 | .9 | 1.8 | 2.1 | .6 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 35.2 | 34.0 | 1.8 | 12.0 | 2.1 | 6.3 | .2 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| 3 | 26.3 | .6 | 44.8 | 8.0 | 7.4 | .4 | 3.1 | .5 | .1 | 8.7 |
| 4 | 58.7 | 9.6 | 5.4 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 2.0 | . | 5.8 | .3 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 22.1 | 10.8 | 12.9 | 8.4 | 10.4 | 5.9 | 1.6 | 15.3 | 11.9 | .7 |
| 6 | 9.4 | 3.6 | 67.1 | 10.1 | - | 1.4 | .7 | .3 | 7.4 | - |
| 7 a | 11.5 | 10.3 | 43.9 | 6.4 | .1 | 1.8 | 13.5 | 2.4 | 10.1 | - |
| 7 b | 47.3 | 4.2 | 12.9 | 24.8 | 8.1 | - | 1.5 | - | 1.2 | - |
| 8 a | 48.9 | 5.0 | 12.4 | 14.1 | .7 | .4 | 17.1 | .3 | 1.0 | - |
| 8 b | 20.1 | - | 7.4 | 37.4 | .2 | 13.0 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 14.5 | - |
| 9 | 7.1 | 2.7 | 55.7 | 20.2 | 4.6 | .6 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 3.6 | - |
| State | 28.6 | 6.2 | 32.6 | 13.7 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 1.2 |

as was also the case for single women, owned a greater number of acres of farm and ranch land in the western part of the State (Areas 1, 2, and 4). In these same areas, housewives owned a greater number of acres of cropland than grazing land. In the low income areas of Southeastern Oklahoma, a smaller percentage of housewives owned farm and ranch land compared to the other parts of the State.

Retired farmers owned seven percent of the total cropland and three percent of the grazing land in Oklahoma.

Average Size of Ownership Unit by Occupational Pursuits
There is no sure explanation why business and professional people own the largest size units, but there would appear to be some logical reason for the variation in size among the various groups. Many in business and professions in this State buy land for investment purposes and frequently go into the more intensive types of enterprises like beef production. Such production requires larger units. By the same token, active farmers require larger units to operate efficiently with present day technology. In contrast to this, the housewife probably could be expected to have a smaller unit if she were to maintain her status as a housewife. When we note the smallest average size unit as belonging to those active in other nonfarming pursuits, it is not likely that included in the average are many small farms purchased for residence and part-time farms (Table 10).

TABLE 10. AVERAGE SIZE OF OWNERSHIP UNIIT BY OCAMPATTONAL PGRSUITS OF TEE OWNER, OKLAHOMA 1958

| Owner | Average <br> (Acres) | Owner | Average <br> (Acres) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nonretired business \& prof. | 464 | Retired occupation unknown | 290 |
| Nonretired farmer | 421 | Nonretired howsewife | 288 |
| Retired nonfarmer | 307 | Nonretired occupation unknown 233 |  |
| Retired fanmer | 291 | Nonretired other occupation | 285 |
| Wnknown | 220 | State |  |

Source: Appendix Table 7.

## Entreprenewrial Status of Owners

The influence of time and economic change has established all degrees of owner relationships to the land he owns. The entreprenewrial charere teristics of land ownership in this study refers to the relationship of the owner to the land he owns. In some studies this has been referred to es the tenure stetws of farm operators. Here, the owners are grouped into three major classifications-owner operators, owner operator 1 lad lords and nonoperator landlords. The first two mar classifications are further broken dow into two minor classificationsw-full-owner and partowner.

The discribution of owners by entreprenevrial status will be dise cussed first. A description of the distribution of the amount of land and its value conpared with the distribution of owners will then follow Finally, the distrimution of land use and the average size of ownership unit by entreprenearial statis will be described.

State.--In 1953, nearly 80 percent of Oklahomas farm and ranch land owners were farm operators. Forty-two percent operated only their awn land.
while an additional 21 percent not only farmed their own land but rented from others. Some operating owners also could be classed as landlords. Sixteen percent of the owner-operator group rented land to others, and a relatively small number of owners, four percent, rented land to others as well as rented from others (Table 11).

TABLE 11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS, AMOUNT AND VALDE OF LAND OWNED BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNERS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

|  |  | Percent |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entrepreneurial Status | Owners | Acres | Value |
| Owner operator: | 63 | 50 | 55 |
| Full | 42 | 28 | 29 |
| Part | 21 | 22 | 26 |
| Owner operator landlord: | 16 | 33 | 27 |
| Part | 4 | 14 | 10 |
| Full | 12 | 19 | 17 |
| Nonoperator landlord: | 21 | 17 | 18 |

Source: Table 12.

Economic Area. --The variation in the percentage of owners in the fullowner operator group ranges from 21 percent in Area 2, the North Central Red Prairies, to 73 percent in Area 8 b , the East Central Ozark Highlands (Table 12). The relatively lower proportion falling into the full-owner operator category started in Area 2 and increased in Areas 1 and 4 to 28 and 34 percent, respectively. These areas are in Western Oklahoma. Relatively, the largest numbers of full-owner operators were in the low income areas of Southeastern Oklahoma with Area 8 b having 73 percent and 7b and 9 having 61 percent each. Other than the low proportions of owners in this category in the Western part of the State and the high proportions
table 12. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, AMOUNT AND VALUE OF LAND, BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNER, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | Full-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator Landlord | Operator Landlord | Landlord |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of Farm and Ranch Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 23.9 | 25.7 | 7.4 | 21.8 | 21.1 |
| 2 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 16.7 | 21.8 | 27.3 |
| 3 | 25.6 | 36.7 | 10.6 | 16.3 | 10.9 |
| 4 | 30.0 | 26.8 | 6.5 | 14.4 | 22.4 |
| 5 | 23.3 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 15.8 | 21.2 |
| 6 | 24.7 | 29.4 | 9.2 | 18.9 | 17.9 |
| 7a | 22.3 | 17.1 | 26.0 | 28.5 | 6.1 |
| 76 | 34.8 | 9.4 | 37.3 | 10.8 | 7.7 |
| 8a | 38.0 | 17.8 | 4.4 | 22.5 | 17.3 |
| 8b | 70.0 | 12.8 | - | 6.5 | 10.6 |
| 9 | 56.0 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 10.8 | 14.7 |
| State | 28.2 | 21.6 | 13.7 | 19.4 | 17.1 |
| Percent of Owners |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 28.2 | 25.3 | 5.4 | 11.9 | 29.2 |
| 2 | 20.9 | 24.4 | 7.2 | 14.4 | 33.1 |
| 3 | 50.3 | 18.2 | 3.1 | 15.4 | 13.0 |
| 4 | 33.7 | 29.8 | 4.5 | 10.5 | 21.4 |
| 5 | 37.4 | 18.5 | 4.9 | 12.8 | 26.4 |
| 6 | 51.2 | 19.2 | 2.7 | 11.2 | 15.8 |
| 7a | 43.4 | 21.7 | 8.0 | 11.3 | 15.6 |
| 7b | 60.8 | 13.8 | 3.8 | 9.2 | 12.3 |
| 8 a | 43.7 | 22.7 | 2.8 | 12.2 | 18.5 |
| 8b | 73.0 | 11.9 | - | 6.3 | 8.7 |
| 9 | 61.0 | 13.1 | 2.8 | 8.5 | 14.6 |
| State | 41.9 | 21.2 | 4.4 | 11.8 | 20.8 |
| Percent of Value of Farm and Ranch Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24.8 | 32.2 | 8.3 | 12.7 | 22.1 |
| 2 | 19.0 | 20.1 | 12.7 | 18.4 | 29.8 |
| 3 | 32.0 | 35.2 | 6.5 | 15.5 | 10.7 |
| 4 | 25.3 | 31.1 | 7.4 | 15.0 | 21.3 |
| 5 | 31.6 | 22.6 | 7.2 | 19.7 | 18.9 |
| 6 | 26.1 | 28.9 | 6.9 | 19.7 | 18.5 |
| 7a | 24.3 | 25.6 | 19.5 | 25.3 | 5.3 |
| 7b | 42.2 | 9.6 | 30.9 | 12.4 | 4.9 |
| 8 a | 36.4 | 29.5 | 2.8 | 17.8 | 13.5 |
| 8b | 62.0 | 17.9 | - | 7.6 | 12.5 |
| 9 | 54.3 | 11.9 | 7.6 | 15.6 | 10.6 |
| State | 28.6 | 26.3 | 9.8 | 17.2 | 18.1 |

in the Southeastern part of the State. There is no particular pattern in the full-owner operators ownership in the rest of the State. Nonoperating landlords were the second largest group of owners comprising about 21 percent of all owners. This landlord group was relatively larger in the Western two areas (1 and 2) where agricultural production potential and farm incomes were higher.

The third major entrepreneurial group, owner operator landlords, occurred more frequently in the Northern ${ }^{2}$ and Central areas of Oklahoma near the metropolitan area B and Red Plains areas of Northern Oklahoma.

Amount of Land and Its Value by Entrepreneurial Status of Owners
State. --Owner operators, 63 percent of all owners owned 50 percent of the land and 55 percent of its value. If value is any criterion owner operators owned the better land, but fewer number of acres per person than operator landlords. Operator landlords, 16 percent of all owners, owned 33 percent of the land and 27 percent of its value (Table 11). Nonoperator landlords, 21 percent of all owners, owned 17 percent of the land and 18 percent of its value. Operator landlords owned larger acreages, but apparently less valuable land than nonoperator landlords.

Economic Areas,--Many areas did not have enough owners in some of the ownership groups to get a very reliable estimate of the pattern of ownership by economic areas.

The land the owner operators owned and the value of their holdings was nearly equal to the number of owners and varied by economic area in the same proportion as the owners (Table 12).
${ }^{2}$ Figure 2.

Entrepreneurial Status and Land Use
State. --About one-fourth of the $11,894,000$ acres of cropland was owned by nonoperator landlords, 30 percent was owned by operator landlords and about 45 percent of the cropland and 53 percent of the $23,405,000$ acres of grazing land was owned by owner operators. Owner operators and operator landlords owned a greater percentage of grazing land than cropland. Nonoperator landlords owned 25 percent of the cropland (2,973,680 acres) and 13 percent of the grazing land ( $2,942,650$ acres); an even division of their holdings between cropland and grazing land (Table 13).

TABLE 13. DISTRIBUTION OF CROPLAND, GRAZING LAND, AND OTHER FARM AND RANCH LAND BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNER, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Tenure | Cropland | Grazing Land | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner operator: | 44.7 | 52.8 | 42.7 |
| Full | 22.9 | 29.9 | 32.8 |
| Part | 21.8 | 22.9 | 9.9 |
| Owner operator landlord: | 30.0 | 34.3 | 47.0 |
| Part | 10.4 | 16.4 | 4.7 |
| Full | 19.6 | 17.9 | 42.3 |
| Nonoperator landlord: | 25.3 | 12.9 | 10.3 |

Source: Table 14.

