JOB MARKET PAPER

Insecurity of Property Rights and Matching in the Tenancy Market

Version: February 11, 2003

Karen MACOURS

Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

University of California at Berkeley

Abstract

This paper analyzes the effects of insecure property rights over land on the functioning of the land rental market in the Dominican Republic. It shows that insecurity of property rights not only reduces the level of activity on the land rental market, but also causes market segmentation. A principal-agent framework is used to model the utility maximization of both the tenant and the landlord, where the landlord takes into account the risk of losing the land when it is not traded within a narrow local circle of confidence. Using data collected with a methodology that enables the entire market to be characterized, I show that insecure property rights lead to matching in the tenancy market along socio-economic groups and hence severely limit access to land for the rural poor. The results also show the importance of a minimum endowment of assets to gain access to land in the rental market.

This paper has benefited greatly from comments by Alain de Janvry, Ethan Ligon, Edward Miguel and Elisabeth Sadoulet. Thanks go also for many valuable comments to Caridad Araujo, Pranab Bardhan, Bradford Barham, Tania Barham, Frederico Finan, Kenneth Train and David Zilberman, participants at the development workshop in Berkeley, participants at seminars in Berkeley, Leuven, and Madison-Wisconsin, and participants at the NEUDC, AAEA, EAAE and LASA conferences. Assistance for the data collection from Inmaculada Adames, Erin Godtland, Jose Miguel Hernandez, Tomas Garcia Holguin, Luis Polanco, Pedro Juan del Rosario, Horacio Lopez, and Blas Santos is greatly appreciated. Financial support for the data collection from IFAD and the IDB is gratefully acknowledged. All remaining errors are mine.

Contact address: Karen Macours, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 207 Giannini Hall #3310, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3310, Tel: (510) 643 0846 Fax: (510) 643 8911
E-mail: macours@are.berkeley.edu

Insecurity of Property Rights and Matching in the Tenancy Market

"Because the rights (to most of the poor's resources) are not adequately documented, these assets cannot readily be turned into capital, cannot be traded outside narrow local circles where people know and trust each other ..." (Hernando de Soto, 2000)

1. Introduction

Many have argued that security of property rights is a key determinant for economic growth and development (e.g., Olson, 2000; de Soto, 2000). Empirical results from cross-country studies do indeed suggest that there is a link between the security of property rights and economic growth (e.g., Knack and Keefer, 1995; Barro, 1996). The empirical results of these studies have however been questioned due to a number of methodological problems found in cross-country growth studies in general (Temple, 1999). Security of property rights for land has been argued to have important effects on incentives for investment, and hence efficient and sustainable land use, on access to credit, and on the functioning of the land sales and rental markets (Feder and Feeny, 1991; Besley 1995). Deininger and Feder (2001) provide an overview of empirical studies analyzing the investment and credit effects of secure property rights for land. However, there exists little micro-evidence of the effects on land market activity. This paper aims at providing such evidence by analyzing the effect of insecurity of property rights on the functioning of the land rental market using household level data for two regions in the Dominican Republic. The results show that insecure property rights not only reduce the level of activity on the land rental market, but also induce market segmentation. These empirical findings shed light on a specific mechanism through which lack of property rights might impede efficiency and equity gains, and hence influence growth and development.

Empirical work that analyzes the functioning of the land rental market typically attempts to explain the net demand for land as a function of the tenant's asset endowments and household characteristics (e.g., Skoufias, 1995). Deininger and Chamorro (2000) estimate the probability of renting and their results are consistent with land tenancy markets in Nicaragua enhancing equity and efficiency, as they transfer land to more efficient producers with lower land-labor ratios and higher profit levels.[1] DeSilva (2000) shows that the skill level of a household is an important determinant of renting in Sri Lanka, which also indicates an efficiency enhancing rental market. Baland et al. (2000) model the decision to rent as a function of the characteristics of the tenant and show that land tenancy markets, together with land sales markets, correct for initial inequality in land endowments in Uganda.

