

LEASING PATTERNS AND LANDLORD-TENANT RELATIONSHIPS
BY SELECTED TENURE STATUS GROUPS IN SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA

By

KENNETH LEWIS HOBSON

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1948

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

1951

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
MAY 9 1951

LEASING PATTERNS AND LANDLORD-TENANT RELATIONSHIPS
BY SELECTED TENURE STATUS GROUPS IN SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA

KENNETH LEWIS HORDON

MASTER OF SCIENCE

1950

THESIS AND ABSTRACT APPROVED:

Robert L. Tontz

Thesis Adviser

W. P. Slack

Faculty Representative

A. C. McIntosh

Dean of the Graduate School

273802

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the Department of Agricultural Economics and its Head, Dr. Peter Nelson, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, for the opportunity and assistance in making this study possible.

Special recognition and thanks are due Mr. Robert L. Tontz, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, for the considerate assistance and helpful advice which he contributed. Thanks are due Mr. K. C. Davis, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, for his supervision and assistance during the inception of this study and Mr. John D. Campbell, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, for his able advice and suggestions.

Appreciation is also expressed to Mrs. Mary Jo Hobson for her assistance in preparing and typing the manuscript.

K. L. N.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| A. Problem..... | 1 |
| B. Method and Scope of Study..... | 1 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 7 |
| III. LEASING CHARACTERISTICS..... | 11 |
| A. Patterns..... | 11 |
| B. Landlord-Tenant Relationships..... | 16 |
| IV. SUMMARY..... | 36 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 42 |
| APPENDIX..... | 43 |

TABLES

| NUMBER | | PAGE |
|--------|---|------|
| 1 | Tenure of Farm Operators and Percentage of Land Under Lease by Selected Type of Farming Areas in Oklahoma, 1945..... | 3 |
| 2 | Tenure of Farm Operators and Percentage Distribution of Sample Pertaining to Present Study by Selected Type of Farming Areas..... | 4 |
| 3 | Method of Rental Payment in Selected Tenure Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease..... | 12 |
| 4 | Type of Landlord of Single Unit Rented Farms, by Form and Length of Lease Groups..... | 13 |
| 5 | Type of Landlord of Major Unit of Multiple Unit Rented Farms by Form and Length of Lease Groups..... | 14 |
| 6 | Type of Landlord of Rented Unit of Part-Owner Farms by Form and Length of Lease Groups, 1949-1950..... | 15 |
| 7 | Kinship of Landlords to Operators in Selected Tenure Status Groups by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950..... | 17 |
| 8 | Kinship to Landlord of Operators in Selected Tenure Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease, 1949-1950..... | 20 |
| 9 | Soil Conservation Requirements in Selected Tenure Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease, 1949-1950..... | 21 |
| 10 | Type of Landlord of Single Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950..... | 23 |
| 11 | Type of Landlord of Main Unit of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950..... | 24 |
| 12 | Type of Landlord of Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950..... | 25 |
| 13 | Supervision or Restrictions by the Landlord in Selected Tenure Status Groups by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950..... | 27 |
| 14 | Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Single Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 29 |
| 15 | Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Main Units of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 30 |
| 16 | Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 31 |
| 17 | Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Single Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 32 |

| NUMBER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 18 Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Main Units of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 33 |
| 19 Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950..... | 34 |

CHAPTER I

Introduction

A. Problem. This study is a segment of a larger project undertaken by the Agricultural Economics Department of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College which is entitled "A Study of Farm Lease Contracts."¹ An objective of the project as it applies to the present study is"to secure information pertaining to leasing and leasing practices in order to permit an objective approach to this phase of the tenure problem."

B. Method and Scope of Study. A questionnaire (See Appendix) was prepared to secure information on tenure status, leasing arrangements and practices, and other tenure information from tenant and part-owner operators. A field survey was conducted between March, 1949 and February, 1950 by undergraduate students who received college credit hours for securing a definite number of schedules from farm operators in various counties throughout the state. The students selected the farms in the tenure status groups by their own discretion. They were restricted somewhat in the number of schedules from each county; however, no other restrictions were made as to what tenure status group to select (tenants or part-owners) or where in the county to select the farmers to be interviewed.

In compiling the data, one hundred and eighty-four available schedules were examined and one hundred and fifty-four were selected largely on the basis of completeness. Out of this total, one hundred and thirty-nine tenant schedules and fifteen part-owner schedules from type of farming area six, eleven, and twelve in Southwestern Oklahoma made the schedules for this study.

Because many enumerators who took part in the field survey had little or

¹ Agricultural Economics Department Project No. 588, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater.

no previous training as enumerators except for brief instructions given before starting the survey, there was variation in the completeness of some schedules especially concerning descriptive terms of the lease. Certain similar terms and descriptions of leasing arrangements were interpreted differently by different enumerators. Qualitative descriptions of tenure factors in the material were largely discarded because of the uncertainty of the accuracy of the data. On the whole, this study considers mainly tenure factors of a quantitative nature.

The schedules from tenant operated farms were divided into one hundred and fifteen single unit tenant farms and twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms. Operators on single unit tenant farms have one landlord, while those on multiple unit tenant farms have two or more landlords. Throughout the study, single and multiple unit tenant farms are separated into these different tenure status groups.

In each of the schedules taken, leasing arrangements and other information were secured having to do with the operator and one landlord only. Where the operator had more than one landlord (multiple unit tenant farms), the data included the leasing arrangement between the operator and the landlord who owned the primary or major unit making up the farm.

Various tenure factors taken from the schedules concerning characteristics of the operator and landlord, and leasing arrangements and practices were classified as to single and multiple unit tenant farms and part-owner farms. They were then summarized to discover patterns and relationships that might exist.

Weaknesses in the method of securing data for this study are readily recognized by the writer. The sample can by no means be considered representative of Southwestern Oklahoma. No attempt was made to secure a representative

sample by stratified random sampling or any other method of representative sampling. Also, no attempt was made to secure a certain proportion of farm operators in each tenure status group. The proportion of tenant to part-owner operators in the study is considerably greater than is found in the area as indicated by the agricultural census. The percentage distribution of the tenure of farm operators of the area under study as taken from the 1945 census shows full owners to be 38 percent, part-owners 19 percent, managers .3 percent, and tenants 43 percent of all farm operators in the area (Table 1).

In the present study, the percentage distribution of farms in the different tenure status groups are as follows: no full owners, part-owners 10 percent (Table 2). Full owners and managers were omitted from the survey purposefully since the study is primarily of tenure factors pertaining to leasing.

Recognizing the weaknesses and limitations of the sampling method to the extent that the sample of the farms used cannot be considered a representative sample of the area, there is still believed to be sufficient merit in the study to warrant a summarization of the data. This belief is based on the writer's

Table 1
Tenure of Farm Operators and Percentage of Land Under Lease
by Selected Type of Farming Areas in Oklahoma, 1945*

| Type of: Farming: Farms Area : | Tenure of Operators | | | | Land | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------|------------|-----------|--------------------|----|
| | Number | Full Owner | Managers | Part-Owner | Tenants** | Total: Under Lease | |
| | | Percent | | Percent | Acres | Percent | |
| 6*** | 7,238 | 40 | .3 | 27 | 33 | 2,535,813 | 27 |
| 11**** | 8,767 | 43 | .4 | 17 | 40 | 2,270,999 | 32 |
| 12***** | 18,783 | 35 | .3 | 17 | 47 | 4,146,064 | 40 |
| Total or | | | | | | | |
| Average | 34,788 | 38 | .3 | 19 | 43 | 8,952,876 | 34 |
| Oklahoma | 164,790 | 43 | .4 | 17 | 40 | 36,161,822 | 32 |

* U. S. Census of Agriculture, Vol. 1 Part 25, 1945.

** Including croppers.

*** Includes Blaine, Custer, Dewey and Roger Mills Counties.

**** Includes Becham, Greer, Harmon, Jackson, and Tillman Counties.

***** Includes Caddo, Comanche, Cotton, Grady, Kiowa, Stevens, and Washita Counties.

Table 2
Tenure of Farm Operators and Percentage Distribution
of Sample Pertaining to Present Study by Selected Type of Farming Areas

| Type of Farming Areas | Sample of Farms | Tenure of Farm Operators | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | | Part-Owner | Tenants |
| | | Number | |
| 6 | 28 | 1 | 27 |
| 11 | 21 | 0 | 21 |
| 12 | 105 | 14 | 91 |
| Total or Average | 154 | 15 | 139 |
| | | Percent | |
| 6 | 100 | 4 | 96 |
| 11 | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| 12 | 100 | 13 | 87 |
| Total or Average | 100 | 10 | 90 |

hypothesis that certain situations are regarded as prevaillingly characteristic of leasing by tenure status regardless of the lack of representativeness of the sample. It is the author's desire to indicate the extent of these leasing patterns and landlord-tenant relationships by means of quantified data. In those instances wherein specific leasing characteristics are shown by the sample data to be predominantly true as indicated by the quantified indicators, conclusions of the study presumably would be applicable to a broader area than the farms surveyed.