Economic Areas. --In general, owner operators own greater proportions of cropland in the Southeastern areas of Oklahoma and smaller proportions in North Central areas of Oklahoma. There appears to have been no pattern of ownership among the areas for operator landlords except that the largest proportions of cropland ownership by these owners occurred in the Grand Prairie areas in Southern Oklahoma.

In the Eastern areas of Oklahoma, owner operators own a greater proportion of grazing land and operator landlords own greater proportions of grazing land in the Central and Northeastern areas of Oklahoma. Great variations occurred among the economic areas in the proportion of cropland and pasture land owned by part-owner operator landlords, but there was no pattern from one section of the State to another in this variation (Table 14).

Average Size of Ownership Unit by Entrepreneurial Status
State. --It appears that the men who might be classed as the better entrepreneurs, full-owner operator landlords, owned the largest average size ownership units. This type of entrepreneur owned an average of 1,153 acres per unit. The part-owner operator landlord owned the second largest average size units, 610 acres (Table 15).

The entrepreneurial group, full-owner operators, with the largest number of owners ( 42 percent of all owners) have the smallest average size ownership unit (248 acres). The part-owner operator and the nonoperator landlord owned 377 and 303 acres, respectively, per ownership unit.

Age of the Farm and Ranch Owner
The ages of the 108 thousand owners of Oklahoma's approximately 38 million acres of farms and ranches vary from near the oldest living person to teenagers who have managed to acquire ownership of farm and ranch land. Owners of farm and ranch land could, of course, be classified into many age groups, but for purposes of this discussion, they were grouped as follows: 24 years and below, 25 to 44 years, 45 to 64 years, and elderly owners who were 65 years and older (Table 16).

TABLE 14. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CROPLAND, GRAZING LAND AND OTHER FARM AND RANCH LAND, BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNER

IN OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | Full-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \text { Part-Owner } \\ \text { Operator } \\ \text { Landlord } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Operator Landlord | Landlord |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of Acres in Cropland |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 22.7 | 25.8 | 8.6 | 16.6 | 26.2 |
| 2 | 16.7 | 17.2 | 13.5 | 22.6 | 29.9 |
| 3 | 24.6 | 20.3 | 15.8 | 23.9 | 15.4 |
| 4 | 27.6 | 24.0 | 6.7 | 14.9 | 26.8 |
| 5 | 20.0 | 22.3 | 6.5 | 19.5 | 31.8 |
| 6 | 25.3 | 20.4 | 5.9 | 20.8 | 27.6 |
| 7a | 16.9 | 20.1 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 7.7 |
| 7b | 37.1 | 10.8 | 15.8 | 25.6 | 10.6 |
| 8 a | 25.4 | 18.4 | 5.5 | 25.5 | 25.3 |
| 8b | 59.8 | 19.3 | . | 8.0 | 12.9 |
| 9 | 47.5 | 18.9 | 14.2 | 12.5 | 7.0 |
| State | 22.9 | 21.8 | 10.4 | 19.6 | 25.4 |
| Percent of Acres in Grazing Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24.6 | 25.6 | 6.5 | 27.5 | 15.9 |
| 2 | 18.1 | 17.7 | 25.7 | 19.4 | 19.0 |
| 3 | 24.1 | 41.9 | 10.8 | 13.0 | 10.2 |
| 4 | 33.5 | 32.6 | 5.3 | 14.8 | 13.8 |
| 5 | 23.9 | 20.8 | 27.0 | 13.2 | 15.2 |
| 6 | 24.9 | 34.6 | 10.9 | 12.0 | 17.7 |
| 7a | 23.0 | 17.2 | 26.5 | 28.2 | 5.1 |
| 7b | 30.8 | 9.3 | 43.7 | 8.1 | 8.1 |
| 8a | 43.2 | 19.8 | 3.3 | 18.1 | 15.6 |
| 8b | 73.9 | 13.0 | - | 6.6 | 6.5 |
| 9 | 59.4 | 10.6 | 8.0 | 4.9 | 17.0 |
| State | 29.9 | 22.9 | 16.3 | 17.9 | 12.9 |

Percent of Acres in Other Farm and Ranch Land

| 1 | 25.2 | 42.7 | .9 | 14.6 | 16.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 21.7 | 11.1 | 2.6 | 42.6 | 22.0 |
| 3 | 39.5 | 12.3 | .1 | 37.6 | 10.4 |
| 4 | 25.1 | 29.4 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 37.2 |
| 5 | 34.5 | 9.2 | 3.8 | 24.7 | 27.9 |
| 6 | 14.1 | 2.3 | .4 | 79.0 | 4.2 |
| 7a | 27.0 | 9.7 | 6.4 | 56.0 | 1.0 |
| 7b | 41.6 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 33.8 | 6.2 |
| 8a | 41.8 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 38.4 | 5.7 |
| 8b | 58.5 | 6.9 | .- | 4.8 | 29.8 |
| 9 | 39.1 | .6 | 11.0 | 48.8 | .6 |
| State | 32.8 | 9.9 | 4.7 | 42.3 | 10.3 |

TABLE 15. AVERAGE SIZE OF OWNERSHIP UNIT BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNER, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Owners | Average |
| :--- | ---: |
| Full-owner operator landlord | 1,153 |
| Part-owner operator landlord | 610 |
| Part-owner operator | 377 |
| Nonoperator landlord | 303 |
| Full-owner operator | 248 |
| State average | 359 |

Source: Appendix Table 7.

TABLE 16. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, AMOUNT AND VALUE OF LAND OWNED, BY AGE, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Age | Percent |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Owner | Land | Value |
| 24 and below | .4 |  | .3 |
| 25 to 44 | 20.4 | 16.0 | 18.9 |
| 45 to 64 | 51.7 | 53.2 | 54.6 |
| 65 and above | 25.6 | 27.9 | 24.6 |
| Age unknown | 1.5 | .7 | .8 |
| Corporation and institution:. | .4 | 1.9 | .8 |

Source: Appendix Table 8.

State. More than 50 percent of Oklahoma's farm owners were between 45 and 64 years of age. The second largest owner age group was the elderly farm owners who were 65 years of age or older and which comprised about 26 percent of all owners. This is the group which will soon be retiring. About 20 percent of the owners were between 25 to 44 years old and .4 percent were under 25 years old (Table 16).

Economic Areas. --In spite of the fact that in Area 7a about 58 percent of the owners were 45 to 64 years of age as compared to Area 2 where

49 percent of the owners were in that age group, this difference was not significant. ${ }^{3}$ In general, the distribution of the various age groups among economic areas was not great enough to be important to this analysis (Appendix Table 8).

Average Size of Ownership Unit by Age of Owner

State, --There appears to be, as one might expect, a direct relationship between age of the owner and the amount of land he owns. It is understandable that the older the owner the more time he has had to accumalate land. For the purpose of this discussion, and to more clearly show the relationship of age to size of holdings, some of the age group have been further divided. This permits a range of sizes for each group to show that even the older owners within the original group have the larger acreages. The larger number was the average size ownership unit for the older owners of the particular group and the smaller number was for the younger owners of the particular group (Table 17).

TABLE 17. AVERAGE SIZE OF OWNERSHIP UNIT, BY AGE OF THE OWNER, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Age | Acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| Under 25 | 311 |
| 25 to 34 | 284 |
| 35 to 44 | 302 |
| 45 to 54 | 356 |
| 55 to 64 | 411 |
| 65 to 74 | 318 |
| Over 74 | 495 |
| Age unknown | 227 |
| State average | 359 |

[^14]The elderly owners who were 65 years of age and older had an average size ownership unit that ranges from 318 to 495 acres per unit. The owners who were 45 to 64 years of age owned units that ranged from 356 to 411 acres per unit. These owners had less variation in the number of acres they owned than the elderly owners.

Farm and ranch owners 25 to 44 years of age owned units smaller than the average for the State, but even here, the upper range of ages in this group had the larger farms. The average size unit these owners owned ranged from 284 to 302 acres per unit. The number of owners sampled under 25 years of age may not have been representative of the owners in this group, but it appears that about 80 to 160 acres per unit (Appendix Table 7) was a more typical size for the beginning owners. The average (Table 17) 311 acres per unit was the average of the survey data for the young owners, but there were two very large units which caused the average to differ widely from the typical size unit.

## Summary of Personal Characteristics of Owners

Occupational Pursuits of Owners.--For occupational pursuits of Oklahoma farm and ranch owners, the distribution of the amount of land and its value was proportional to the number of owners. Active farmers were the backbone of Oklahoma's agricultural land ownership. About one-half of the farm and ranch owners were in the active group and they owned nearly one-half of the land, and more than half of the total value of farm and ranch land. The business and professional owners owned somewhat more than a proportional share of the land but the land was the less productive land (assuming the lower value land was less productive).

In general, active farmers owned greater proportions of cropland and grazing land than other farm and ranch land. Active farmers also owned less other land in areas near recreational projects and metropolitan areas than in areas where these influences were not present. Business and professional people owned smaller proportions of cropland, larger proportions of grazing land, and the greatest proportion of other farm and ranch land. In the areas of metropolitan and recreational influence, the business and professional class owned about two-thirds of the other farm and ranch land.

In short, while farmers comprised the largest group of owners, business and professional people were an important segment of land owners in the State. It appeared, however, that business and professional owners were more interested in nonfarm and ranch land and in land around areas where nonagricultural influences were strong.

Entrepreneurial Status of Owners. --Owner operators comprise the largest group of owners, nonoperator landlords were second and operator landlords third.

The land the owner operators and nonoperator landlords owned, and the value of their holdings was nearly proportional to the number of owners. Nonoperator landlords owned a greater proportion of cropland than grazing land. The owner operators owned a relatively greater proportion of grazing land than of cropland. Operator landlords had the largest ownership units and owner operators the smallest units.

Age of Owners. --Owners 45 to 64 years of age ( 52 percent of all owners) owned the largest percentage of the land ( 53 percent) and its value ( 55 percent of the total value of farm and ranch land).

The distribution of the land and its value among the various age groups was nearly proportional to the number of owners. The average size of ownership unit by the various age groups increased as the age of the groups increased.

## CHAPTER V

## METHODS OF ACQUISITION AND HOLDING

## Methods of Acquisition

While there may be many shades of differences in the methods of acquiring ownership of land, practically all methods except homesteading would fall into one of the following broad categories. Purchase from relatives, purchase from nonrelatives, gift, and inheritance. ${ }^{1}$ The category "other" used here would include homesteading as well as any unique method not susceptable to specific classification. The methods of acquisition by owners of farm and ranch land and the amount of land owned will be discussed first. Then a discussion of relationships of the different entrepreneurial groups to the methods of acquisition will be followed by methods of holding farm and ranch land.

State. --While there were several different ways ownership of land could have been acquired, more than one-half of the owners, 57 percent, acquired their land by purchase from nonrelatives. These owners acquired larger tracts than those acquired by any other method (Table 18). The second largest group, owners who purchased from relatives, comprised about 17 percent of all owners. These owners acquired smaller tracts. About 20 percent of the owners inherited part or all of their farm and ranch land. The remaining methods were not significantly different, one from the other.