In these empirical specifications, the authors only consider either the characteristics of the tenant or the characteristics of the landlord. However, given that land, due to its geographically fixed nature, can only be traded within a certain local rental market, access to land is likely to be determined by the characteristics of the potential tenants that are desired by the specific landlords in the local market. If all the landlords have the same preferences over types of tenants, the probability of renting can indeed be modeled as a function of the characteristics of the tenant. However, with heterogeneous landlords and heterogeneous tenants,

[1] In this paper, the terminology: "renting" refers to the action of the tenant, and "letting" or "renting out" refers to the action of the landlord.

different landlords might prefer different tenants. This paper argues that these preferences will be significantly influenced by the security of property rights over land. In particular, landlords who have reasons to fear losing their land will only rent out land within narrowly defined social circles. For potential tenants, belonging to the circle of confidence of particular landlords will be a key determinant for access to land in environments with substantial insecurity of property rights.

Hence, access to land for a particular tenant will not only depend on his own characteristics, but also on the characteristics of all available landlords and all other potential tenants in the community, and on the institutional context that might influence the landlords' preferences. Analyzing the matching process on the tenancy market should therefore help disentangle the micro-foundations of access to land through the land rental market, and hence help identify constraints for potential efficiency and equity gains.

Such an analysis of the determinants of access to land is of particular importance in a Latin American context with a highly unequal distribution of land in ownership. In most Latin American countries land reallocations through the rental market are limited. In the Dominican Republic, only 14% of the land is traded in the land rental market. This stands in sharp contrast with agricultural land rental markets in many other parts of the world (e.g., 73% in Belgium, 44% in the United States). Furthermore land rental markets are often found to be segmented in Latin America, with the land being redistributed mainly among people of the same socio-economic class (see e.g., Carter and Chamorro (2001) for empirical evidence for Nicaragua).

This paper shows how the landlord's fear of losing the land can explain these structural features of Latin American land rental markets. Such fear results from insecure property rights, caused by frequent lack of undisputed formal titles to the land and by weak law enforcement. In the Dominican Republic for instance, land ownership and distribution have been severely affected by the different property rights systems of various foreign powers (Spanish, French, and US) that got implemented without abolishing the previous system, and by the redistributive land reform initiated in the 1960s. Those policies have resulted in a considerable heterogeneity in property rights and in the strength of these rights. Furthermore, until today, legislation remains in place that allows for expropriation of ill-used land, creating incentives for land invasions and squatting (Gill, 2000).

The structure of this paper is as follows: First I discuss the methodology that was used to collect the data that allow analyzing the matching patterns. The methodology relies on key informants and on the fact that a lot of private information is locally public, and allows characterizing the market universe in a cost-effective way. Section 3 analyzes the determinants of renting, considering the tenant's characteristics in line with the existing literature. In a next step, a distinction is made between factors affecting the willingness and the opportunity to rent, to separate factors affecting the demand and the supply side of the land rental market. The effect of plot and landlord characteristics on the likelihood of renting out is also analyzed, further shedding light on the supply side. In section 4 follows the analysis of matching between landlords and tenants. It specifically focuses on analyzing, first theoretically and then empirically, the effects of insecurity of property rights on trading within local circles of confidence. Several alternative hypotheses of the determinants of matching are tested and the robustness of the results to alternative specifications is assessed. The last section concludes and discusses the policy implications of the findings.

2. The Data

2.1. Survey Methodology

To analyze access to land through the tenancy market, I collected data specifically for this purpose in two regions of the Dominican Republic (DR). An "indirect" survey approach was used to obtain data on communities, each household, and each plot within these communities. The indirect approach relies on the fact that a lot of private information is public at the level of the community. Hence, selected informants from the community can be used to answer questions about private matters of individual community members that are locally public knowledge.

This approach is advantageous because it allows characterizing at low cost the whole universe, in this case the complete rental market with all actual and potential tenants and landlords. Data are collected on every household in a geographically closed area, and selectivity bias due to non-response or difficulties in reaching certain households (often the most marginal groups) is eliminated. The indirect approach is an efficient method of collecting data, as information about a large amount of households can be gathered in a short time period, and with relatively minimal effort as compared to direct interviews with each of the concerned households. In Macours (2002) a sub-sample of the data collected with the indirect approach is compared with data collected on the same households by asking the household heads. The overall level of agreement is found to be relatively large and there is no strong evidence of systematic biases by the informants. Related work by Takasaki, Barham, and Coomes (2000) also shows that reliable information on households' asset endowments was obtained using an indirect survey approach in the Peruvian Amazon.