These Hypothesized Characteristics Are:

Patterns.

1. The oral one year lease is the most prevalent form and length of lease between landlord and tenant.
2. Individuals as landlords are much more prevalent than other types of landlords.

3. The one third and one fourth share method of rental payment or a variation from it is the predominant method of rental payment.²

Landlord-Tenant Relationships

4. The type of landlord, the occupation of the landlord, the method of rental payment, and related or non-related landlord and tenant are factors which have an effect upon the extent to which oral or written leases and the lengths of these leases will prevail in an area.
- a. Landlords actively engaged in farming have oral leases more frequently than have landlords in other occupations.
 - b. Leases by Indian Agencies are written and most are for a period of five years.
 - c. Farms using the one third and one fourth share method of rental payment more often have oral leases. Those using the cash rental method more frequently have written leases.
 - d. Related landlords and tenants usually have oral leases.
5. Farms with written leases have soil conservation requirements specified in their lease more frequently than have farms with oral leases.
6. Factors such as kinship between the landlord and tenant, and type of landlord affect the method of rental payment on farms in the area.
- a. Cash method and one third and one fourth and cash method of rental payment are relatively infrequent among related landlords and tenants.
 - b. Farms leased from Indian Agencies use the cash method of rental payment.
 - c. Related landlords and tenants use unconventional methods of rental payment to a greater extent than do non-related landlords and tenants.

² One third grain and feed crops, one fourth cotton, one half hay and alfalfa seed, one fifth peanuts paid to the landlord as rent are included in the one third and one fourth share crop rental payment.

7. The method of rental payment has an effect upon certain leasing practices carried out.
 - a. Cash rent farms have less restrictions on crops raised or livestock kept specified in the lease or less supervision by the landlord than do farms in other rental groups.
 - b. The operator pays all of the wheat or cotton expenses on farms raising wheat or cotton and having a cash method of rental payment.
 - c. With the one third share method of wheat rental payment, the operator most frequently pays all wheat expenses; however, the landlord sometimes stands such expenses as one third the harvest expenses, one third the transportation expense, or one third the cost of fertilizer material.
 - d. With the one fourth share method of cotton rental payment, the operator most frequently pays all cotton expenses. When the landlord does pay a portion of the cotton expenses, one fourth the ginning expense is a frequent expense charged to him.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

A review of literature of projects or studies from throughout the United States shows that considerable research has been directed toward problems associated with farm tenancy. The tenancy problem was most severe during the years of the depression between 1930 and 1940. The report to the president on tenancy in 1937 focused much attention on the seriousness of the tenancy situation at that time and showed the need for a study into the problem and for specific corrective measures.¹ The great need and awareness of the tenancy problem in the 1930's and the years following brought forth a great deal of research particularly by state agricultural experiment stations. The studies were of a varied nature, some were primarily descriptive and were concerned with presenting a picture of tenancy in this country. Some dealt with the effects on land tenure, describing functions of the landlord and tenant, the situation of the operators, and the agricultural ladder. Other tenure studies were concerned with tracing the effects of tenant farming upon farm management, soil exploitation, rural communities, and scale of living.²

Land tenure research is concerned with the effect of the distribution of man's rights on the use of land, in various forms, on the present and future social economic welfare of the individual and society.³ In a survey of the literature between 1933 and 1941, Ackerman discussed one hundred and two studies dealing with land tenure. Of these studies examined:

1 Report of the President's Committee, Farm Tenancy, (February, 1937)

2 Joseph Ackerman, "Status and Appraisal of Research in Farm Tenancy," Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, (February, 1941), 279.

3 Ackerman, loc. cit.

40 were principally descriptive

16 dealt with the effects on tenure

27 dealt with the effects of tenure

19 dealt almost exclusively with recommendations.

Most of the studies contained an analysis of the tenancy situation based on factual material with their primary objective to analyze the causal factors entering into the problem and to recommend necessary improvements. He found that studies dealing with recommendations suggested proposals for written leases, longer term leases, compensation for unexhausted improvements and disturbances, graduated land tax, and homestead exemptions. It was not the objective of most of the projects on farm leasing to analyze the economic significance of the various lease systems, but simply to outline the provisions in use by landlord and tenant. He suggested that some implication should be given to the economic and social effect upon all parties concerned. Lease studies needed to be directed toward the isolation of factors in renting which produce bad effects.

The most extensive study of the area and general subject of the present study has been the Regional Land Tenure Project completed in 1946.⁴ This regional project covered the five states of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The sampling area in Oklahoma included all of Jackson County and some areas adjacent to Jackson County in Greer, Harmon, and Tillman Counties in type of farming area eleven and Kiowa County in type of farming area twelve. The area of the Oklahoma sample was referred to as Oklahoma Rolling Plain.⁵ The regional study found that:

⁴ Harold Hoffsommer, Editor, The Social and Economic Significance of Land Tenure (Durham: The University of North Carolina Press, 1950).

⁵ Ibid., p. 88.

1. The pattern of the leasing arrangement is largely conditioned by the type of landlord who owns the land. Institutional, non-resident, non-related, and female landlords use the cash method of rental payment and the written lease more often than do other types of landlords. Other types of landlords tend to use an oral, informal arrangement which is typical of folk practices.
2. The great bulk of farmland in the areas surveyed was owned by individual males. Estates accounted for less than 10 percent of all landlords sampled.
3. The written lease showed little or no relationship to the number of years on the rented tract or to measures of soil conservation practices. It was associated with the types of landlords who had formal, contractual relationships with the leases.
4. The third and fourth system of renting, with its variations was the most prevalent method of rental payment in each area sampled. The cash-share variation in the Oklahoma area represented additional cash payments for pasture and dwelling.
5. Renters related to their landlords were younger than other renters and a considerable number of them did not pay conventional rent.⁶

Of two hundred and fourteen leases in the sample area of the Oklahoma Rolling Plain, the distribution of the types of leases were as follows: one year oral leases 39 percent, indefinite oral leases 32 percent, one year written leases 18 percent and written leases over one year 11 percent.⁷ In the distribution of these leases among the various types of landlords, 77 percent of the related individuals had oral leases as compared to 73 percent for non-related individuals. Seventy-five percent and sixty-eight percent of male and female individual landlords respectively had oral leases. Seventy-four percent of estates and 69 percent of institutional landlords had oral leases.⁸

By tabulating the method of crop rental payment by type of lease and also by type of landlord for the leases in the Oklahoma Rolling Plain area it was

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 197-199.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 603.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 574.

determined that 70 percent of the leases were of a one third and one fourth share rental nature. Of these leases that had the one third and one fourth share method, 39 percent had indefinite oral leases, 42 percent had one year oral leases, and 10 percent had one year written leases. Of the 11 percent of leases that had a cash or standing method of crop rental payment, 43 percent were one year oral leases and 35 percent were one year written leases.⁹

Sixty-eight percent of the male landlords and 89 percent of the female landlords used the one third and one fourth share method. Eighty percent of estates and 20 percent of institutions employed this share method.¹⁰

The leasing arrangements and landlord-tenant relationships of leases in the sample areas of the regional study were undifferentiated as to tenure status groups. In the present study, these leasing arrangements and landlord-tenant relationships have been refined into leases from single unit tenant farms, multiple unit tenant farms, and rented units of part-owner farms. The sample area included in the present study is much larger than that in the Oklahoma Rolling Plain sample area. This study covers tenant and part-owner farms in the type of farming areas six, eleven, and twelve which is approximately one fourth of the state of Oklahoma.

⁹ Ibid., p. 604.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 577.

CHAPTER III

Leasing Characteristics

A. Patterns. The oral one year lease is the most prevalent form and length of lease between landlord and tenant. Fifty-eight of the one hundred and fifteen single unit tenant farms or 51 percent have one year oral leases (Table 3). Twenty-nine or 25 percent have one year written leases. Oral indefinite leases and written leases of two years and over among single unit tenant farms are of almost equal frequency. Fifteen and thirteen of the one hundred and fifteen single unit tenant farms or 13 percent and 11 percent have oral indefinite and written leases of two years and over respectively. Twelve or 50 percent of the twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms and eight or 54 percent of the part-owner farms in the study have oral leases of one year duration. According to an Oklahoma statute, the one year oral lease is the only oral lease that is valid or enforceable. Tenants and landlords who enter into an oral agreement for indefinite periods, agree that the lease will continue only as long as no differences arise. Written leases are enforceable for a period of time as designated in the contract.¹

Individuals as landlords are much more prevalent than other types of landlords. Individuals comprise ninety-eight or 87 percent of the landlords of the one hundred and thirteen single unit tenant farms, twenty-two or 92 percent of the landlords of the twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms, and thirteen or 87 percent of the landlords of the fifteen part-owner rented units (Tables 4, 5, and 6). One corporation in the single unit tenant group, Indian Agencies, and estates make up the remainder of the types of landlords.