[^15]TABLE 18. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND AND AMOUNT OF LAND BY METHOD OF ACQUISITION, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Method of Acquisition | Owners <br> (Percent) | Land <br> (Percent) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase from: |  |  |
| Relatives <br> Nonrelatives <br> Gift | 16.8 | 10.1 |
| Inherit | 56.6 | 60.0 |
| Other methods of acquisition | 2.8 | 1.6 |
| Method unknown | 3.4 | 15.5 |

Source: Table 19.

Economic Areas. --The Eastern one-half of Oklahoma beginning with Area 3 in the Northeastern corner had the largest number of owners ( 69 percent) who purchased their land from nonrelatives. However, in the Western onehalf of the State a relatively smaller number of owners had purchased land from nonrelatives. Area 2, in the North Central, showed the smallest proportion ( 43 percent) who had purchased 45 percent of the land from nonrelatives (Table 19). A relatively high proportion of the owners (32 percent) in the Northwestern areas (Area 2) inherited part or all of their farm and ranch land while only 10 percent of the owners in the Northeastern area (Area 3) acquired land by inheritance. ${ }^{2}$

The variations occurring between the areas for each of the other methods of acquisition were relatively unimportant.

[^16]table 19. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND AND AMOUNT BY METHOD OF ACQUISITION, ORLAHOMA, 1958


Acres

| 1 | 13.0 | 47.0 | 1.0 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 10.8 | 2.3 | 14.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 14.5 | 44.6 | 2.4 | 15.3 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 14.0 |
| 3 | 5.8 | 75.8 | 1.1 | 3.0 | .7 | 1.5 | .8 | 11.3 |
| 4 | 12.4 | 55.5 | 1.9 | 7.5 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 15.1 |
| 5 | 20.8 | 49.0 | 2.2 | 10.0 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 2.6 | 8.6 |
| 6 | 9.0 | 71.0 | 1.3 | 5.2 | .2 | 4.9 | 2.4 | 6.0 |
| 7 a | 2.3 | 71.7 | 3.2 | 7.7 | .4 | 7.2 | .4 | 7.1 |
| 7 b | 2.1 | 85.2 | 1.1 | 3.5 | .8 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 3.2 |
| 8a | 11.8 | 58.3 | .7 | 8.3 | 2.2 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 10.6 |
| 8b | 7.5 | 56.0 | .2 | 4.1 | 6.1 | 1.4 | 4.6 | 20.1 |
| 9 | 5.7 | 68.6 | .7 | 6.5 | .5 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 11.6 |
| State | 10.1 | 60.0 | 1.6 | 7.9 | 1.8 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 11.0 |

Owners

| 1 | 21.7 | 47.7 | 1.7 | 13.4 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 4.6 | - |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 18.4 | 42.6 | 4.3 | 20.2 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 2.3 | - |
| 3 | 14.6 | 69.0 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | - |
| 4 | 20.9 | 55.3 | 2.6 | 11.7 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 2.0 | - |
| 5 | 18.7 | 49.2 | 3.4 | 16.6 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 3.7 | - |
| 6 | 17.8 | 58.5 | 4.0 | 7.1 | 0.8 | 7.1 | 4.7 | - |
| 7 a | 12.6 | 60.7 | 4.4 | 11.2 | 1.5 | 6.8 | 2.9 | - |
| 7 b | 10.7 | 67.2 | 3.1 | 7.6 | 2.3 | 6.1 | 3.1 | - |
| 8 a | 8.9 | 67.6 | 1.8 | 9.6 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 2.5 | - |
| 8 b | 13.9 | 67.8 | .9 | 6.1 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 3.5 | - |
| 9 | 14.7 | 66.8 | 1.9 | 6.6 | 1.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | - |
| State | 16.8 | 56.6 | 2.8 | 11.7 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 3.4 | - |

## Acquisition by Entrepreneurial Status

Owners of farm and ranch land classified by methods of acquisition and percentage distribution by entrepreneurial status gives sufficient information to get ownership patterns in the State as a whole but many groups of owners were not represented in some of the economic areas.

State. --A substantial majority of owner operators acquired their land by purchase from nonrelatives and all owners acquired more land by this method than any other. However, a substantial number of landlords of all kinds, particularly the nonoperator landlords, acquired ownership by inheritance. Nonoperator landlords comprised about 21 percent of all owners but more than one-third of the nonoperator landlords inherited their land (Table 20).

## TABLE 20. OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND CLASSIFIED BY METHODS OF ACQUISITION, PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Method of Acquisition | Owner Operator |  | Owner Operator Landlord |  | Nonoperator Landlord |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fell | Part | Part | Full |  |
| Purchase from: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relatives | 16.0 | 19.7 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 15.1 |
| Nonrelatives | 63.6 | 63.6 | 44.0 | 52.0 | 43.0 |
| Gift | 2.1 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Inherit | 14.4 | 12.8 | 22.0 | 25.7 | 34.3 |
| Other methods | 3.9 | 1.9 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 4.2 |
| Total owners | 41.9 | 21.2 | 4.4 | 11.8 | 20.8 |

The variations that occurred between the other entrepreneurial groups of a given method of acquisition were relatively unimportant.

## Methods of Holding Farm and Ranch Land

The acquisition of land is the first step in legal possession. But possession of property rights is a complicated legal concept consisting of man's rights in the property object. His rights may be exclusive or limited, depending upon the claim he has to the various "sticks" in the "bundle of rights". There were five degrees of ownership of property rights shown during the course of this survey. These were: fully owned, mortgaged, estates or partnerships, life estates, and purchase contract or contract for deed.

The degree of ownership or the methods of holding land will first be discussed by State and economic areas. There will be some discussion by entrepreneurial relationship to the method of holding, and last will be shown the relationship between the value of farm and ranch land, and the debt held against the land.

State. --A majority of farm and ranch owners fully owned all of the land to which they held title. That is, 59 percent of the owners reported a free and clear title to all their land. ${ }^{3}$ However, the property rights held by 25 percent of the owners were more limited in that someone else had a claim against them in the form of a mortgage. About 11 percent of the owners were holding their land by partnership agreement, three percent by life estate, and one percent by a contract for deed or purchase contract (Table 21).

[^17]TABLE 21. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND AND AMOUNT OF LAND, BY METHOD OF HOLDING, ORLAHOMA, 1958

| Method of Holding | Percent of <br> Owners | Percent of <br> Acres |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fully owned | 59.3 | 58.5 |
| Mortgaged | 24.6 | 20.4 |
| Partnerships ${ }^{1}$ | 11.3 | 14.1 |
| Life estate | 3.4 | 2.8 |
| Contract ${ }^{2}$ | 1.4 | .9 |
| Unknown | 0 | 3.3 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes all methods of holding that had partnership agreements. ${ }^{2}$ Purchase contract or contract for deed.

Source: Appendix Table 8.

Mortgage Status by Entrepreneurial Classification
State. - The figures given in Table 22 show the percentage of the land and the percentage of the value that was without mortgage for each of the entrepreneurial categories. The ratio of the mortgage debt to the value of the mortgaged land does not include the land that was not held under mortgage.

The proportion of land held without mortgage varies among the entrepreneurial groups. Full-owner operator landlords had the greatest percentage of their land free of debt. That is, about 92 percent of the land and 72 percent of its value was free of mortgage.

About 91 percent of the land and 80 percent of the value of land held by nonoperator landlords was free of mortgage obligations. The nonoperator landlords had the smallest percentage ( 20 percent) of the total value of their farm and ranch land under a mortgage.

TABLE 22. FARM AND RANCH LAND CLASSIFIED BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS, PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNT AND VALUE OF LAND BY MORTGAGE STATUS AND RATIO OF MORTGAGE DEBT TO VALUE OF MORTGAGED LAND, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Entrepreneurial <br> States of Owner | Land Owned <br> Without Mortgage <br> (Percent) | Value of Land <br> Without Mortgage <br> (Percent) | Ratio of Mortgage <br> Debt to Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Owner operator: | 72.3 | 54.0 | .253 |
| Full <br> Part | 68.3 | 51.0 | .232 |
| Operator landlord: <br> Part-owner <br> Full-owner | 80.4 |  |  |
| Nonoperator landlord | 90.8 | 78.8 | .175 |
| All land | 83.3 | 80.0 | .153 |

Source: Appendix Table 5.

Part-owner operator landlords had 80 percent of their land, but only about one-half of its value free of mortgage obligations.

Full-owner operators and part-owner operators held 72 and 68 percent, respectively, of their land without mortgage. However, only 54 percent of the value of land owned by full-owner operators was free of debt, and In the case of part-owner operators 51 percent of the value was free of debt. In general, for the state of Oklahoma, while only eight to 28 percent of the acres of land held by the various entrepreneurial groups was mortgaged, a higher percentage of the value was mortgaged. This ranged from 20 to 51 percent for the various groups (Table 22). All of the groups had a greater proportion of the value mortgaged than the acres which affirms what might be supposed that financing was more generally required on the higher priced land.

The ratio of mortgage debt to mortgage value was obtained by dividing the mortgage debt by the value of the acres mortgaged. The ratio of mortgage debt to the value of the mortgaged land was smallest (. 153 to 1 ) in the full-owner operator landlords. Part-owner operator landlords ranked second lowest with a debt of .175 to 1 , and nonoperator landlords third with .198 to 1. Part-owner and full-owner operators' debt was highest with . 232 to 1 and .253 to 1 , respectively.

Mortgage Debt by Entrepreneurial Status of Owners
State. -While full-owner operators, because they comprise the largest group have the greatest proportion of the total mortgage debt in the State, part-owner operator landlords and part-owner operators carry the greatest relative burden of debt. Part-owner operator landlords, four percent of all owners, bore eight percent of the total indebtedness. Part-owner operators, 21 percent of all owners bore 35 percent of the total mortgage debt. Nonoperator landlords, 21 percent of all owners, was relatively debt free bearing only eight percent of the total mortgage debt (Table 23).

TABLE 23. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MORTGAGE DEBT AND OWNERS OF FARM and ranch land, by entrepreneurial status, oklahoma, 1958

|  | Mortgage Debt <br> (Percent) | Owners <br> (Percent) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Owner operators: |  |  |
| Full | 39 | 42 |
| Part | 35 | 21 |
| Operator landlord: <br> Part-owner <br> Full-owner | 8 |  |
| Nonoperator landlord | 10 | 4 |
|  | $\frac{8}{100}$ | 12 |

Source: Table 24.