In a first step, basic information about all households and all plots in a community was collected in order to (1) characterize the complete land rental market, (2) match landlords with their respective tenants and hence obtain information about the partners on both sides of the transaction, and (3) obtain a sampling frame for more detailed household and plot level questions. In the second step, a stratified sample of households was drawn with oversampling of landlords and tenants in the population. This stratification was used to guarantee sufficient observations on the variables of interest, as rental in some communities is a rare event. All landlords and tenants were selected, complemented by a random sample from all other households in the community. In addition to household-level information, data on all the plots these households owned (either owner-cultivated or rented out) and rented was obtained. Data on community characteristics were also collected.

Data were collected in the regions of Constanza (1092 households) and San Francisco de Macoris (1431 households). Constanza is located in a fertile valley in the mountainous area in Central DR (La Vega province). It is characterized by very intensive irrigated horticultural production, which depends to a large extent on hired labor. San Francisco de Macoris is located in the flatlands of the Cibao region (Duarte province) and agricultural production consists mainly of rice, complemented by plantains and pastures.[2] In both regions, agricultural income is an

[2] In both regions, land is mainly used for annual or seasonal crops, not for perennial crops. Only a limited amount of plots are used as pasture. Hence, the use of the land does not seem to be a limiting factor for renting.

important component of households' budget.[3] Rent is paid as a fixed amount, as a share of the harvest, or in labor services.

2.2. Descriptive statistics

Table 1, using data from the 1998 national survey of producers, shows that most land in these two provinces is owner-cultivated (60% and 78%, respectively). The land rental market activity is much more important in the La Vega province, with 23 % of farmland rented out, compared to only 9 % in the Duarte province, and 14% in the country as a whole. Specifically, for the two sub-regions within these provinces where the data were collected, the land rental market is quite developed in the horticultural region, Constanza, and much more reduced in the rice region, San Francisco de Macoris (Table 2). In the horticultural region, 75% of the plots have a registered public title and 84% a registered public or land reform title. The land rental market involves about half of the households as landlords (25%) or tenants (22%) and 52% of the land. In contrast, in the rice region, where only 33% of the plots have a registered public title and 71% a registered public or land reform title, only 21% of the households and 39% of the land are part of the land rental market. In addition, a larger share of the households is land constrained (i.e., reported as wanting to rent more land) in the second region (60%) as compared to the first (46%).

The weakness of property rights in the rice region is not only reflected in the lower share of titled land, but also in the much greater occurrence of land conflicts (Table 2). The frequency of land conflicts originates from a long and complex history of land reform in this region. During the Trujillo era, most of the land in the region was owned by one of the dictator's close aides. Immediately after the fall of the regime, much of the land was expropriated and distributed as part of the newly established land reform. However, within a few years the window of opportunity for large-scale distributions had closed, as Trujillo's former aide soon became an ally of the new government. Further redistribution of the land, although now officially owned by the Dominican state, was stalled and the former owner and his family maintained possession of most of the property. This incited squatting and land invasions by the peasant population that claimed this land to be the property of the Dominican people and hence fundamentally theirs. Invasions and squatting have had mixed results. Sometimes, the military intervenes in favor of the former owners; at other times, case law has granted rights to squatting tenants. This might explain why, in all but one community in the rice region, the primary reason for difficult access to land in rental was identified as fear of the landlords to lose their land. In contrast, in the horticultural region, where the land reform only had a very marginal impact, this seemed not to be the major concern (0% of communities). The occurrence of more rental contracts in writing in the rice region might be a response to this uncertain environment, although the share of written contracts is still low at only 21%.

Examining household characteristics in the dataset provides further indications on the variables that affect the functioning of the land rental market. Comparing landlord households (households that rent out land) with tenant households (that rent land from others), and with autarkic households (land owning households that neither rent or let land), it appears first of all that the land rental market helps to correct for differences in labor assets between these groups of households (table 3): landlords tend to be older and are more often female headed compared to

[3] In the rest of this paper, the first region is referred to as the "horticultural region", and the second region as the "rice region".

autarkic households, while the opposite holds for tenant households. Land reallocation through the land rental market overcompensates tenants for the significantly smaller area of land they own, as the cultivated area per adult member is higher (1.5 ha) for tenant households than for landlord households (1 ha). Apart from a larger area of owned land, landlord households also tend to have more cattle and a higher number of members who live abroad.