¹ William J. Coleman and H. Alfred Hockley, Legal Aspects of Landlord-Tenant Relationships in Oklahoma, (Oklahoma Experiment Station Bulletin No. 241, August, 1940), p. 12.

Table 3
Method of Rental Payment in Selected Tenure
Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease

| Form and Length of Lease | Tenure Status Groups | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | Single Unit Rented Farms | | | | Multiple Unit Rented Farms | | | | Part-Owner Farms | | | |
| | :Method of Rental Payment: | | | | :Method of Rental Payment: | | | | :Method of Rental Payment: | | | |
| | :Cash: 1/3 : 1/3 : Other: | | | | :Cash: 1/3 : 1/3 : Other: | | | | :Cash: 1/3 : 1/3 : Other: | | | |
| :Total: : 1/4 : 1/4 : | | | | :Total: : 1/4 : 1/4 : | | | | :Total: : 1/4 : 1/4 : | | | | |
| :Share:&Cash: | | | | :Share:&Cash: | | | | :Share:&Cash: | | | | |
| Number | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 15 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Oral, 1 year | 58 | 12 | 38 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 7 | |
| Written, 1 year | 29 | 19 | 8 | 2 | | 4 | 4 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Written, 2 yrs. & over | 13 | 9 | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| ALL | 115 | 42 | 59 | 8 | 6 | 24 | 3 | 20 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 11 |
| (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 13 | 5 | 19 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 20 | | 13 | | 9 | 100 |
| Oral, 1 year | 51 | 29 | 64 | 62 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 100 | 54 | 33 | 64 | |
| Written, 1 year | 25 | 45 | 14 | 25 | | 17 | 20 | | 13 | | 18 | |
| Written, 2 yrs. & over | 11 | 21 | 3 | | 33 | 16 | 100 | 5 | 20 | 67 | 9 | |
| ALL | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: From field survey conducted between March 1949 and February 1950. See questionnaire, Appendix.

Table 4
Type of Landlord of Single Unit Rented Farms,
by Form and Length of Lease Groups

| Form and Length of Lease | Single Unit Rented Farms | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Active Farmers | Retired Farmers, Widows of Farmers and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers | Corporation | Estate | Agency | Indian |
| | Number | | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 15 | 5 | 7 | | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 56 | 18 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 7 | | | 3 | |
| Written, 1 year | 29 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 5 | | | 2 | 3 |
| Written, 2 yrs. & over | 13 | | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 6 |
| All | 113 | 26 | 43 | 9 | 6 | 14 | | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 100 | 19 | 16 | | | 14 | | 100 | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 100 | 69 | 47 | 44 | 66 | 50 | | | 60 | |
| Written, 1 year | 100 | 12 | 28 | 33 | 17 | 36 | | | 40 | 33 |
| Written, 2 yrs. & over | 100 | | 9 | 22 | 17 | | | | | 67 |
| All | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: From field survey conducted between March 1949 and February 1950. See questionnaire, Appendix.

Table 5
 Type of Landlord of Major Unit of Multiple Unit Rented Farms
 by Form and Length of Lease Groups

| Form and Length of Lease | Multiple Unit Rented Farms | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|------------------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | | |
| | Total: | Active Farmers: | Retired Farmers, Widows of Farmers and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers: | Corporation: | Estate: | Agency Indian |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 4 | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 12 | 3 | 7 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Written, 1 year | 4 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| Written, 2 years and over | 4 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| All | 24 | 3 | 15 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 100 | | 27 | | | | | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 100 | 100 | 47 | 50 | | 50 | | | |
| Written, 1 year | 100 | | 20 | 50 | | | | | |
| Written, 2 years and over | 100 | | 6 | | | 50 | | | 100 |
| All | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | | | 100 |

Source: Field survey conducted between March 1949 and February 1950. See questionnaire, Appendix.

Table 6
 Type of Landlord of Rented Unit of Part-Owner Farms
 by Form and Length of Lease Groups, 1949-1950.

| Form and Length of Lease | Part-Owner Farms | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|--------|------------------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Active Farmers | Retired Farmers Widows of Farmers and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers | Corporation | Estate | Indian Agency |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 8 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Written, 1 year | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Written, 2 years and over | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | 2 |
| All | 15 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 100 | 50 | | | 50 | | | | |
| Oral, 1 year | 100 | 50 | 80 | 100 | | 50 | | | |
| Written, 1 year | 100 | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| Written, 2 years and over | 100 | | 20 | | | | | | 100 |
| All | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | 100 |

The one third and one fourth share method of rental payment or a variation from it is the predominant method of rental payment. With this method of rental payment of the more common crops, the landlord receives one third of the wheat and other grain and feed crops, one fourth of the cotton, one half of the hay and alfalfa seed, and one fifth of the peanuts. The cash method of rental payment is commonly a lump cash payment made to the landlord regardless of the amount of crops produced. The one third and one fourth share and cash method is the regular one third and one fourth method of rental payment, but it includes also a cash payment most frequently as rent for pasture though sometimes as a privilege rent or bonus. Other than conventional methods of rental payment include; one half rental payment on all crops, two fifths rental payment of all crops, fifty-fifty share on livestock and crops, and all returns of one enterprise paid to landlord as rent for entire farm. Of the one hundred and fifteen single unit tenant farms, fifty-nine or 51 percent use the one third and one fourth share method (Table 7). Twenty of the twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms or 83 percent and eleven of the fifteen part-owner farms or 73 percent use the one third and one fourth rental method. Cash rent is paid by forty-two or 37 percent of the single unit tenant farms, three or 13 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms and three or 20 percent of the part-owner farms.

B. Landlord-Tenant Relationships. The type of landlord, the occupation of the landlord, the method of rental payment, and related or non-related landlord and tenant are factors which have an effect upon the extent to which oral or written leases and the lengths of these leases will prevail in an area. Landlords actively engaged in farming have oral leases more frequently than have landlords in other occupations. Twenty-six or 23 percent of the landlords of the one hundred thirteen single unit tenant farms are active farmers.

Table 7
Kinship of Landlords to Operators in Selected Tenure
Status Groups by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950

| Method of Rental Payment | Tenure Status Groups | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----|----|----------------------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|-----|
| | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms | | | Part-Owner Farms | | |
| | Related | | | Related | | | Related | | |
| | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No |
| | Number: | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 42 | 5 | 37 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | | 3 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 59 | 24 | 35 | 20 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 2 | 9 |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 8 | 1 | 7 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Other | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| ALL | 115 | 34 | 81 | 24 | 8 | 16 | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 12 | 88 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | | 100 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 100 | 41 | 59 | 100 | 35 | 65 | 100 | 18 | 82 |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 100 | 12 | 88 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Other | 100 | 67 | 33 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | | 100 |
| ALL | 100 | 30 | 70 | 100 | 33 | 67 | 100 | 13 | 87 |

(Table 4). Of these twenty-six landlords, 88 percent have oral leases. Sixty-three percent of the forty-three landlords in the grouping, retired farmers, widows of farmers, and housewives have oral leases. Sixty-four percent of the fourteen laborers, 44 percent of the nine business men and 66 percent of the six professional men who are landlords have oral leases. Three of the twenty-four major units of multiple unit tenant farms are owned by active farmers (Table 5). All of the three farms have oral leases. Seventy-four percent of the fifteen landlords in the group, retired farmers, widows of farmers and housewives have oral leases. Two of the fifteen rented units of part-owner farms are owned by farmers actively engaged in farming (Table 6). Both of these landlords have oral leases. Eighty percent of the five in the group, retired farmers, widows of farmers, and housewives have oral leases. Among single unit tenant farms, individual landlords in other occupational groups that have oral leases range from 44 percent to 66 percent. Those of multiple unit tenant farms range from 50 percent to 74 percent, while those of part-owner farms range from 50 percent to 100 percent.

Leases by Indian Agencies are written and most are for a period of five years. Of the one hundred and thirteen single unit tenant farms, nine or eight percent are leases from Indian Agencies (Table 4). Two of the twenty-four major units of multiple unit tenant farms or eight percent are rented from Indian Agencies (Table 5). Among rented units of the fifteen part-owner farms, two or 13 percent are leased from Indian Agencies (Table 6). Three of the nine single unit tenant farm leases by Indian Agencies are written for one year. The other six are for five years duration. All of the multiple unit tenant and part-owner farms leased from Indian Agencies are written and for a period of five years.