TABLE 24. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MORTGAGED DEBT OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, BY ENIREPRENEURIAL STATUS OF OWNER, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | Total Mortgaged Debt | Fu11-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator Landlord | Operator <br> Landlord | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land- } \\ & \text { lord } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 868,607 | 35.0 | 48.5 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 7.2 |
| 2 | 1,168,339 | 20.9 | 43.4 | 18.3 | 6.5 | 11.0 |
| 3 | 615,583 | 43.9 | 31.9 | 1.4 | 14.6 | 8.3 |
| 4 | 1,064, 277 | 29.9 | 42.1 | 9.1 | 10.8 | 8.2 |
| 5 | 579,959 | 36.0 | 28.6 | 2.8 | 25.1 | 7.5 |
| 6 | 807,282 | 29.0 | 38.3 | 25.9 | 5.5 | 1.3 |
| 7 a | 861, 185 | 58.3 | 13.5 | 24.1 | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| 7b | 241,130 | 71.9 | 12.0 | 9.7 | 5.4 | 1.2 |
| 8 a | 508,671 | 60.6 | 19.7 | 2.2 | 7.7 | 2.7 |
| 8b | 221,005 | 55.6 | 20.0 | - | 6.5 | 17.8 |
| 9 | 728,919 | 44.0 | 27.3 | 8.8 | 0.7 | 19.3 |
| State | 7,664,958 | 39.2 | 34.2 | 10.1 | 8.4 | 8.1 |

Economic Areas. --The distribution of the debt of full-owner operators by economic areas in Oklahoma seems to be heavier in the Southeastern areas (Areas $7 \mathrm{a}, 7 \mathrm{~b}, 8 \mathrm{a}, 8 \mathrm{~b}$, and 9) than the other two-thirds of the State. Full-owner operators had the lowest percentage ( 21 percent) of the debt for this ownership group in Area 2. However, the pattern of debt for part-owner operators was just the opposite to that of the full-owner operators (Table 24). In the Northwestern areas (Area 1 and 2) full-owner operators had the smallest percentage of the total mortgage debt in their area compared to the other areas in Oklahoma.

In general, the Northeastern areas show a lower debt by part-owner operator landlords than the other areas. Nonoperator landlords in the Southeast (Areas $8 \mathrm{a}, 8 \mathrm{~b}$, and 9) bear a heavier portion of the debt than they do in other areas. The pattern of the debt of the full-owner operator landlords did not wary appreciably from one area of the State to the other.

Summary of Method of Acquisition and Holding

The majority of the owners purchased their land from nonrelatives. Falling far behind were the owners who had purchased their land from relatives. Those who inherited the farm and ranch land they owned was the third most important group.

The entrepreneurs who were more closely associated with the farm operation purchased a greater proportion of their land from nonrelatives and inherited smaller proportions. The group with the least actual contact with the farm operation (nonoperator landlords) purchased smaller proportions from nonrelatives and inherited greater proportions.

With respect to the degree of ownership, the greater percentage of the owners (59 percent) fully owned all of their farm and ranch land. The next largest category were those who had mortgage loans outstanding, nearly one-fourth of all owners were in this group. About eleven percent of all owners held their land in partnership with someone else.

The low income areas in the Southeastern areas of Oklahoma had the greater proportions of farm and ranch land mortgaged but the lowest debt ratio (Appendix Table 5).

Part-owner operators in the State had the greatest percentage of the value of their land under mortgage. The nonoperator landlord had the greatest percentage of the value of the land held without mortgage.

The nonoperator landlord had the lowest debt burden while the partowner operator landlord had the heaviest burden of the various entrepreneurial groups.

Full-owner operators, 42 percent of all owners, had 39 percent of the total mortgage debt in the State and the landlord groups had the smallest percent ( 8 to 10 percent) of the total mortgage debt.

## CHAPTER VI

## CONCLUSIONS

The Great Plains ownership survey was completed in early 1958. The data from this survey that apply to Oklahoma were tabulated and analyzed for use in this study.

The characteristics of ownership to be analyzed were those selected by the Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. These characteristics were type of land ownership--legal types of owners, land use and mineral rights--, personal characteristics of owners--, occupational pursuits, entrepreneurial status of owners and age--, and methods of acquisition and holding.

## Type of Land Ownership

The changes in ownership patterns in Oklahoma occur very slowly. It appears that land owned by corporations decreased in the past twenty years. In late $1930^{\prime} s, 1,993,860$ acres were owned by corporations, and in late 1957 and early 1958, $1,035,900$ acres $^{1}$ were owned by corporations and institutions.

Corporate ownership of land was not highly significant to Oklahoma in general, but areas in Northeastern and South Central Oklahoma showed a relatively important amount of corporate ownership. The number of corporations and institutions owning land was relatively less important than the acreage they owned. About . 4 percent of all owners were classed

[^18]as corporate and they owned 2.7 percent of the farm and ranch land in Oklahoma in 1958.

Legal Forms of Ownership. --Individual owners consisted of a number of classes. Fifty-four percent of all owners of farm and ranch land were married couples. They owned one-half of the farm and ranch land and more than one-half of its value.

Partnerships owned larger number of acres of farm and ranch land per person than the married couples, but the variation between the proportion of land and its value was relatively unimportant to this study. The smaller percentages of ownership groups did vary but the number of owners concerned was not large enough to influence the ownership pattern in general.

Mineral Rights.--The number of acres of farm and ranch land in which both surface and subsurface rights are under the same ownership appeared to be growing smaller each year. Married couples still owned a fair share of their subsurface rights compared to the other types of owners; i.e., single individuals, partnerships, and corporations.

Occupational Pursuits of the Owner
The occupational pursuits of owners seemed to influence the pattern of land ownership in Oklahoma. One-half of all nonretired owners, which comprised about 82 percent of all owners, were farmers. These farmers owned large acreages of the better quality land. Business and professional owners owned a smaller proportion of the acreage and the less valuable land. They concentrated their ownership near population centers or recreational areas.

Variation between economic areas of the other categories of owners was relatively unimportant, but a smaller percentage of housewife owners did occur in the mountain highland regions in Southeastern Oklahoma.

Cropland and Grazing Land by Occupational Pursuits.--The distribution of cropland and grazing land varied between occupational groups and between economic areas. Active farmers owned about the same proportion of cropland and grazing land, but business and professional people and other occupations owned a greater proportion of grazing land than of cropland. Those owners who had retired owned a greater proportional share of the cropland.

## Entrepreneurial Status of the Owner

Entrepreneurial status refers to the relationship of the owner to his land. Owner operators, 63 percent of 108,333 owners, owned one-half of the better quality land. Sixteen percent of all owners were owneroperator landlords. This group owned one-third of all the land in the State.

About two-thirds of the owner operators were full owners and fullowner operators were relatively more numerous in the Eastern areas.

Cropland and Grazing Land by Entrepreneurial Status. The variations between the proportion of cropland and grazing land owned by the entrepreneurial groups were relatively unimportant except for the nonoperator landlords who owned one-fourth of the cropland but only one-eighth of the grazing land.

## Methods of Acquisition

Farm and ranch owners acquired land in many different ways. Six different methods were used in this study--purchase from relatives,
purchase from nonrelatives, inheritance and gift. Owners who purchased from nonrelatives were by far the largest group, purchase from relatives second and inherit full interest, the third group. The other methods occurred in the order previously given.

Full-owner operators had purchased a greater proportion of their land than the nonoperator landlords. A relatively high proportion of the latter had acquired their land by gift.

Method of Holding
The methods of holding were divided into five different classes of farm and ranch ownership. These were fully owned, mortgaged, ${ }^{2}$ partnership, life estate, and purchase contract or contract for deed. These various methods of holding were ranked in descending order with about 59 percent of the owners owning full interest in 60 percent of the farm and ranch land. One-fourth of the 108,333 farm and ranch owners had mortgages on their land comprising about one-fifth of the land. A greater proportion of the owners held full title to their holdings in the low income areas than those in other parts of the State. The Northwestern half of Oklahoma had a greater number of owners with a mortgage on their land. Partnerships were relatively more numerous in the Central and South Central areas of Oklahoma.

The distribution of methods of holding shows that the owner operator had larger percentages of mortgaged land while landlords had smaller percentages of land under mortgage.

[^19]Mortgage Debt
The relationship of mortgage debt to the value of the mortgaged land may be reflected in percentages. The ratio . 219 for Oklahoma in general means that of the land under mortgage there was an outstanding debt of about 22 percent of the value. Owner operators had a greater proportion of the value of their land under a mortgage debt while landlords had the smaller percentage held against their title.

The Average Size of Ownership Units
The discussion of the average size of ownership units was placed at the end of the chapter so that all owner characteristics could be compared at the same time. The average number of acres owned by all owners gives a quantitative relationship of one group to another as well as verifying the percentage relationship between owners and the amount of land they own.

Married couples owned an average of 342 acres which was 17 acres below the average for the State. Married couples in partnerships with other individuals owned the largest average size of units with 1,131 acres. Partnerships, in general, owned the larger farm units. Owners over 75 years of age owned an average size of about 500 acres. Owners 55 to 64 years of age owned an average of 411 acres. All other ages owned less than below the State average--45 to 54 years--averaged 356 acres, 65 to 74 years old averaged 318 acres, 35 to 44 years old averaged 302 acres, 25 to 34 years old averaged 284 acres and under 25 years old averaged 311 acres. The older the owner in general the better the probability of his owning a larger farm unit.

Although more than one-half of the owners were active farmers, they did not own the largest units. The business and professional groups owned the larger farms (464 acres per unit), active farmers second with 421 acres per unit. All other occupational groups were below the State average which was 356 acres per unit.

The variations among entrepreneurial and legal types of owners groupings was greater than among age and occupational pursuits groupings. The average size of unit of the various classes of entrepreneurs varied from 1, 153 to 248 acres per unit. The land held by full-owner operator landlords had the largest acres per unit. Part-owner operator landlord was second with 610 acres per unit. Part-owner operators owned an average of 377 acres per unit which was also above the State average. Nonoperator landlords averaged 303 acres per unit and full-owner operators were the smallest average ownership unit--248 acres per unit.

Corporations and institutions had an average of 2,374 acres per unit. This was partly due to the fact that only 12 such owners were sampled in Oklahoma and one of them owned over 20,000 acres. This large unit of farm and ranch land occurred in Carter County in Southern Oklahoma.

APPENDIX

## THE USE OF NOMOGRAMS

As an example of the use of Appendix Figure $1_{3}$ assume that there are 2,000 respondents $(N=2,000)$ giving entreprenewix 1 status of owners. Assume also that $P_{n}=25$ percent $f\left(11\right.$ owners and $P_{2}=22$ percent part owners. Along the lower border of the graph 25 is marked, and along the left border 22 is marked. The intersection of a vertical line drawn frote 25 and a horizontal line drawn from 22 lies below the $N=2,000$ corve in the area designated "Significant Difference". Therefore the 25 pexcent classified as full omers does represent gromp that is siguificantly larger than the 22 percent af part owners.

Appendix Figure 2 and 3 are more general in their application out more complex in operation. They are used when two percentages fromi different distribntzons are compared. such as percentages from a disergivo tion of owners and percentage from a distribution of acreage.