Interestingly, tenants have on average a higher educational level than any of the other groups. In particular, differences with landless households suggest that access to land through the land rental market is only functional for certain categories of households, namely for people that already have certain minimum endowments in physical assets (especially machinery and land), human capital (education), and social assets (membership in organizations). Especially in the capital-intensive horticulture region, this is an important factor. 87% of the households are reported to be constrained on the land rental market because of lack of the necessary means to cultivate. In fact, lack of capital in this region is also reported as one of the main reasons to rent land out.

Finally, tenants also have a higher living standard than any of the other groups. The living standard variable reflects the ranking of different households by the informant in 4 classes of living standards: very low, low, regular, and high.[4] The informant was asked to base these rankings on criteria associated with different measures of living standard, including the characteristics of the house (such as number of rooms, type and quality of materials), means of transportation and use of education and health institutions. Criteria indicating income-generating potential (such as land or machinery ownership) were specifically excluded. The criteria used were consistent across communities.

3. Empirical analysis of the determinants of renting

3.1. Determinants of renting

The importance of a necessary minimum asset endowment, secure property rights, absence of land conflicts, and belonging to the circle of confidence of a landlord when property rights are weak is confirmed by regression analysis of the determinants of renting. A weighted regression was used to account for the sample design.[5]

The regression results in the first column of table 4 show that the rental market is effective in redistributing land for cultivation to the landless as households without land are more likely to rent. However, access to land through the land rental market is constrained in communities with weak property rights or with lack of enforcement of these rights. The regression results suggest that access to land is facilitated in communities where the majority of the land has strong formal property rights. The presence of land conflicts on the other hand, has a very significant negative effect on land rental.[6] Occurrence of at least one case of land

[4] For the analysis in this paper, the categories “very low” and “low” are considered one category because the number of households in the “very low” category is rather small.

[5] Given that the sample is response based, a pseudo-maximum likelihood approach is used, which starts from the likelihood function for a random sample, and then re-weights the data to achieve consistency.

[6] The variable for land conflicts is a dummy variable taking the value of 1 if there was at least one case of land occupation or squatting in the community in the last 5 years.

occupation or squatting during the last 5 years decreases the likelihood of renting by 13%. The positive coefficient of the number of parcels owned by people within your own living standard group, can be explained by the fact that landowners might be more likely to trust people as tenants if they belong to the same socio-economic group.

Furthermore, the household's asset endowment is an important determinant of renting. The result confirms that ownership of machinery significantly increases access to land in rental.[7] A positive but diminishing effect of education indicates that a minimum level of education is desirable to obtain land in rental, but logically people with higher education rent less as the opportunity cost of their labor in other occupations is also higher. Households with female heads are less likely to rent. Furthermore, households that are active in one of the community organizations are more likely to rent. While this is consistent with social capital being important for access to land, this coefficient needs to be interpreted with caution due to possible endogeneity. However, the coefficients and significance of the other variable are robust to excluding this variable and the variable measuring the number of household members, which potentially is also endogenous (see second column of table 4). The regressions further show that the availability of non-agricultural employment and proximity to the local city decreases the likelihood of renting.

3.2. Determinants of the willingness and the opportunity to rent

The results in table 4 could reflect the effects of different variables on the willingness to rent (determined by the tenant's preferences) or the opportunity to rent (determined by the landlords' preferences). To disentangle these effects, the determinants of the willingness to rent, and the determinants of the likelihood of renting for those who want to, are estimated separately. Because of a possible selection bias in the second estimation, a heckit model is estimated.

The first column of table 5 reports the results on the determinants of the willingness to renting land, and the second column shows the supply side results. Insecurity of property rights is found to mainly affect the supply side. The lack of titles, the presence of conflicts, and the number of parcels within your own living standard group only affect the opportunity to rent. Households with male household heads, more household members, and households who own no land have a higher demand for land, but do not get more opportunities to do so. Owning machinery only affects the opportunity to rent, while education on the other hand increases both the willingness and the opportunity to rent. The age of the household head has opposite effects on demand and supply, with younger people more willing to rent, but landlords preferring older farmers, possibly because of their greater experience. Interestingly, membership in a community organization increases the willingness to rent, but not the opportunity, suggesting that this is not a measure of social capital, but rather of entrepreneurship. Finally, off-farm labor opportunities affect the demand for land negatively, while distance to the markets affects the supply. Because the selection coefficient was found not to be statistically significant from zero, two separate equations were also estimated. The results of the two separate probit models (not reported) are largely consistent with the heckit estimation.

[7] The variable 'own machinery' measures the ownership of machinery if the household head is younger than 35. For this category of households, machinery ownership can be considered exogenous, as the period of potential accumulation is relatively short.