Farms using the one third and one fourth share method of rental payment

more often have oral leases. Those using the cash rental payment method more frequently have written leases. Among single unit tenant farms, forty-nine of the fifty-nine farms or 83 percent that use the one third and one fourth method of rental payment have oral leases (Table 3). Fifteen of the twenty multiple unit tenant farms or 75 percent with one third and one fourth share rental have oral leases. Seventy-three percent or eight of the eleven part-owner farms with one third and one fourth rental have oral leases. Sixty-six percent or twenty-eight of the forty-two single unit tenant farms with cash rent method have written leases. All of the three multiple unit farms using the cash method of rental payment have written leases. Two of the three part-owner farms with cash rent have written leases.

Related landlords and tenants usually have oral leases. Thirty-four operators of the one hundred fifteen single unit tenant farms, eight operators of the twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms, and two operators of the fifteen part-owner farms, or 30, 33, and 13 percent respectively, are related to their landlords (Table 8). Thirty of the thirty-four or 88 percent of the tenants of single unit tenant farms related to their landlords have oral leases. All related tenants and landlords of multiple unit tenant farms and part-owner farms have oral leases. Most related landlords and tenants who do have written leases are related in a lesser degree such as grandfather-grandson, uncle-nephew, and father-in-law - son-in-law. Congenial relationships between related landlords and tenants are dependent on factors other than the terms of the lease; therefore, they no doubt feel less need for written leases than other groups.

Farms with written leases have soil conservation requirements specified in their lease more frequently than have farms with oral leases. Thirty-one leases of the one hundred fifteen single unit tenant farms or 27 percent have certain soil conservation requirements stipulated in the lease (Table 9).

Table 8
Kinship to Landlord of Operators in Selected Tenure
Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease, 1949-1950

| Form and Length of Lease | Tenure Status Groups | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|-----|
| | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms | | | Part-Owner Farms | | |
| | Related | | | Related | | | Related | | |
| | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 15 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 4 | | 2 | | 2 |
| Oral, 1 year | 58 | 21 | 37 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Written, 1 year | 29 | 1 | 28 | 4 | | 4 | 2 | | 2 |
| Written, 2 years and over | 13 | 3 | 10 | 4 | | 4 | 3 | | 3 |
| All | 115 | 34 | 81 | 24 | 8 | 16 | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 13 | 26 | 7 | 17 | 50 | | 13 | | 15 |
| Oral, 1 year | 51 | 62 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 54 | 100 | 46 |
| Written, 1 year | 25 | 3 | 35 | 17 | | 25 | 13 | | 15 |
| Written, 2 years and over | 11 | 9 | 12 | 16 | | 25 | 20 | | 23 |
| All | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Table 9
Soil Conservation Requirements in Selected Tenure
Status Groups by Form and Length of Lease, 1949-1950

| Form and Length of Lease | Tenure Status Groups | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|
| | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms | | | Part-Owner Farms | | |
| | Soil Conservation Requirements | | | Soil Conservation Requirements | | | Soil Conservation Requirements | | |
| | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 15 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 2 |
| Oral, 1 year | 58 | 12 | 46 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 8 | | 8 |
| Written, 1 year | 29 | 8 | 21 | 4 | | 4 | 2 | | 2 |
| Written, 2 years and over | 13 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| All | 115 | 31 | 84 | 24 | 5 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Oral, indefinite | 100 | 20 | 80 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | | 100 |
| Oral, 1 year | 100 | 21 | 79 | 100 | 25 | 75 | 100 | | 100 |
| Written, 1 year | 100 | 28 | 72 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | | 100 |
| Written, 2 years and over | 100 | 62 | 38 | 100 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 67 | 33 |
| All | 100 | 27 | 73 | 100 | 21 | 79 | 100 | 13 | 87 |

Five of the twenty-four multiple unit tenant farms and two of the fifteen part-owner farms or 21 and 13 percent respectively have soil conservation requirements stated in their leases. Twenty-one percent of the oral leases of single unit tenant farms have soil conservation requirements while 38 percent of the written leases have these requirements specified. Three of sixteen multiple unit tenant farms or 19 percent with oral leases and 25 percent or two of eight farms with written leases have soil conservation requirements specified in the leases. No part-owner farms with oral leases have soil conservation requirements stipulated while two of five part-owner farms or 40 percent with written leases have soil conservation requirements stated.

Factors such as kinship between the landlord and tenant, and type of landlord affect the method of rental payment on farms in the area. Cash method and one third and one fourth share and cash method of rental payment are relatively infrequent among related landlords and tenants. Only five of the thirty-two single unit tenant farms or 16 percent with related landlords and tenants pay cash rent (Table 7). None of the related landlords and tenants of multiple unit tenant farms and part-owner farms pay cash rent or one third and one fourth share and cash rent. On the eight single unit tenant farms that employ the one third and one fourth and cash method only one or 12 percent of the landlords and tenants are related.

Farms leased from Indian Agencies use the cash method of rental payment. The nine single unit tenant farms, two multiple unit tenant farms, and two rented units of part-owner farms which are leased from Indian Agencies use the cash method of rental payment (Tables 10, 11 and 12).

Related landlords and tenants use unconventional methods of rental payment to a greater extent than do non-related landlords and tenants. Other or unconventional methods are infrequent in the study. Only six of the single

Table 10
 Type of Landlord of Single Unit Tenant Farms
 by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950

| Method of Rental Payment | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Active Farmers | Retired Farmers, Widows of Farmers, and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers | Corporation | Estate | Agency | Indian |
| Number | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 42 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 7 | | | 2 | 9 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 57 | 16 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | | 3 | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Other | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | |
| All | 113 | 26 | 43 | 9 | 6 | 14 | 1 | | 5 | 9 |
| (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 17 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 17 | | | 5 | 21 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 100 | 28 | 41 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 2 | | 5 | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 100 | 25 | 38 | 37 | | | | | | |
| Other | 100 | 17 | 67 | 17 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 23 | 39 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 1 | | 4 | 8 |

Table 11
 Type of Landlord of Main Unit of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms
 by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950

| Method of Rental Payment | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Active Farmers | Retired Farmers, Widows of Farmers, and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers | Corporation | Estate | Agency |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 20 | 3 | 14 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Other | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| All | 24 | 3 | 15 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | | | | | 33 | | | 67 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 100 | 15 | 70 | 10 | | 5 | | | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Other | 100 | | 100 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 13 | 62 | 9 | | 8 | | | 8 |

Table 12
 Type of Landlord of Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms
 by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950

| Rental Payment | Part-Owner Farms | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------|---|--------------|------------------|----------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Type of Landlord | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Active Farmers | Retired Farmers, Widows of Farmers and Housewives | Business Men | Professional Men | Laborers | Corporation | Indian Estate Agency |
| | Number | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 3 | | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 11 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Other | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| All | 15 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 2 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | | | | | 33 | | 67 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 100 | 9 | 46 | 27 | 9 | 9 | | |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Other | 100 | 100 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 14 | 33 | 20 | 7 | 13 | | 13 |

unit tenant farms and one each of the multiple unit tenant farms and part-owner farms have rental methods in this classification (Table 7). Of the six single unit tenant farms with atypical methods of rental payment, four or 67 percent are between related landlords and tenants. The small number of cases in the multiple unit and part-owner groups deem them to be unsatisfactory in determining characteristics in this event.

The method of rental payment has an effect upon certain leasing practices carried out. Cash rent farms have less restrictions on crops raised or livestock kept specified in the contract or less supervision by the landlord than do other rental groups. Among the forty-two single unit tenant farms with cash rent, thirty-four or 81 percent have no supervision or restrictions by the landlord (Table 13). Twenty-nine farms or 71 percent with one third and one fourth share rent have no supervision or restrictions imposed by the landlord. Three of the eight farms or 37 percent with one third and one fourth and cash and two of the six farms or 33 percent with non-conventional methods of rental payment have no supervision or restrictions by the landlord. Of the three multiple unit tenant farms with cash rent, two or 67 percent have no supervision by the landlord or restrictions stipulated in the lease. Twelve of the twenty multiple unit tenant farms or 60 percent in this group with the one third and one fourth share rent method are free of supervision or restrictions by the landlord. Of the three part-owner farms with cash method of rental payment, all have no supervision or restrictions by the landlord. Six of eleven part-owner farms or 55 percent with the one third and one fourth share rental method have certain restrictions or supervision by the landlord.