As an example of the rise of Figure 3, suppose we compare the proporm tion in each of two states of owners who are "fu11 owners". Asswre thet $N_{1}=2,500$ responderts in Area A, of which 28 percent ( $P_{1}$ ) are full owners. Assume that $N_{2}=2,000$ respondents in Area $B_{3}$ of which 26 percent $P_{2}$ are full owners. The lower right hand scale of Figer 3 is entered at 28 and a vertical Iine is drawn to $N=2,500$ cweve From this point a horizontal line is drawn to the vertical scale in the center of che nomo gran and its intersection marked. Similarly, 26 is entered on the lower right-hand soge and a vertical line drawn to a point representing $\mathbb{N}=$ 2,000. A horizontel I Re is drom from this polat to the vercical scale. and a mark is made on the scale. From the lower ork on the vertical scale an imainary arc is traced to the corresponding point on the lemet
left-hand scale ( 1.48 in this case). A vertical line is drawn from this point to intersect a horizontal line drawn from the upper mark on the vertical scale. From this intersection another arc is traced down to the Lower left-hand scale, intersecting it at 2.18, As the nomogram states, 2.18 is the least significant difference between two percentage points in question. Because the observed difference is less than the least significant difference, there is no significant difference between 28 and 26 percent from these two tabulations, and that the proportion of full owners in the two areas do nor differ.

These nomograms were computed to provide the least significant difference at the 90 percent confidence level. This means that conclusions based on these nomograms will be reliable except for $1-1 n-10$ chance of an error. Sample size $N$ other than those shown must be interpolated on the nomogram to determine the number of respondents in any particular percentage distribution an adjustment factor (.0272) is provided for the State of Oklahoma and the area factors ${ }^{1}$ are listed in the Appendix. These factors are to be maltiplied by the numbers listed in the tables wader "all owners" to obtain the appropriate sample size $\mathbb{N}$ on which the percentages in question are based. This reduces the estimate of owners back to the original number of respondents. The number of respondents who supplied information, rather than the number of acres or vilwe reported, is needed to permit the use of the nomograms.