3.3. Determinants of renting out

To further investigate the supply side of the rental market, the determinants of renting out at the plot level are analyzed. The results, reported in table 6, show that older and female-headed households are more likely to rent out, as are landowners who have household members abroad, and households who own more land and have less labor. These results suggest that the land rental market does help reallocate land away from those who cannot or do not want to work it efficiently. Table 6 also confirms the effect of insecurity of property rights on supply on the land rental market. Plots without title and plots in communities with land conflict are less likely to be rented out. Landlords who have a lot of potential tenants within their socio-economic group are also more likely to rent out, suggesting again the role of circles of confidence in explaining land rental transactions. These results are not affected by omitting the number of household members, nor the variable measuring membership in a community organization (both potentially endogenous) from the equation.

Exploring the relationship between landlords and tenants in more detail, table 7 shows the correspondence between the living standard of the landlords and their tenants, distinguishing between communities with and without recent land occupations. Table 7a shows that in communities with recent land conflicts, there is a very strong positive assortative matching along living standards. For each living standard class, more than half of the transactions are between members of the same class. The assortative matching is strongest for the richest class. On the other hand, less than 7 % of the land transacted by the rich is rented out to the poor, and vice versa. Comparing this pattern to the pattern in communities without land conflicts (table 7b), one sees that transactions are much more equally distributed across living standard classes in the later, with 41% of the plots rented out by the rich going to the poor. Table 7c shows the distribution of area transacted over all communities. A pattern of reverse renting is apparent, with more land being rented out to tenants with a higher living standard. Comparing this pattern with table 7a and 7b, suggests that it is mainly the larger plots that are rented out to people with a higher living standard.

Estimations of the determinants of renting only capture the matching between landlords and tenants in an indirect way. I now turn to analyzing matching between landlords and tenants directly. In analyzing the determinants of matching, the focus is in particular on the role of circles of confidence in environments with insecure property rights.

4. Matching in the tenancy markets

4.1. Theoretical foundations of matching in the tenancy market

I assume that landlords and tenants have perfect information about all the players in the market and about their preferences. Hence matching patterns are not explained by relying on a search mechanism, as is often done in matching models in the labor literature (Mortensen, 1982; Pissarides, 1990; Burdett and Coles, 1999). Search in these models occurs because employers do not have perfect information on the traits of potential employees, but can obtain this information by engaging in a costly search process. The assumption of perfect information on the variables that matter seems warranted for the village communities in the Dominican Republic, as information sharing (gossiping) is an inherent part of social life. Furthermore, in the last 10 years, few new households have immigrated into the communities in this study, which further enhances information about each other. Different studies in other parts of the world find that

information on attributes of others is widely available in village communities (Bardhan, 1984; Bell, 1988; and Lanjouw, 1999).

In the context of the rural Dominican Republic, the threat of losing the land because of squatting by the tenant, once the plot is rented, is not only likely to decrease the total amount of land offered for rent, but might also influence differently the access to land for different groups in society. In deciding whom to rent out to, landlords will account for the probability of losing their land. I hypothesize that conflicts and insecurity of property rights will lead to positive assortative matching by group or class-membership.[8] Such positive matching is likely to occur because enforcement against squatting is easier for members of the same group. People from the same group depend on each other for various other interactions, apart from the ones in the land market (e.g., mutual insurance or access to credit). If squatting leads to exclusion from the group, and hence loss of all the benefits from these interactions, within-group enforcement will be stronger.

To model this formally, a principal-agent model is used in which the landlord makes an offer to the tenant, and the tenant accepts or rejects. This modeling approach is justified by field observations, as in reality it is indeed the landlord who takes the first step and determines the terms of the contract. Furthermore, all players are assumed to know the best possible pay-offs of each of the other players. Hence, matching is modeled as a decision process of the landlord, who takes the reservation utility of the potential tenants into account. The reservation utility of a potential tenant is the utility he would derive without access to that particular landlord-plot. It will be determined both by the characteristics of the tenant, and by his access to other plots in the market. I assume that the profit the tenant receives from working plot i for one time period equals this reservation utility, i.e., the landlord has all the bargaining power and drives the tenant to his reservation utility.