The operator pays all of the wheat or cotton expenses on farms raising wheat or cotton and having a cash method of rental payment. The operator pays all of the wheat expenses of the eleven single unit tenant farms, two multiple

Table 13
 Supervision or Restrictions by the Landlord in Selected Tenure
 Status Groups by Method of Rental Payment Groups, 1949-1950

| Method of Rental Payment | Tenure Status Groups | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|----|--------------------------------|-----|----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|
| | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms | | | Part-Owner Farms | | |
| | Supervision or Restrictions | | | Supervision or Restrictions | | | Supervision or Restrictions | | |
| | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No | Total: | Yes | No |
| | Number | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 42 | 8 | 34 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 3 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 59 | 17 | 42 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 5 |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 8 | 5 | 3 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Other | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| ALL | 115 | 34 | 81 | 24 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 9 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 19 | 81 | 100 | 33 | 67 | 100 | | 100 |
| 1/3-1/4 Share | 100 | 29 | 71 | 100 | 40 | 60 | 100 | 55 | 45 |
| 1/3-1/4 & Cash | 100 | 63 | 37 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Other | 100 | 67 | 33 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | | 100 |
| ALL | 100 | | | 100 | 42 | 58 | 100 | 40 | 60 |

unit tenant farms, and three part-owner farms with cash rent (Tables 14, 15 and 16). Of the twenty-five single unit tenant farms that pay cash rent and produce cotton, the operator pays all cotton expenses (Table 17). The operator also pays the cotton expenses for the one part-owner farm that has a cash method of rental payment (Table 18).

With the one third method of wheat rental payment, the operator most frequently pays all wheat expenses; however, the landlord sometimes stands such expenses as one third the harvest expense, one third the transportation expense, or one third the cost of fertilizer material. The operator pays all the wheat expenses of forty-five of the fifty-seven single unit tenant farms or 79 percent that employ the one third wheat share rental method (Table 14). With ten of the eighteen multiple unit tenant farms or 55 percent with the one third wheat rental method of payment, the operator is required to pay all the wheat expenses (Table 15). The operator pays all the wheat expenses on seven of the ten part-owner rented units or 70 percent with this method of rental payment (Table 16). On 5 percent or three of the fifty-seven single unit tenant farms raising wheat in which one third share is paid to the landlord, the landlord pays one third of the transportation expense. On two or four percent of the farms in this grouping, the landlord has one third the harvest expense and on another two farms the landlord pays for one third of the fertilizer material. The landlord assumes one third of the harvesting and transportation expenses on 16 percent or three of the eighteen multiple unit tenant farms using the one-third wheat share rental method of payment. One third of the harvest expense is paid by the landlord on 11 percent or two of the eighteen farms. On two farms or 20 percent of the ten rented units of part-owner farms in which one third wheat rental is paid, the landlord pays one third of the transportation expense.

Table 14
 Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Single Unit Tenant Farms
 by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| Method of Wheat Rental Payment | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|
| | Total | Operator Pays All | Landlord's Share of Wheat Expenses | | | | Other |
| | | | 1/3 Harvest Expense | 1/3 Trans- portation | 1/3 Harvest, Trans- portation | 1/3 Fertilizer Material | |
| | | | | | | | Number |
| Cash | 11 | 11 | | | | | |
| 1/3 | 57 | 45 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 5* |
| 1/2 | 3 | | | | | | 3** |
| Other | 1 | | | | | | 1*** |
| All | 72 | 56 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 9 |
| (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| 1/3 | 100 | 79 | 4 | 5 | | 4 | 8 |
| 1/2 | 100 | | | | | | 100 |
| Other | 100 | | | | | | 100 |
| All | 100 | 78 | 3 | 4 | | 3 | 12 |

* 1/3 seed, (2) 1/3 seed and 1/3 land preparation, (d) 1/3 harvesting expense and 1/3 fertilizer material, (4) 1/2 harvesting and 1/2 transportation, (5) 1/2 fertilizer material.

** 1/3 seed, (2) 1/2 seed and machinery and supplies, (3) 1/2 of all crop expenses.

*** Landlord receives all of wheat from 65 acres and pays all wheat expenses including labor.

Table 15
Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Main Units of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms
by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| Method of Wheat Rental Payment | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms (Main Units) | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------|
| | Landlord's Share of Wheat Expenses | | | | | | |
| | Total | Operator Pays All | 1/3 Harvest Expense | 1/3 Trans- portation | 1/3 Harvest, Trans- portation | 1/3 Fertilizer Material | Other |
| | Number | | | | | | |
| Cash | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| 1/3 | 18 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1* |
| 1/2 | 1 | | | | | | 1** |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 21 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | (Percent of Total) | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| 1/3 | 100 | 55 | 11 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 6 |
| 1/2 | 100 | | | | | | 100 |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 57 | 10 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 9 |

* 1/4 fertilizer material.

** All harvesting and transportation expenses.

Table 16
 Distribution of Wheat Expenses on Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms
 by Method of Wheat Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| Method of Wheat Rental Payment | Part-Owner Farms (Rented Units) | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | Landlord's Share of Wheat Expenses | | | | | |
| | Total | Operator Pays All | 1/3 Harvest Expense | 1/3 Trans- portation | 1/3 Harvest, Trans- portation | 1/3 Fertilizer Material Other |
| | | | | | | |
| | Number | | | | | |
| Cash | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| 1/3 | 10 | 7 | | 2 | | 1* |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | |
| All | 13 | 10 | | 2 | | 1 |
| (Percent of Total) | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 100 | | | | |
| 1/3 | 100 | 70 | | 20 | | 10 |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 77 | | 15 | | 8 |

* 1/3 harvesting, machinery, supplies and transportation.

Table 17
Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Single Unit Tenant Farms
by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| Method of Cotton Rental Payment | Single Unit Tenant Farms | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------|-------|
| | Total | Operator Pays All | Landlord's Share of Cotton Expenses | | | | | Other |
| | | | 1/4 Ginning | 1/4 Fertilizer Material | 1/4 Fertilizer Ginning | 1/2 Ginning | | |
| | | | | | | | Number | |
| Cash | 25 | 25 | | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 33 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4* | |
| 1/2 | 1 | | | | | | 1** | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | | |
| All | 59 | 42 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | |
| | | | (Percent of Total) | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 100 | | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 100 | 52 | 21 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 12 | |
| 1/2 | 100 | | | | | | 100 | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 71 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | |

* 1/3 fertilizer material, (2) 1/3 ginning, (3) 1/4 ginning and 1/4 transportation, (4) 1/4 ginning and 1/4 transportation.

** 1/2 all crop expense.

Table 18
 Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Main Units of Multiple Unit Tenant Farms
 by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| | | Multiple Unit Tenant Farms (Main Units) | | | | | |
|-----------|-------|---|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|-------|
| | | Landlord's Share of Cotton Expenses | | | | | |
| Method of | | Operator | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | |
| Cotton | Total | Pays All | Ginning | Fertilizer: | Fertilizer: | Ginning | Other |
| Rental | | | | Material | | | |
| Payment | | | | 1/4 | | | |
| | | | | Ginning | | | |
| | | Number | | | | | |
| Cash | 0 | | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 13 | 6 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 13 | 6 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | (Percent of Total) | | | | | |
| Cash | 0 | | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 100 | 48 | 38 | | 7 | 7 | |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 48 | 38 | | 7 | 7 | |

Table 19
Distribution of Cotton Expenses on Rented Units of Part-Owner Farms
by Method of Cotton Rental Payment, 1949-1950

| Method of Cotton Rental Payment | Part-Owner Farms (Rented Units) | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------|-------|
| | Total | Landlord's Share of Cotton Expenses | | | | | |
| | | Operator | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | |
| | | Pays All | Ginning | Fertilizer | Fertilizer | Ginning | Other |
| | | | Material | | | | |
| | | | 1/4 | | | | |
| | | | Ginning | | | | |
| Number | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| (Percent of Total) | | | | | | | |
| Cash | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| 1/4 | 100 | 34 | 33 | | | 33 | |
| 1/2 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | | | | | | |
| All | 100 | 50 | 25 | | | 25 | |

With the one-fourth method of cotton rental payment, the operator most frequently pays all cotton expenses. When the landlord does pay a portion of the cotton expenses, one fourth the ginning cost is a frequent expense charged to him. Of the thirty-three single unit tenant farms raising cotton and paying one fourth share rental, seventeen or 52 percent charge no portion of cotton expenses to the landlord (Table 17). In seven or 21 percent of these farms the landlord pays for one fourth of the ginning of the cotton.² In 48 percent or six of the thirteen multiple unit tenant farms in which the one fourth share is the method of rental payment, the operator stands all the cotton expenses (Table 18). On 38 percent or five of the thirteen farms in this grouping, the landlord pays for one fourth the ginning. Of the three part-owner farms that pay one fourth cotton share rental, the operator pays all on one farm, the landlord pays one fourth the ginning expenses on another farm and the landlord pays one half the ginning expense on the third farm (Table 19). Several other individual farms among the various selected tenure status groups have other methods of distribution of the wheat and cotton expenses apportioned to the landlord and tenant.