[^20]
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APPENDIX TABLE 1. EXPANSION FAGTORS FOR ESTIMATING AREA TOTALS FROM SAMPLE DATA AND RECIPROCALS OF THE EXPANSION FACTORS FOR REDUCING EXPANDED FIGURES TO SAMPLE DATA BY ECONOMIC AREA, OKLAHOMA, 1958
```

| Area | Expansion <br> Factor | Reciprocal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 22.63 | .04418 |
| 2 | 38.92 | .02569 |
| 3 | 42.85 | .02337 |
| 4 | 35.72 | .02800 |
| 5 | 54.91 | .01821 |
| 6 | 30.77 | .03250 |
| $7 a$ | 38.98 | .02565 |
| $7 b$ | 34.76 | .02877 |
| $8 a$ | 27.08 | .03693 |
| 8 | 52.21 | .0219 |

APPENDIX TABLE 2. TOTALS FOR OWNERS, ACRES AND VALUE OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, CROPLAND, GRAZING AND OTHER FARM AND RANCH LAND BY AREAS, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Acres } \\ (1,000 \mathrm{~A}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ommers | $\begin{gathered} \text { Value } \\ (1,000 \\ \text { dollars }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cropland } \\ & (1,000 \mathrm{~A}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grazing } \\ & \text { Land } \\ & (1,000 \mathrm{~A}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Other } \\ & (1,000 \mathrm{~A}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4,774 | 8,758 | 267,420 | 2,161 | 2,385 | 101 |
| 2 | 4, 311 | 12,454 | 472,467 | 2,663 | 1,387 | 119 |
| 3 | 3,172 | 12,512 | 278,990 | 633 | 2,187 | 217 |
| 4 | 3,296 | 11,859 | 326,189 | 1,868 | 1,277 | 59 |
| 5 | 5,245 | 18,065 | 404, 852 | 1,626 | 3,077 | 208 |
| 6 | 3,362 | 8,000 | 132,483 | 449 | 2,576 | 288 |
| 7 a | 6,204 | 8,264 | 299,535 | 754 | 5,210 | 152 |
| 7b | 1,716 | 4,519 | 69,254 | 123 | 1,391 | 124 |
| 8 a | 1,959 | 7,745 | 144, 192 | 594 | 1,101 | 235 |
| 8b | 1,072 | 6,578 | 69,423 | 139 | 771 | 154 |
| 9 | 3,264 | 9, 579 | 139,503 | 230 | 2,587 | 399 |
| State | 38,369 | 108,333 | 2,601,118 | 11, 240 | 23,949 | 2,057 |

appendix table 3. total value, acres, owners and mortgage debt by tenure cf owner, oklahoma, 1958

| Area | Full-Owner Operator | Part-Owner Operator | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Part-Owner } \\ & \text { Operator } \\ & \text { Landlord } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Operator <br> Landlord | Landlord | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1,141 | 1,228 | 354 | 1,041 | 1,005 | 4,769 |
| 2 | 738 | 736 | 720 | 941 | 1,176 | 4,311 |
| 3 | 811 | 1,163 | 337 | 517 | 345 | 3,173 |
| 4 | 987 | 882 | 214 | 475 | 738 | 3,296 |
| 5 | 1,225 | 1,026 | 1,057 | 827 | 1,110 | 5,245 |
| 6 | 831 | , 989 | 308 | 634 | - 601 | 3,363 |
| 7a | 1,383 | 1,026 | 1,612 | 1,770 | 376 | 6,204 |
| 7b | 597 | 161 | 639 | 185 | 133 | 1,715 |
| 8 a | 745 | 348 | 86 | 441 | 339 | 1,959 |
| 8b | 751 | 137 | - | 70 | 114 | 1,072 |
| 9 | 1,829 | 321 | 283 | 351 | 481 | 3,265 |
| States | 11,038 | 8,054 | 5,610 | 7,252 | 6,418 | 38,372 |
|  | Value ( 1,000 Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 66,236 | 86,019 | 22,207 | 33,914 | 59,044 | 267,420 |
| 2 | 89,606 | 95,035 | 60,192 | 87,025 | 140,609 | 472,467 |
| 3 | 62,823 | 98,169 | 18,228 | 43,368 | 29,967 | 252,555 |
| 4 | 82,369 | 101,309 | 24,218 | 48,781 | 69,511 | 326,188 |
| 5 | 127,872 | 91,685 | 28,968 | 79,883 | 76,445 | 404,853 |
| 6 | 34,520 | 38,229 | 9,077 | 26,100 | 24,557 | 132,483 |
| 7a | 72,740 | 76,809 | 58,305 | 75,789 | 15,892 | 299,535 |
| 7b | 29,233 | 6,629 | 21,377 | 8,590 | 3,425 | 69,254 |
| 8a | 52,448 | 42,476 | 4,060 | 25,736 | 19,472 | 144,192 |
| 8b | 13,019 | 12,453 | - | 5,247 | 8,703 | 69,422 |
| 9 | 75,807 | 16,559 | 10,592 | 21,762 | 14,784 | 139,504 |
| States | 736,673 | 665,372 | 257,224 | 456,195 | 462,409 | 2,577,873 |
| Mortgage Debt (1,000 Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 7,437 | 10,305 | 1,237 | 739 | 1,526 | 21,244 |
| 2 | 8,853 | 18,415 | 7,776 | 2,768 | 4,682 | 42,494 |
| 3 | 10,492 | 7,659 | 347 | 3,500 | 2,001 | 23,999 |
| 4 | 10,373 | 14,600 | 3,156 | 3,730 | 2,828 | 34,687 |
| 5 | 10,278 | 8,170 | 803 | 7,184 | 2,152 | 28,587 |
| 6 | 3,464 | 4,572 | 3,086 | 655 | 160 | 11,937 |
| 7a | 9,698 | 2,253 | 4,013 | 265 | 425 | 16,654 |
| 7 b | 4,913 | 819 | 655 | + 368 | 81 | 6,836 |
| 8 a | 11,177 | 3,640 | 406 | 1,419 | 1,793 | 18,435 |
| 8b | 2,888 | 1,039 | 04 | 339 | 925 | 5,191 |
| 9 | 4,763 | 2,949 | 947 | 73 | 2,089 | 10,821 |
| States | 84,336 | 74,421 | 22,426 | 21,040 | 18,662 | 220,885 |
| Owners of Farm and Ranch Land |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2,467 | 2,218 | 475 | 1,041 | 2,557 | 8,758 |
| 2 | 2,608 | 3,036 | 895 | 1,790 | 4,126 | 12,455 |
| 3 | 6,299 | 2,271 | 386 | 1,928 | 1,628 | 12,512 |
| 4 | 4,001 | 3,536 | 536 | 1,250 | 2,536 | 11,859 |
| 5 | 6,753 | 3,350 | 879 | 2,306 | 4,777 | 18,065 |
| 6 | 4,092 | 1,538 | 215 | 893 | 1,262 | 8,000 |
| 7a | 3,586 | 1,793 | 663 | 935 | 1,286 | 8,263 |
| 7b | 2,746 | . 626 | 174 | 417 | 556 | 4,519 |
| 8 a | 3,385 | 1,760 | 217 | 948 | 1,435 | 7,745 |
| 8b | 4,803 | 783 | - | 418 | 574 | 6,578 |
| 9 | 5,846 | 1,259 | 270 | 809 | 1,394 | 9,578 |
| States | 46,586 | 22,170 | 4,710 | 12,735 | 22,131 | 108,332 |

APPENDIX TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LAND OWNED BY INDIVIDUAL AND NONINDIVIDUAL OWNERS BY ECONOMIC AREAS, OKLAHOMA

| Area and Type of Owner | Farm and Ranch |  |  |  | Nonfarm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Cropland | Grazing | Other |  |
| Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Individual | 99.46 | 99.52 | 99.47 | 97.05 | 68.33 |
| Nonindividual | . 54 | . 48 | . 53 | 2.97 | 31.67 |
| 2 Individual | 99.81 | 99.88 | 99.72 | 98.81 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 19 | . 12 | . 28 | 1.19 | . 00 |
| 3 Individual | 97.52 | 95.67 | 98.63 | 91.28 | 62.75 |
| Nonindividual | 2.48 | . 33 | 1.37 | 8.72 | 37.25 |
| 4 Individual | 99.26 | 99.05 | 99.44 | 99.03 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 74 | . 95 | . 36 | . 97 | . 00 |
| 5 Individual | 98.90 | 98.41 | 98.98 | 97.23 | 92.06 |
| Nonindividual | 1.10 | 1.59 | 1.02 | 2.77 | 7.94 |
| 6 Individual | 100.00 | 99.88 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 00 | . 12 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 7a Individual | 87.13 | 94.83 | 85.42 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | 12.87 | 5.17 | 14.58 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 7b Individual | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 8a Individual | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 8b Individual | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 9 Individual | 95.65 | 100.00 | 94.50 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Nonindividual | 4.35 | . 00 | 5.50 | . 00 | . 00 |
| State |  |  |  |  |  |
| Individual | 97.33 | 99.04 | 96.23 | 98.82 | 81.10 |
| Nonindividual | 2.67 | . 96 | 3.77 | 1.18 | 18.90 |

appendix table 5. farm and ranch land by method of holding - percentage DISTRIBUTION BY ENTREPRENEURIAL STATUS, OKLAHOMA, 1958ª

| Area | Method of Holding | Al1 Land | Operator |  | Landlord |  |  | Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non- |  |
|  |  |  | Full | Part | Part | Ful1 | Operator |  |
| 1 | Life estate | 287, 243 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 6.6 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 6.0 |
|  | Contract | 40,734 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 | - | - | . 9 |
|  | Mortgaged | 868,607 | 26.9 | 31.4 | 11.1 | 5.2 | 8.3 | 18.2 |
|  | Fully owned | 2,625,782 | 60.0 | 52.9 | 45.4 | 40.7 | 70.3 | 55.1 |
|  | Partnerships | 753,149 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 51.6 | 9.6 | 15.8 |
| 2 | Life estate | 150,504 | 1.5 | . 6 | - | . 7 | 11.0 | 3.5 |
|  | Contract | 63,790 | - | . 4 | . 9 | 5.8 | - | 1.5 |
|  | Mortgaged | 1,168, 339 | 33.2 | 49.4 | 50.4 | 12.9 | 6.4 | 27.1 |
|  | Fully owned | 2,477,024 | 56.7 | 45.2 | 34.7 | 74.0 | 66.3 | 57.5 |
|  | Partnerships | 436,254 | 3.5 | 6.2 | 11.0 | 4.7 | 20.5 | 10.1 |
| 3 | Life estate | 66,075 | 6.0 | . 7 | 3.0 | - | - | 2.1 |
|  | Contract | 53,820 | . 4 | 3.9 | 1.1 | - | . 5 | 1.7 |
|  | Mortgaged | 615,583 | 30.4 | 16.2 | 2.0 | 20.5 | 20.0 | 19.4 |
|  | Fully owned | 1,943,805 | 53.8 | 63.6 | 53.3 | 66.8 | 70.8 | 61.3 |
|  | Partnerships | 405,490 | 10.4 | 8.7 | 4.1 | 12.1 | 5.5 | 12.8 |
| 4 | Life estate | 32,684 | . 4 | - | - | 1.2 | 3.1 | 1.0 |
|  | Contract | 46,865 | . 9 | 1.0 | 8.6 | - | 1.5 | 1.4 |
|  | Mortgaged | 1,064, 277 | 34.0 | 52.2 | 29.4 | 18.6 | 15.9 | 32.3 |
|  | Fully owned | 1,762,425 | 48.6 | 42.7 | 22.3 | 70.0 | 71.3 | 53.5 |
|  | Partnerships | 242,610 | 10.9 | 1.1 | 14.4 | 11.4 | 5.5 | 7.4 |
| 5 | Life estate | 133,596 | 5.6 | - | . 8 | 4.7 | 1.6 | 2.5 |
|  | Contract | 66,880 | . 7 | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | 1.3 |
|  | Mortgaged | 579,959 | 13.3 | 21.7 | 3.7 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 11.1 |
|  | Fully owned | 3,465,700 | 60.6 | 63.5 | 81.2 | 60.3 | 64.5 | 66.1 |
|  | Partnerships | 624,986 | 14.1 | 9.8 | 4.3 | 11.9 | 18.7 | 11.9 |
| 6 | Life estate | 28,308 | . 7 | - | - | 2.8 | . 8 | . 8 |
|  | Contract | 22,001 | 2.0 | - | 1.7 | - | - | . 7 |
|  | Mortgaged | 807,282 | 27.6 | 43.7 | 31.7 | 5.5 | 2.3 | 24.0 |
|  | Fully owned | 1,926,879 | 59.0 | 41.3 | 20.6 | 65.6 | 91.5 | 57.3 |
|  | Partnerships | 636,047 | 8.7 | 12.0 | 46.1 | 28.4 | 20.5 | 18.9 |

APPENDIX TABLE 5 (Continued)

| Area | Method of Holding | A11 Land | Operator |  | Landlord |  |  | Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non- |  |
|  |  |  | Full | Part | Part | Ful1 | Operator |  |
| 7a | Life estate | 179,386 | - | 8.9 | - | 3.8 | 4.7 | 2.9 |
|  | Contract | 16,761 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | . 3 |
|  | Mortgaged | 861,185 | 30.5 | 7.9 | 20.7 | . 7 | 2.9 | 13.9 |
|  | Fully owned | 3,899,832 | 32.4 | 58.4 | 73.7 | 76.9 | 74.6 | 62.9 |
|  | Partnerships | 1,217,073 | 32.1 | 22.2 | 4.3 | 23.0 | 16.2 | 19.6 |
| 7b | Life estate | 38,062 | . 8 | - | - | 18.1 | - | 2.2 |
|  | Contract | 10,080 | . 3 | 5.0 | - | - | - | . 6 |
|  | Mortgaged | 241, 130 | 28.6 | 27.4 | . 4 | 1.7 | 15.2 | 14.1 |
|  | Fully owned | 1, 208,849 | 54.6 | 57.2 | 86.9 | 78.6 | 67.4 | 70.5 |
|  | Partnerships | 193,439 | 12.9 | 7.8 | 12.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 11.3 |
| 8a | Life estate | $42,786$ | - | - | - | 7.4 | 3.0 | 2.2 |
|  | Contract | $4,874$ | . 7 | - | - | - | - | . 2 |
|  | Mortgaged | 508,671 | 43.1 | 28.3 | 13.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 | 26.0 |
|  | Fully owned | 958, 009 | 47.0 | 44.6 | 49.6 | 58.2 | 45.1 | 48.9 |
|  | Partnerships | 292,437 | 4.7 | 14.2 | 37.2 | 24.9 | 19.2 | 14.9 |
| 8b | Life estate | 26,679 | . 3 | 11.9 | - | - | 7.3 | 2.5 |
|  | Contract | 16,707 | 1.3 | - | - | - | 6.4 | 1.6 |
|  | Mortgaged | 221,005 | 14.6 | 31.8 | - | 28.4 | 41.7 | 20.6 |
|  | Fully owned | 662,649 | 74.8 | 26.3 | - | 71.6 | 13.3 | 61.8 |
|  | Partnerships | 61,086 | 2.9 | 1.1 | - | - | 33.1 | 5.7 |