² The question has been raised as to whether as large a portion of the operators pay all the ginning expense as was found in this study. It may be that there was some errors in the data when collected on this point.

CHAPTER IV

Summary

This study is a segment of a larger project by the Agricultural Economics Department of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College entitled "A Study of Farm Lease Contracts." An objective of the project as it applies to the present study is...."to secure information pertaining to leasing practices in order to permit an objective approach to this phase of the tenure problem."

A field survey was made in type-of-farming area six, eleven and twelve through the use of a questionnaire. One hundred and eighty-four schedules of tenant and part-owner farms were secured and one hundred and fifty-four used in the study. Due to the nature of the process in securing the sample, it could not be considered a representative sample of the area of Southwestern Oklahoma.

By having a general knowledge of the leasing practices of the area and by an examination of the data collected, certain leasing characteristics appeared evident in the tenure picture in Southwestern Oklahoma. The hypothesis of the study is that certain situations are regarded as prevailing characteristic of leasing by tenure status regardless of lack of representativeness of the sample. It is the author's desire to indicate the extent of these leasing patterns and landlord-tenant relationships by means of quantified data. In those instances wherein specified leasing characteristics are shown by the sample data to be predominantly true as indicated by quantified indicators, conclusions of the study presumably are applicable to a broader area than the farms surveyed.

These Characteristics Are:

Patterns

1. The oral one year lease is the most prevalent form and length of lease

between landlord and tenant.

Fifty-one percent of the single unit tenant farms, 50 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms, and 53 percent of part-owner farms have oral one year leases.

2. Individuals as landlords are much more prevalent than other types of landlords.

Individuals comprise 87 percent, 92 percent, and 87 percent of single unit tenant farms, multiple unit tenant farms, and part-owner farms respectively.

3. The one third and one fourth share method of rental payment or a variation from it is the predominant method of rental payment.

Fifty-one percent of single unit tenant farms, 83 percent of multiple unit tenant farms, and 73 percent of part-owner farms use the one third and one fourth rental method.

Cash rent is the method of rental payment on 37 percent of the single unit tenant farms, 13 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms, and 20 percent of the part-owner farms.

Landlord-Tenant Relationships

4. The type of landlord, the occupation of the landlord, the method of rental payment, and related or non-related landlord and tenant are factors which have an effect upon the extent to which oral or written leases and the lengths of these leases will prevail in an area.

- a. Landlords actively engaged in farming have oral leases more frequently than have landlords in other occupations.

Eighty-eight percent of the active farmers who are landlords of single unit tenant farms have oral leases.

All of the active farmer landlords of multiple unit tenant and part-owner farms have oral leases.

Among single unit tenant farms, individual landlords in other occupational groups that have oral leases range from 44 percent to 66 percent. Those of multiple unit tenant farms range from 50 percent to 74 percent, while those of part-owner farms range from 50 percent for the two farms owned by business men to 100 percent.

- b. Leases by Indian Agencies are written and most are for a period of five years.

Sixty-seven percent of the single unit tenant farms have written leases of five years duration. Thirty-three percent have one year written leases.

All of the multiple unit tenant and part-owner farms leased from Indian Agencies are written and for a period of five years.

- c. Farms using the one third and one fourth share method of rental payment more often have oral leases. Those using the cash rental method more frequently have written leases.

Eighty-three percent of the single unit tenant farms that use the one third and one fourth method of rental payment have oral leases.

Seventy-five percent and 73 percent of multiple unit tenant and part-owner farms respectively, have oral leases.

Sixty-six percent, 100 percent, and 66 percent of the single unit tenant farms, multiple unit tenant farms, and part-owner farms using the cash rental method have written leases.

- d. Related landlords and tenants usually have oral leases.

Eighty-eight percent of the tenants of single unit tenant farms who are related to their landlords have oral leases.

All related tenants and landlords of multiple unit tenant farms and part-owner farms have oral leases.

5. Farms with written leases have soil conservation requirements specified in their lease more frequently than have farms with oral leases.

Thirty-eight percent of the single unit tenant farms, 25 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms, and 40 percent of the part-owner farms with written leases have soil conservation requirements stipulated in the lease; whereas 21 percent of the single unit tenant farms, 19 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms, and none of the part-owner farms with oral leases have soil conservation requirements specified in the lease.

6. Factors such as kinship between the landlord and tenant, and type of landlord affect the method of rental payment on farms in the area.

- a. Cash rent method and one third and one fourth share and cash method of rental payment are relatively infrequent among related landlords and tenants.

Sixteen percent of the operators of single unit tenant farms and none of the operators of multiple unit tenant or part-owner farms who are related to their landlords pay cash rent.

Twelve percent of the operators of single unit tenant farms who are related to their landlords use the one third and one fourth and cash method of rental payment. None of the operators of multiple unit tenant or part-owner farms who are related to their landlords use this method.

- b. Farms leased from Indian Agencies use the cash method of rental payment. In all twelve cases in the status groups, cash rent is charged by Indian Agencies.

- c. Related landlords and tenants use unconventional methods of rental payment to a greater extent than do non-related landlords and tenants.

Other or unconventional methods of rental payment are infrequent in the

study.

Of the six single unit tenant farms with unconventional methods of rental payment, 67 percent are by tenants who are related to their landlords.

There are too few cases in the multiple unit tenant and part-owner status group to show a relationship.

7. The method of rental payment has an effect upon certain leasing practices carried out.

a. Cash rent farms have less restrictions on crops raised or livestock kept specified in the contract or less supervision by the landlord than do other rental groups.

Eighty-one percent of single unit tenant farms with cash rent and 71 percent with one third and one fourth share rent have no supervision or restrictions.

Sixty-seven percent of multiple unit tenant farms with cash rental and 60 percent with one third and one fourth share rent have no supervision or restrictions by the landlord.

None of the part-owner farms with cash rental have supervision or restrictions by the landlord while 55 percent with one third and one fourth share rental have no supervision or restrictions stipulated by the landlord.

b. The operator pays all of the wheat or cotton expenses on farms raising wheat or cotton and having a cash method of rental payment.

On the sixteen farms raising wheat and the twenty-six farms raising cotton that pay cash rent in the various status groups, the operator pays all of the wheat and cotton expenses.

c. With the one third method of wheat rental payment, the operator most

frequently pays all wheat expenses; however, the landlord sometimes stands such expenses as one third the harvest expense, one third the transportation expense, or one third the cost of fertilizer material. On 79 percent, of the single unit tenant farms, 55 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms and 70 percent of the part-owner farms the operator is required to pay all the wheat expense.

- d. With the one-fourth method of cotton rental payment, the operator most frequently pays all cotton expenses. When the landlord does pay a portion of the cotton expenses, one fourth the ginning expense is a frequent expense charged to him.

Fifty-two percent, 48 percent and 33 percent of the landlords of single unit tenant farms, multiple unit tenant farms, and part-owner farms respectively pay no portion of the cotton expenses.

The landlord pays one fourth the ginning expenses on 21 percent of the single unit tenant farms, 38 percent of the multiple unit tenant farms, and 33 percent of the part-owner farms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Joseph. "Status and Appraisal of Research in Farm Tenancy." Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. XXIII (February, 1941), 277-290.
- Baker, J. A. and McNeely, J. G. Land Tenure in Arkansas, I. The Farm Tenancy Situation. Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 384, Fayetteville, 1940.
- Coleman, William J. and Hockley, H. Alfred. Legal Aspects of Landlord-Tenant Relationships in Oklahoma. Oklahoma Experiment Station Bulletin No. 241, Stillwater, 1940.
- Garey, L. F., Lambrecht, George H., and Miller, Frank. Farm Tenancy in Clay County Nebraska. Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 337, Lincoln, 1942.
- Hanson, H. P. and Myers, Max. Leasing and Leases in South Dakota. South Dakota State College Extension Circular No. 383, Brookings, 1939.
- Harris, Marshall D., Sharp, Max M., and Turner, Howard A. Better Farm Leases. United States Department of Agriculture Farmer's Bulletin No. 1969, Washington, D. C., 1945.
- Hoffsommer, Harold, editor. The Social and Economic Significance of Land Tenure in the Southwestern States. Durham: The University of North Carolina Press, 1950.
- Lloyd, O. G., Morine, H. S. Jr., and Hays, J. R. Principal Methods of Share Renting and Compensation for Unexhausted Improvements in Four Type-of-Farming Areas in Indiana. Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 464, Lafayette, Indiana, 1942.
- Nelson, Peter. "Landlord-Tenant Relations in the Southwest with Special Reference to Oklahoma." The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. XIX, No. 4 (March, 1939), 362-369.
- Report of the President's Committee, Farm Tenancy. United States Government Printing Office, Washington D. C., February, 1937.
- Schneider, Samuel B. and Graham, H. A. "Improving Rental Agreements as a Means of Encouraging Development of a Permanent Agriculture." Current Farm Economics, Vol. 11, No. 4, Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station, Stillwater, August, 1938.
- Southern, John H. Farm Tenancy in Oklahoma. Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 239, Stillwater, 1939.
- Timmons, John F. Landlord-Tenant Relationships in Renting Missouri Farms. Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 409, Columbia, 1939.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

OKLAHOMA FARM LEASE STUDY
PROJECT 588

Enumerator _____ Date _____ Schedule _____

1. Operator _____ Address _____

2. County _____ Type of farming area _____ Soil _____

A. Farm Location Miles _____ ; Miles _____ ; Miles of _____

3. Leasing Arrangements (By units)

| Unit | Type of Lease | Oral | Written | Length | Size of | Sec. | Twp. | Range | Length of Time |
|------|---------------|------|---------|--------|---------|------|------|-------|----------------|
| A | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| C | | | | | | | | | |
| D | | | | | | | | | |

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION-OPERATOR

1. Operator _____ Address _____

A. Age _____ B. Education _____ C. Father's Occupation _____

D. No. years farm experience _____, Tenant _____, Farm Labor _____, Unpaid family labor _____, Other _____. Where did operator start farming _____

E. What part of farming experience was in this neighborhood _____ years. Other, but with similar type of farming _____ years. Other type of farming _____

F. How did operator get financed (set-up) to start farming?

1. _____ Accumulated capital while working at home.
2. _____ Father furnished operating capital.
3. _____ Father-in-law furnished operating capital.
4. _____ Family gave enough to start on.
5. _____ Borrowed capital on own security.
6. _____ Borrowed capital on father's security.
7. _____ Landowner furnished capital.
8. _____ Other (describe) _____

G. Number years of formal agricultural training?

1. FFA _____ years, 4-H _____ years, Agri. college _____ years, Veteran's training _____ years.

H. Wife's age _____ (b) Education _____ yrs. (c) Wife's father's occupation _____ (d) _____ Years owner, _____ years tenant, _____ years Other _____

4. Land Use General

| Land Use | Unit A Acres | Unit B Acres | Unit C Acres | Unit D Acres |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Total Land in unit | | | | |
| 2. Cropland | | | | |
| 3. Pasture | | | | |
| a. Plowable | | | | |
| b. Woods | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | |
| d. Not pastured | | | | |
| 4. Pasture tilled | | | | |
| 5. Meadow | | | | |
| 6. Abandoned | | | | |
| 7. Farmstead and roads | | | | |

5. Capital Investment by Landowner or Landowners

| Item | Unit A Dollars | Unit B Dollars | Unit C Dollars | Unit D Dollars |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Land | | | | |
| 2. Dwelling | | | | |
| 3. Barns | | | | |
| 4. Garage | | | | |
| 5. Sheds | | | | |
| 6. Granaries | | | | |
| 7. Poultry | | | | |
| 8. Fences | | | | |
| 9. Water System | | | | |
| 10. Other | | | | |

6. Operating Capital Investment by Operator

| Item | Size | Make or Model | Original Cost | Year Bought | Present Value |
|------------------------|------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 1. Truck or Pickup | | | | | |
| 2. Car | XXX | | XXX | | |
| 3. Trailer or Wagon | | XXX | | | |
| 4. Trailer or Wagon | | XXX | | | |
| 5. Tractor | | | | | |
| 6. Tractor | | | | | |
| 7. Workstock No. | | XXX | XXX | XXX | |
| 8. Combine | | | | | |
| 9. Binder | | | | | |
| 10. Plow | | XXX | | | |
| 11. Plow | | XXX | | | |
| 12. Harrow | | XXX | | | |
| 13. Harrow | | XXX | | | |
| 14. Row Crop (equip.) | | XXX | | | |
| 15. Row Crop (equip.) | | XXX | | | |
| 16. Row Crop (equip.) | | XXX | | | |
| 17. Other ¹ | | | | | |
| 18. Other ¹ | | | | | |
| 19. Other ¹ | | | | | |
| 20. Total | | | | | |

¹ Under "other" should be listed such items as farm shops, feed grinders, movable granaries, fencing and the like that the operator uses in farming.

7. Cropland Organization, Production and Division by Units

| Unit | A | | | | B | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Crop- land | Acres | Pro- duction | Yield: Op.:LL | Share to Op.:LL | Acres | Pro- duction | Per Acre: Yield | Share to Op.:LL |
| Wheat | | | | | | | | | |
| Cotton | | | | | | | | | |
| Cottonseed | XXX | | | | XXX | | | | |
| Corn | | | | | | | | | |
| Grain Sorghum | | | | | | | | | |
| Hays () | | | | | | | | | |
| Meadow ¹ | | | | | | | | | |
| Pasture-tilled ¹ | | XXX | | | XXX | | | | |
| Orchard | | | | | | | | | |
| Gardens | | | | | | | | | |
| Total* | | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

| Unit | C | | | | D | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Crop- land | Acres | Pro- duction | Yield: Op.:LL | Share to Op.:LL | Acres | Pro- duction | Per Acre: Yield | Share to Op.:LL |
| Wheat | | | | | | | | | |
| Cotton | | | | | | | | | |
| Cottonseed | XXX | | | | XXX | | | | |
| Corn | | | | | | | | | |
| Grain Sorghum | | | | | | | | | |
| Hays () | | | | | | | | | |
| Meadow ¹ | | | | | | | | | |
| Pasture-tilled ¹ | | XXX | | | XXX | | | | |
| Orchard | | | | | | | | | |
| Gardens | | | | | | | | | |
| Total* | | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

¹ Do not include in total cropland.

* This total must check with total cropland per unit given in table (4).

8. Distribution of Crop Expense Between Operator and Landlord (Unit)

| Crop | Land | | Fertilizer | | Cultivating | | Harvesting | | | Process- | | Trans- | | Market- | |
|-------------|-------|------|------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|----------|------------------|---------|--------|------|---------|--|
| | Prep. | Seed | Material | Distrib. | Mach. | Labor | Labor | Mach. | Supplies | ing ¹ | porting | ing | | | |
| | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | |
| Wheat | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Corn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gr. Sorghum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cotton | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cottonseed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Legumes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alfalfa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

8. Distribution of Crop Expense Between Operator and Landlord (Unit)

| Crop | Land | | Fertilizer | | Cultivating | | Harvesting | | | Process- | | Trans- | | Market- | |
|-------------|-------|------|------------|----------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|----------|------------------|---------|--------|------|---------|--|
| | Prep. | Seed | Material | Distrib. | Mach. | Labor | Labor | Mach. | Supplies | ing ¹ | porting | ing | | | |
| | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | O:LL | |
| Wheat | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Corn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gr. Sorghum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cotton | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cottonseed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Legumes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alfalfa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

¹ Processing to include ginning and peanut or threshing.

9. Amount and Method of Rental Payment

| Crop Rent | Unit A | | Unit B | | Unit C | |
|-------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Amount | Value | Amount | Value | Amount | Value |
| Wheat | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Corn | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Oats | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Cotton | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Hay | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Grain Sorghums | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Peanuts | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| House Use | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Pasture | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Privilege (Bonus) | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Cash | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| Total | : | : | : | : | : | : |

10. Farm Income (other than crops)

| | Dollars |
|----------------------|---------|
| Livestock sold (net) | : |
| Livestock products | : |
| Milk | : |
| Butterfat | : |
| Wool | : |
| Work of farm | : |
| Operator | : |
| Family | : |
| Other Income | : |

11. G. Livestock-Organization, Production and Disposal, 194

| No.: | Jan. 1, | Pur- | Born | Sales | Losses: | None | On Farm | Landlord's | |
|------------------------|---------|--------|------|-------|---------|----------|---------|------------|----|
| | 194 | chases | | | Died: | Use | Dec. | Share | |
| | No.: | No.: | No. | No.: | No. | No.: | No.: | No.: | |
| 1:Horses and mules | : | : | : | : | : | XX : XXX | : | : | 1 |
| 2:Colts | : | : | : | : | : | XX : XX | : | : | 2 |
| 3:Milk cows | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 3 |
| 4:Beef cows | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 4 |
| 5:Calves (under 1 yr.) | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 5 |
| 6:Yearlings | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 6 |
| 7:Two-year olds | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 7 |
| 8:Bulls | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 8 |
| 9:Sheep | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 9 |
| 10:Lambs | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 10 |
| 11:Sows and gilts | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 11 |
| 12:Pigs | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 12 |
| 13:Other hogs | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 13 |
| 14:Hens and roosters | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 14 |
| 15:Chickens raised | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 15 |
| 16:Turkeys and guineas | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 16 |
| 17:Total A. U. | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | 17 |

TERMS OF LEASE

1. Lease written Oral.

- (a) Date present contract made _____.
- (b) Date present contract expires _____.
- (c) Did landowner contact you? _____.
- (d) Describe conditions leading to obtaining this lease contract _____.