| 9 | Life estate | 56,662 | . 9 | - | 14.2 | - | - | 1.7 |
|  | Contract | 6,296 | - | 2.0 | - | - | - | . 2 |
|  | Mortgaged | 728,919 | 20.2 | 45.9 | 44.6 | 3.2 | 15.7 | 22.3 |
|  | Fully owned | $1,828,885$ | 67.6 | 46.6 | 27.6 | 61.2 | 31.4 | 56.0 |
|  | Partnerships | 402,571 | 7.3 | - | 13.7 | 35.1 | 22.4 | 12.3 |
| State | Life estate | $1,041,985^{a}$ | 1.6 |  | 1.6 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 2.8 |
|  | Contract | 348,808 | . 9 | 1.4 | . 7 | . 9 | . 3 | . 9 |
|  | Mortgaged | 7,664,957 | 27.7 | 31.6 | 19.6 | 7.7 | 9.2 | 20.4 |
|  | Fully owned | 22,759,839 | 55.3 | 51.5 | 59.1 | 63.1 | 66.9 | 58.5 |
|  | Partnerships | 5,265, 142 | 10.5 | 9.0 | 12.2 | 25.5 | 15.1 | 14.1 |

[^21]
## APPENDIX TABLE 6. FARM AND RANCH LAND BY TENURE, AMOUNT AND VALUE BY MORTGAGE STATUS, AND RATIO OF MORTGAGE DEBT TO VALUE OF MORTGAGED LAND, OKLAHOMA, 1958

|  |  |  | Owner-Operator | Non- <br> Operator <br> Landlord |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Percent of Land Owned Without Mortgage

| 1 | 73.1 | 68.6 | 88.9 | 94.8 | 91.7 | 81.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 66.8 | 50.6 | 49.6 | 87.1 | 93.6 | 72.9 |
| 3 | 69.6 | 83.8 | 98.0 | 79.5 | 80.0 | 80.6 |
| 4 | 66.1 | 47.8 | 70.6 | 81.4 | 84.1 | 67.7 |
| 5 | 86.7 | 78.3 | 96.3 | 88.0 | 95.0 | 88.9 |
| 6 | 72.4 | 56.3 | 68.4 | 94.5 | 97.7 | 76.0 |
| 7a | 69.5 | 92.1 | 79.3 | 99.3 | 97.1 | 86.1 |
| 7b | 71.4 | 72.6 | 99.6 | 98.3 | 84.4 | 85.9 |
| 8a | 56.9 | 71.7 | 86.8 | 91.0 | 88.7 | 74.0 |
| 8b | 85.4 | 68.2 | - | 71.6 | 58.3 | 79.4 |
| 9 | 79.8 | 54.1 | 55.4 | 96.8 | 84.3 | 77.7 |
| State | 72.3 | 68.3 | 80.4 | 92.3 | 90.8 | 83.7 |

## Percent of Value of Land Without Mortgage

| 1 | 49.1 | 41.7 | 47.0 | 78.4 | 86.0 | 58.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 54.3 | 37.7 | 45.4 | 79.2 | 80.0 | 62.1 |
| 3 | 49.4 | 63.2 | 90.6 | 63.4 | 62.9 | 61.7 |
| 4 | 48.5 | 41.9 | 33.8 | 50.4 | 76.7 | 51.7 |
| 5 | 66.1 | 59.0 | 66.4 | 58.5 | 88.1 | 67.2 |
| 6 | 63.8 | 24.3 | 23.3 | 89.6 | 97.1 | 60.9 |
| $7 a$ | 33.5 | 89.2 | 56.0 | 98.1 | 92.5 | 71.7 |
| 7 a | 42.3 | 36.4 | 42.0 | 26.4 | 97.5 | 42.4 |
| 8a | 32.8 | 58.5 | 49.3 | 37.9 | 65.2 | 46.1 |
| 8b | 80.6 | 65.2 | - | 55.2 | 61.8 | 73.6 |
| 9 | 73.5 | 44.1 | 10.4 | 96.7 | 41.7 | 65.5 |
| State | 54.0 | 51.0 | 48.8 | 72.0 | 80.0 | 60.5 |

## Ratio of Mortgage Debt to Value of Mortgaged Land

| 1 | .221 | .206 | .105 | .101 | .184 | .191 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | .216 | .311 | .237 | .153 | .167 | .237 |
| 3 | .330 | .212 | .203 | .221 | .180 | .248 |
| 4 | .245 | .248 | .197 | .154 | .175 | .220 |
| 5 | .237 | .217 | .083 | .217 | .237 | .215 |
| 6 | .277 | .158 | .443 | .242 | .222 | .230 |
| 7 a | .201 | .273 | .157 | .186 | .357 | .196 |
| 7 b | .291 | .194 | .053 | .058 | .934 | .171 |
| 8 a | .317 | .207 | .197 | .089 | .264 | .237 |
| 8 b | .346 | .240 | - | .144 | .278 | .283 |
| 9 | .237 | .319 | .100 | .101 | .243 | .225 |
| State | .253 | .232 | .175 | .153 | .198 | .219 |

appendix table 7. average size of ownership units of farm and ranch land by type, occupation, age, and TENURE OF OWNER AND BY ECONOMIC AREA, ORLAHOMA, 1958

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 73 | 7 b | $8{ }_{8}$ | $8{ }^{6}$ | 9 | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenure: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-Owner | 462.7 | 283.0 | 128.7 | 246.8 | 181.3 | 202.9 | 385.6 | 217.6 | 220.1 | 156.3 | 312.8 | 248.5 |
| Part-Owner | 553.5 | 242.5 | 512.1 | 249.5 | 306.2 | 642.5 | 593.0 | 257.2 | 197.8 | 175.5 | 254.7 | 377.0 |
| Operator Landlord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-Owner | 744.4 | 804.1 | 872.8 | 398.5 | 1,203.5 | 1,428.3 | 2,433.0 | 3,678.8 | 397.2 | - | 1,047.3 | 1,153.0 |
| Part-Owner | 1,000.3 | 525.5 | 267.9 | 380.2 | 358.7 | 710.2 | 1,892.1 | 444.6 | 465.3 | 167.1 | 433.5 | 610.0 |
| Landlord | 393.0 | 285.0 | 211.6 | 290.8 | 232.4 | 476.7 | 292.1 | 238.8 | 236.2 | 198.2 | 345.0 | 303.2 |
| Type of Owner: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Man | 419.0 | 280.7 | 328.5 | 387.4 | 230.2 | 589.9 | 759.4 | 253.1 | 194.8 | 74.3 | 174.9 | 347.2 |
| Single Woman | 488.2 | 316.3 | 199.7 | 204.2 | 212.8 | 232.2 | 124.0 | 238.8 | 91.9 | 25.0 | 344.0 | 271.9 |
| Husband-Wife | 480.6 | 338.8 | 201.5 | 263.0 | 314.1 | 395.7 | 708.4 | 327.1 | 230.7 | 164.1 | 345.8 | 342.0 |
| Partnership of Individuals | 690.7 | 348, 2 | 402.9 | 223.8 | 237.1 | 780.9 | 1,309.1 | 360.3 | 337.7 | 238.0 | 426.0 | 494.7 |
| Man \& Pror. of Indiv. | 635.0 | 320.0 | 399.5 | 480.0 | 400.0 | - | 463.5 | 120.0 | 1,000.0 | 79.0 | 980.0 | 459.7 |
| Woman \& Ptrir. of Indiv. | 400.0 | 640.0 | 55.0 | 160.0 | 640.0 | - ${ }^{-}$ | - | - | 439.3 | 151.0 | - | 369.0 |
| Husband-Wife \& Ptnr. of Indiv. | 2,318.5 | 640.3 | 1,723.2 | 497.1 | 339.5 | 1,224.7 | 1,515.3 | 3,013.8 | 572.1 | 226.7 | 285.7 | 1,131.1 |
| Indiv., but Type Unknown | 464.4 | 353.2 | 192.0 | 299.0 | 269.9 | 202.8 | 312.9 | 242.3 | 255.6 | 176.9 | 275.0 | 289.2 |
| Age of Owner: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corporation \& Institution | 376.7 | 160.0 | 890.0 | 716.0 | 351.0 | - | 20,485.0 | - | - ${ }^{-}$ | - | 3,164.0 | - |
| Under 24 Years | 15.0 | 960.0 | 80.0 | 160.0 | 41.7 | 40.0 | - | - | 768.0 | - | - | 310.8 |
| 25-34 Years | 294.3 | 207.4 | 61.8 | 166.8 | 113.8 | 145.8 | 880.8 | 400.0 | 599.9 | 133.7 | 175.5 | 283.9 |
| 35-44 Years | 459.4 | 222.5 | 258.8 | 222.0 | 164.5 | 464.8 | 871.0 | 231.2 | 149.6 | 129.5 | 259.6 | 301.8 |
| 45-54 Years | 472.9 | 438.8 | 318.2 | 273.7 | 246.1 | 392.5 | 488.2 | 302.1 | 289.2 | 129.3 | 431.4 | 355.6 |
| 55-64 Years | 780.3 | 379.6 | 188.0 | 269.1 | 283.6 | 574.2 | 511.4 | 729.5 | 189.2 | 195.3 | 388.9 | 411.0 |
| 65-74 Years | 485.8 | 278.6 | 245.8 | 374.3 | 302.0 | 295.7 | 405.1 | 238.4 | 281.6 | 197.3 | 232.2 | 318.5 |
| 75 Years and Over | 535.3 | 369.9 | 267.5 | 367.4 | 630.2 | 371.8 | 1,890.6 | 245.1 | 184.1 | 150.0 | 322.9 | 495.4 |
| Age Unknown | 160.0 | 283.0 | 131.5 | 170.0 | 160.0 | 276.2 | 399.0 | 235.0 | 293.3 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 227.2 |
| Occupation of Owner: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonretired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farmer | 618.1 | 390.1 | 380.5 | 284.7 | 322.1 | 474.3 | 675.9 | 413.0 | 323.1 | 169.5 | 443.6 | 421.4 |
| Housewife | 582.5 | 310.3 | 387.0 | 200.8 | 208.1 | 182.8 | 450.5 | 145.4 | 128.6 | 26.7 | 108.0 | 288.0 |
| Business or Professional | 620.9 | 261.3 | 326.0 | 343.2 | 280.3 | 853.5 | 947.9 | 387.7 | 314.1 | 180.7 | 425.4 | 463.5 |
| Other | 334.1 | 250.4 | 137.5 | 170.8 | 147.0 | 440.8 | 888.6 | 515.1 | 167.5 | 142.1 | 251.9 | 285.9 |
| Unknown | 413.8 | 220.0 | 152.1 | 417.7 | 225.6 | 111.9 | 105.0 | 138.3 | 153.8 | 265.8 | 140.4 | 232.9 |
| Retired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farmer | 490.8 | 414.4 | 169.1 | 318.2 | 318.2 | 140.8 | 145.3 | 48.5 | 140.8 | 137.0 | 206.7 | 290.5 |
| Nonfarmer | 479.4 | 296.6 | 177.6 | 361.2 | 211.9 | 335.8 | 544.1 | 385.0 | 311.2 | 238.9 | 122.4 | 307.0 |
| Unknown | 357.9 | 299.4 | 47.7 | 352.9 | 761.9 | 144.0 | 310.0 | 47.0 | 125.4 | 66.0 | 91.9 | 290.1 |
| No Response | 279.7 | 251.6 | 128.8 | 240.0 | 244.9 | 301.9 | 133.4 | 179.5 | 218.3 | 236.2 | 176.2 | 219.5 |

APPENDIX TABLE 8. PERCENT DISTRTBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCH LAND, AMOUNT AND VALUE OF LAND OWNED BY AGE, OKLAHOMA, 1958


Percent of Land Owned

| 1 | .6 | 0 | 2.0 | 12.2 | 23.3 | 35.2 | 16.1 | 10.4 | .2 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | .1 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 29.3 | 28.5 | 16.9 | 11.7 | 1.8 |
| 3 | 3.1 | .1 | .9 | 20.3 | 36.0 | 14.8 | 17.3 | 6.2 | 1.5 |
| 4 | .9 | .2 | 3.3 | 14.0 | 29.4 | 23.9 | 19.1 | 8.8 | .7 |
| 5 | 1.2 | .1 | 1.0 | 7.2 | 20.7 | 25.8 | 22.7 | 20.9 | .3 |
| 6 | - | 0 | 2.1 | 17.8 | 23.6 | 37.3 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 1.5 |
| 7 a | 12.7 | - | 5.6 | 13.6 | 20.5 | 16.5 | 9.4 | 20.0 | 1.3 |
| 7 b | - | - | 2.4 | 13.9 | 26.4 | 44.6 | 9.0 | 3.4 | .5 |
| 8 a | - | 1.1 | 12.4 | 9.1 | 35.4 | 15.4 | 17.4 | 8.1 | 1.2 |
| 8 b | - | - | 4.1 | 13.8 | 14.3 | 45.5 | 18.3 | 4.0 | .1 |
| 9 | 4.3 | 0 | 3.6 | 14.8 | 34.6 | 25.4 | 12.4 | 4.8 | 0 |
| State | 1.9 | .3 | 3.5 | 12.5 | 26.1 | 27.1 | 14.7 | 13.2 | .7 |

Percent of Owners

| 1 | .8 | .3 | 3.6 | 14.5 | 26.9 | 24.5 | 18.1 | 10.6 | .8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | .3 | .6 | 5.0 | 10.9 | 23.1 | 26.0 | 21.0 | 11.0 | 2.2 |
| 3 | .7 | .3 | 3.4 | 20.2 | 29.1 | 20.2 | 17.5 | 5.8 | 2.7 |
| 4 | .3 | .3 | 5.4 | 17.4 | 30.0 | 24.7 | 14.1 | 6.6 | 1.2 |
| 5 | .9 | .9 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 24.6 | 26.7 | 21.3 | 9.7 | .6 |
| 6 | - | .4 | 6.2 | 16.2 | 25.0 | 27.3 | 12.7 | 10.0 | 2.3 |
| 7 a | .5 | - | 5.2 | 11.8 | 31.6 | 24.5 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 2.4 |
| 7 b | - | .- | 2.3 | 19.2 | 33.8 | 23.8 | 14.6 | 5.4 | .8 |
| 8 a | - | .3 | 5.2 | 15.0 | 31.1 | 20.6 | 15.7 | 10.8 | 1.0 |
| 8 b | - | - | 5.6 | 19.0 | 19.8 | 33.3 | 16.6 | 4.8 | .8 |
| 9 | .5 | - | 7.0 | 19.2 | 27.7 | 22.1 | 17.8 | 5.2 | .5 |
| State | .4 | .4 | 4.7 | 15.7 | 27.5 | 24.3 | 17.2 | 8.5 | 1.5 |

## Percent of Value of Land Owned

| 1 | .8 | 0 | 2.0 | 15.0 | 31.2 | 23.7 | 14.9 | 12.4 | .3 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | .1 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 8.4 | 25.8 | 30.9 | 17.4 | 11.5 | 1.2 |
| 3 | 0 | .4 | 2.0 | 23.8 | 33.2 | 16.1 | 17.3 | 15.2 | .2 |
| 4 | .7 | .3 | 3.8 | 18.8 | 29.0 | 21.3 | 19.1 | 6.5 | .7 |
| 5 | .8 | .2 | 1.3 | 10.8 | 29.7 | 28.6 | 21.6 | 7.0 | .2 |
| 6 | - | .1 | 2.9 | 18.9 | 31.1 | 26.0 | 8.2 | 11.9 | .9 |
| 7 a | 4.0 | - | 12.6 | 8.5 | 26.5 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 21.0 | .8 |
| 7 b | - | - | 5.8 | 12.5 | 28.6 | 43.4 | 6.9 | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| 8 a | - | - | 19.0 | 9.6 | 38.4 | 13.5 | 12.0 | 7.5 | - |
| 8 b | - | - | 5.3 | 15.3 | 13.4 | 51.7 | 10.5 | 2.8 | .9 |
| 9 | 2.6 | - | 3.6 | 15.5 | 32.5 | 34.7 | 10.2 | 2.8 | .4 |
| State | .8 | .3 | 5.1 | 13.8 | 29.7 | 34.9 | 14.7 | 9.9 | .8 |

APPENDIX TABLE 9. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERS OF FARM AND RANCI LAND, BY METHOD OF HOLDING LAND, OKLAHOMA, 1958

| Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Life } \\ \text { Estate } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Purchase Contract | Mortgaged | Fully Owned | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Partner- } \\ \text { ships } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6.0 | . 9 | 18.2 | 55.1 | 15.8 |
| 2 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 27.1 | 57.5 | 10.1 |
| 3 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 19.4 | 61.3 | 12.8 |
| 4 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 32.3 | 53.5 | 7.4 |
| 5 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 11.1 | 66.1 | 11.9 |
| 6 | . 8 | . 7 | 24.0 | 57.3 | 18.9 |