2. Method of renewal.

- (a) New contract (_____) (d) Automatic renewal(_____)
- (b) Formal notice given (_____) (e) Operator contacts landowner(_____)
- (c) Informal notice (_____) (f) Other(_____)

3. Does contract specify a specific time for making renewal? _____

4. In which months did you make or renew lease the last five years?

1948 _____ 1947 _____ 1946 _____
 1945 _____ 1944 _____

5. (a) Is it customary in this area to renew leases by a certain date? Yes
 _____ Month, _____ No.

(b) Do tenants consider their lease to hold over another year if they have not been notified by a certain date, _____ Yes, _____ No, Date _____

(c) Have there been any instances where tenants held or attempted to hold lease because the customary notice period had not been observed?
 _____ Yes, _____ No, _____ Not known.

(d) Has any tenant resorted to court action in this community to retain lease? _____ Yes, _____ No.

Name, if any _____

6. Does your present lease state what crops should or should not be planted?
 _____ Yes, _____ No. If yes, list with acres _____

7. Does the lease limit the kinds and number of livestock? _____ Yes, _____ No.
 If yes, explain _____

8. Are Soil Conservation practices specified in the lease? Yes, No.
If yes, list _____
(a) How are expenses to be distributed? _____
(b) Is there provision for reimbursement for unexhausted improvements?
 Yes, No, Not specified. Give details if yes _____

9. Does lease permit operator to put additional building such as farrowing shed or brooder houses on farm at tenants expense? Yes, No, Not specified.
10. Does lease permit operator to remove buildings or improvements constructed at own expense? Yes, No, Not specified.
11. Does lease permit operator to sub-lease any portion of land? Yes, No, Not specified.
12. Does lease permit operator to lease additional land? Yes, No, Not specified.
13. Does lease permit tenant to vote on school tax levies? Yes, No, Not specified. Who pays school tax? _____
14. Does lease permit marketing products when, where, and to whom operator pleases? Yes, No, Not stated.
(a) If tenant is required by landlord to market with any particular agency or individual what, in his opinion, is the landowner's reason: _____
 Expedites collecting rent. Has interest in business. _____
 Required to market with a cooperative. Other _____
15. Does lease specify that any specific records of sales and expenses be kept by operator? Yes, No, Not stated. (a) Describe, if Yes _____

16. Does lease state when and in what manner final settlement of rent payments are made? Yes, No, Not specified. How settled _____
17. Does lease specify that certain privileges are retained by landowner? Yes, No, Not stated. If yes, list _____

18. Does the lease provide or retain for owner any of the managerial functions? Yes, No, Not stated. (Such as what to plant and when.)
19. List any other terms of the lease that seem significant to operator.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LANDOWNER

1. Name (L.L.) _____ Address _____

2. (a) ___ Male (b) ___ Female (c) ___ Estate (d) ___ Corporation (e) ___ Other

Explain _____

3. (a) Age (approx.) _____ (b) Occupation _____

(c) Place raised _____ (d) Years of farm experience _____

4. Relation to Tenant. ___ None ___ Related, degree _____

5. Location of Landowner: (Distance from farm)

A. DistanceB. Description

(a) ___ 0 - 5 miles

(a) ___ Lives on this farm

(b) ___ 6 - 15 miles

(b) ___ Lives on adjoining farm

(c) ___ 15 - 35 miles

(c) ___ Lives on farm in community

(d) ___ 36 - 75 miles

(d) ___ Lives on farm not in community

(e) ___ 76 - 155 miles

(e) ___ Lives in village or town close by farm

(f) ___ 156 - 315 miles

(f) ___ Lives in other town in county

(g) ___ 316 - 635 miles

(g) ___ Lives in adjacent county

(h) ___ 636 - 1275 miles

(h) ___ Lives in state

(i) ___ 1276 - 2555 miles

(i) ___ Lives outside of state

6. How did landowner acquire this farm, if known?

___ Purchased while farming. Date _____

___ Purchased while occupied other than farming. Date _____

___ Purchased from bonus month. Date _____

___ Inherited, from whom _____ Date _____

___ Inherited money which was used to purchase farm. Date _____

___ Gift, from whom _____ Date _____

___ Foreclosure, Date _____

7. A. Number of other farms owned _____ Size

___ Same community _____

___ Adjoining community _____

___ Outside county _____

___ Outside state _____

B. Are these farms leased on the same basis? _____ If different, describe

rental methods. _____

8. Has landowner operated this farm? Yes No Not known
If yes, last year of operation _____.
9. What are the owner's plans for this farm in the future.
 For sale Hold for investments
 To farm it himself To leave for heirs
10. (a) Does landowner move tenants often? Yes No Not Known
(b) Do tenants move from this farm frequently? Yes No Not Known
11. Including present operator, how many years were the last five tenants, respectively on this farm? Present tenant _____ Years, (2) _____ Years, (3) _____ Years, (4) _____ Years, (5) _____ Years.
12. Is owner in your opinion familiar with problems related to this particular farm? Yes No. Give illustrations _____

13. (a) Is farm leased or looked after by an agent representing owner? Yes
 No.
(b) If yes, is he related to landowner? Yes, Relation _____
 No.
14. How many times a year do you usually see landowner? _____
(a) Of this number, how many times a year does he visit farm? _____
(b) Of this number, how many times do you contact landowner? _____
(c) How many letters or phone calls a year do you receive from landowner? _____
(d) How many letters do you usually write landowner? _____
15. Does the landowner visit informally with you, such as hunt fish, or drop by occasionally for a visit? Yes No If yes, how often _____
16. Do you plan to re-lease farm? Yes No
 One more year Two or three years Indefinite
 Until you are able to buy Until a larger farm can be secured
 Until farm in another community can be leased Undecided
17. In case landowner dies, would you have an opportunity to lease farm? Yes
 No Not known
18. Would you be interested in purchasing this farm if it were for sale? Yes
 No
19. What are the characteristics of this farm
(a) That you like? _____

(b) That you dislike? _____

20. What are the features of your lease contract that you like? _____

21. What are the features of your lease contract that you do not like? _____

22. What, in your opinion, are the essentials of a good contract? _____

23. Of the many kinds of landowners that you are familiar with, either from your own experience or from your observation of other landowners and tenants, which kind of landowners do you rate as the best to rent from?

| Kind | Type of Leaser | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|--------|------|----------|
| | Male | Female | Res. | Non-Res. |
| | : | : | :: | : |
| (a) Farmer | Owner : | : | :: | : |
| | Rep. : | : | :: | : |
| (b) Retired farmer | Owner : | : | :: | : |
| | Rep. : | : | :: | : |
| (c) Professional | Owner : | : | :: | : |
| | Rep. : | : | :: | : |
| (d) Laborers | Owner : | : | :: | : |
| | Rep. : | : | :: | : |
| (e) Business | Owner : | : | :: | : |
| | Rep. : | : | :: | : |
| Estate | : | : | :: | : |
| (f) Administrator | : | : | :: | : |
| Insurance | : | : | :: | : |
| (g) Companies | : | : | :: | : |
| | : | : | :: | : |
| (h) Banks | : | : | :: | : |
| | : | : | :: | : |
| (i) Indian Agency | : | : | :: | : |
| | : | : | :: | : |
| (j) Other | : | : | :: | : |

THESIS TITLE: Leasing Patterns and Landlord-Tenant Relationships by Selected Tenure Status Groups in Southwestern Oklahoma

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kenneth Lewis Hobson

THESIS ADVISER: Robert L. Tontz

The content and form have been checked and approved by the author and thesis adviser. "Instructions for Typing and Arranging the Thesis" are available in the Graduate School office. Changes or corrections in the thesis are not made by the Graduate School office or by any committee. The copies are sent to the bindery just as they are approved by the author and faculty adviser.

NAME OF TYPIST: Mary Jo Hobson