| 7 a | 2.9 | . 3 | 13.9 | 62.9 | 19.6 |
| 7b | 2.2 | . 6 | 14.1 | 70.4 | 11.3 |
| 8 a | 2.2 | . 2 | 26.0 | 48.9 | 14.9 |
| 8 b | 2.5 | 1.6 | 20.6 | 61.8 | 5.7 |
| 9 | 1.7 | . 2 | 22.3 | 56.0 | 12.3 |
| State | 2.8 | . 9 | 20.4 | 58.5 | 14.1 |
| Owners |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 7.0 | 1.4 | 25.9 | 55.2 | 10.4 |
| 2 | 3.9 | . 8 | 29.2 | 54.3 | 11.8 |
| 3 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 30.5 | 55.9 | 8.9 |
| 4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 37.5 | 51.1 | 8.1 |
| 5 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 16.3 | 63.7 | 14.1 |
| 6 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 17.1 | 62.5 | 14.9 |
| 7 a | 2.1 | . 9 | 18.0 | 65.2 | 13.7 |
| 7b | 2.7 | 1.4 | 21.8 | 61.2 | 12.9 |
| 8 a | 1.3 | 1.0 | 23.4 | 62.2 | 12.2 |
| 8b | 3.3 | 2.5 | 26.4 | 62.0 | 5.8 |
| 9 | 2.3 | . 9 | 17.3 | 69.5 | 10.5 |
| State | 3.4 | 1.4 | 24.6 | 59.3 | 11.3 |

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE agricultural research service <br> GREAT PLAINS STATES LAND OWNERSHIP SURVEY

## INSTRUCTIONS: •

1. Report the sotal acres of ALL land in which you have an interest. This includes land held by sole ounership and land held in estates, life estates, purchase contracts or partnerships. (For example, if you own $1 / 4$ interest in 6.10 acres, report land owned as 640 acres, NOT 160 acres.)
2. Wife and husband should repori all land as ONE ou'ner:
3. Corporation or Institution: Person reporting should report corporation land only, not ineluding any personally outned land if it is not in the corporation.
Read all the questions and instruetions carefully, answering all the appropriate questions. If your answer to any question is "None" place an " $X$ " in the box marked "None."

SECTION A: THIS SECTION DEALS WITH THE TOTAL LAND YOU OWN IN NEBRASKA.

1. How many acres of land do you own in Nebraska?
. (acuey
a. Of these, how many acres are in farm or ranch land? (fuclude not only crop tand but also pastare land, wood land, wastc land, etc.).
b. How many actes are not in farm or ranch land? (Imelude commercial forest, used ior producing timber or fimber products industrial or recreational
 $\qquad$ None [] $]^{-x}$
e. Nane all the counties in which you own land in Nebraska. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\qquad$

SECTION B: YOUR FARM OR RANCH LAND IN NEBRASKA.
This Sction deals with the land you identifled above (Qucstion la) as farm or tanch land. If you answered "Nome" to Question la, skip this Section, 00 ta Section $C$ and continue from there,
2. During 1957, how much of your farm or ranch tand was used mainly as:
a. Cropland $\qquad$
AClles) _
$\qquad$ None $\square_{\square}{ }^{+}$
b. Grazing land, permanent or pastured woodland $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
e. Othey farmland (iroodland not pastured, farmstead, waste, etc.) ................(acнes) $\qquad$ None []$^{-}$

Tolal (should agrec with Question Ia). . . . . . . . . . . . . . . (acнев) $\qquad$
3. Do you have any bulldings on your farm or ranch land?.............................. Ye $\qquad$ $-1 \mathrm{No}$ $\qquad$ 2. (14)

If "YES," how much do you estimate your farm or ranch land would sel for, inciuding buildings? . $\$$ $\qquad$
What do you estimate your land would sell for if there were no buildings? $\qquad$
If "NO," how much do you estimate your farm or ranch land would sell for? . \$ $\qquad$
4. How much mortgage debt do you owe on the farm or ranch land you own in this state? $\qquad$ None $\square$

9. Of all the farm or ranch land you own in this state, was any placed in the 1957 Soil Bank Program?
es
$\qquad$ No. -2 ( 18 (47-52) (Acher) $\qquad$ (53-58)

SECTION C: LAND YOU OWN IN NEBRASKA THAT IS NOT FARM OR RANCH LAND.
This Section deals with land you oun in Nebraska that is not farm or ranch land. It is the land you listed in an. swer to O*estion 16. If your answer to Question 16 was "None," skip this Section and proceed to Section D.
10. a. Is any of this land in Commercial Forest (land not in a farm or ranch that is used for production of timber or timber products)...................................... $\qquad$ $-1 \mathrm{No}$ $\qquad$ -2 (7)

If "YES": The number of acres and estimated sale value of forest land. . . . . (acnes)__ \$___ (8-1s)
b. Is any of this land in a town or city? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes -1 N $\qquad$ (14-10)

If "YES": Estimated sale value (inchuding buildings, if any) $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ (LOTs) $\qquad$
c. Is any of this land outside of fown or cify, used for some purpose other than farming, ranching or commercial forest?:..................................... Yes $\qquad$ ${ }^{-1} \mathrm{No}$ $\qquad$ -2 (27)
If "YES," explain $\qquad$ land (including buildings, if any)?..............................................s. $\qquad$ $\$$ $\qquad$

SECTION D: YOUR MINERAL RIGHTS IN ALL LAND IN NEBRASKA.
11. Do you own all mineral rights (oil, gas, coal rights, etc.) on your farm, ranch,
and other land in this state? . . . ............................................................................ Don't Know._-
ptrcent
Acres
If "NO," what percent do you own? On how many acres? $\square$
$\qquad$
If "YES," how many acres were placed in the acreage reserve? . . . . . . . . . . . . How many acres were placed in the conservation reserve?.......

> What is the number of acres and estimated sale value of this
. . . . . . (42-47)

SECTION E: LAND YOU OWN IN STATES OTHER THAN NEBRASKA.
In this Section we are intercsted in anv land you might own in states other than Nebraska.


## SECIION F: ABOUT THE BANDOWNER

And now some generai informaiom: Individuods or Parlnerships answer Questions 16-24; Corporations or Institutions answer only Question 25.


> Chech here $\square$ if you would like a copy of the findings of this survey. BUDGET BUREAU \#40-5734-1-Approval Expires June 30, 1958

General Comments:
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Ownership in the Great Plains States, 1958, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 261, Preface.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Randall T. Klemme, "Some Facts Concerning the Ownership of Land in Oklahoma", Current Farm Economics, Vol. 13, No. 1 and 2 (February-April, 1940), pp. 15-21.
    ${ }^{3}$ The definition of area used in the study by Klemme is not the same as an economic area as used here.

[^2]:    A full description of the sampling and survey methods used in the Great Plains survey is given by the Agricultural Research Service in Bulletin No. 261.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Ibid., p. 3.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid., p. 5.
    ${ }^{4}$ A questionnaire designed by the Agricultural Research Service to give the information desired from the survey.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Ibid., p. 5.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ The weighting procedure is discussed in detail on page 6 of Land Ownership in the Great Plains States, 1958, Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 261, Preface.
    $7_{\text {Economic areas (Figure 2) are the areas that have different influences }}$ upon agricultural production. These influences include topography, climate, soil and rainfall.
    ${ }^{8}$ For complete details of nonrespondent bias survey made see Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin No. 261, pp. 7-9.

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ A full description of the sampling and survey methods used in the Great Plains survey is given by the Agricultural Research Service in Bulletin No. 261. This bulletin fully describes the procedures and methods used in obtaining the data.

    10
    See Appendix.

[^7]:    ${ }^{11}$ These graphs are based on an idea of H. O. Hartley, and developed by Scott Krane, of the Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State University.

    12 The computations for the nomograms were based on a random sample, of which the survey was conducted on a stratified cluster sample. This difference will tend to make the nomograms optimistic; that is, a signif. icant difference may be indicated when in fact one may not exist. A more complete explanation of the use of the nomogram is shown in the Appendix. 13

    Example of wse, Appendix.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Partnerships are considered an individual type of ownership since each member of the partnership is subject to complete liability.

[^9]:    2The owners indicated on the questionnaire that they were individial owners, but did not indicate what type of individual owners.

[^10]:    3 There is no implication here that the type of agriculture has influenced the type of ownership since the difference is not significant, but it does illustrate where the two areas are that have the highest and lowest percentages of man and wife as owners.
    ${ }^{4}$ In single men and single women owner groups were widowers and widows and the female sex had a longer life expectancy.

[^11]:    ${ }^{5}$ This is one type of owner; husband and wife as joint owners with a third party as the second member of the partnership.

[^12]:    ${ }^{6}$ This varies widely from the separation found by E. D. Davidsor and L. A. Parcher in The Influences of Mineral Rights on Transfers of Fara Real Estate in Oklahoms, Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletia B-278, February, 1944, Stillwater, Oklahoma, and "Some Factors Associsted with Separate Ownership of Mineral Rights", L. A. Parcher, Oklahome Carremt Farm Economics, Fol. 23, No. 5, October, 1950.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by tabulating the sum of the expanded economic area totals.

[^14]:    ${ }^{3}$ No significant difference at the 90 percent level, nomogram, Appendix.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Inheritance might have been broken down further into inheritance of full interest, inheritance of part interest and inheritance of part interest without purchasing the balance. This breakdown is shown in Table 19. However, all degrees of inheritance are discussed simply as acquisition by inheritance.

[^16]:    ${ }^{2}$ Total of percentage of land acquired through all degrees of inheritance (Table 19).

[^17]:    ${ }^{3}$ Outstanding mineral rights are ignored for the purpose of this discussion.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land owned by corporations alone would even be smaller since privately owned institutional land is included.

[^19]:    ${ }^{2}$ Any type of holding that had a mortgage debt against the land was listed as mortgaged.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ These factors are the reciprocal of the expansion factors used to expand the survey data to total estimates.

[^21]:    ${ }^{a}$ The sum of the acres of the methods of holding does not equal area total - not all areas were reported.