The tenant (agent) j decides at time t=1 whether to squat or not on plot i, with the decision variable s_{ij} being either 0 (no squatting) or 1 (squatting). The decision is determined by the trade-off between the value of all the future benefits of the plot in case he becomes the new owner, and the value of the benefits of all future social interactions, which depends on the social distance between the tenant and the landlord. If the tenant and the landlord belong to the same group, there exist social interactions between them, leading to benefits R. If they belong to a different group there are no such benefits (R=0). I also allow for some unobserved - from the point of view of the econometrician - preference of tenant j to squat on landlord-plot i, ε_{ij}.

The tenant's maximization problem becomes

$$\underset{s_{ij}}{Max}\ U = \overline{U}_{-ij} + s_{ij}\left[\sigma(P_i) * \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1}\pi_i\right) - \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} R(\Delta_{ij}) + \varepsilon_{ij}\right] \quad (1)$$

with

[8] Membership in different types of groups might be relevant, going from belonging to a same living standard class or landownership class, to, in the limit, belonging to the same family. Note that the effect of wealth (living standard) in the model does not result from a limited liability constraint (as e.g., in Shetty, 1988).

$\overline{U}_{-ij}$ the reservation utility of tenant *j*, given all plots except *i*, measured in monetary terms,
π_i the profit in one time period on plot *i,*[9]
$\sigma(P_i)$ the probability of success of squatting on plot *i*, which is a function of the plot characteristics P_i determining the tenure security of that plot,
δ the discount factor,
and $R(\Delta_{ij})$ the one period benefits (in monetary terms) of all other social interactions, which is a function of the social distance between tenant j and the landlord of plot *i*, (Δ_{ij}).

The outcome of this maximization process will be the equilibrium value $s_{ij}^* = s_{ij}^*(\Delta_{ij}, P_i, \pi_i, \delta, \varepsilon_{ij})$. These equilibrium values are common knowledge to all tenants and all landlords in the market. Given that ε_{ij} is unobservable for the econometrician, I define the probability $\Pr ob(s_{ij}^* = 1) = \tilde{s}_{ij}^*(\Delta_{ij}, P_i, \pi_i, \delta)$.

The landlord chooses to which tenant to offer the plot to, based on the trade-off between the profit he gets from renting out the plot of land for one period versus the potential loss of future profit of the land, in case of a successful squat.[10] The landlord is assumed to decide each period to whom to rent his plot of land (or whether to rent it out at all). The relevant trade-off is the profit from renting out one period, versus the value of the potential loss of future profit. Landlords for whom the latter effect dominates for all potential tenants, will decide not to rent out at all and are not considered here.

The probability that the landlord offers plot *i* to a tenant *j*, $\mu_{ij} = 1$, if

$$U_{ij} \geq U_{ik} \qquad \forall k \in I, k \neq j \qquad (2)$$

or

$$\left(\pi_{ij} - \overline{U}_{-ij}\right) - \tilde{s}_{ij}^* \left[\sigma(P_i) * \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} \pi_i\right] + \eta_{ij} \geq \left(\pi_{ik} - \overline{U}_{-ik}\right) - \tilde{s}_{ik}^* \left[\sigma(P_i) * \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} \pi_i\right] + \eta_{ik} \qquad \forall k \in I, k \neq j \qquad (3)$$

where *I* is the set of choices (tenants) available to the landlord, η_{ij} the unobserved part of the landlord's utility and π_{ij} the profit from plot *i* with tenant *j*. The profit of plot *i*, is allowed to differ between tenants as the productive assets and characteristics of the tenant are likely to affect this profit. The tenant's assets and characteristics are exogenous to the landlord. They will affect both the profit from the plot and the reservation utility of the tenant, which will affect the landlord's choice in opposite directions.

[9] The profit of plot *i* is not modeled as function of the tenant characteristics. Although the tenants' productive assets are likely to affect the profit from the plot, these assets are endogenous to the tenant's maximization problem as the tenant can adjust his asset endowment (machinery ownership, labor) over time.

[10] Note that only the choice of tenant is modeled here, taken the choice of renting as given.

4.2. Empirical specification

The importance of endogenous partner choice for explaining economic outcomes has been incorporated in recent studies in different areas of economic activity, such as fertility (Rosenzweig, 1999), children's education (Foster, 1998; Liu and Zhang, 1999), intergenerational transmission of religious traits (Bisin, Topa and Verdier, 2000), and choice of a rental contract (Ackerberg and Botticini, 2002). These studies all focus on assortative matching along a certain trait and hence do not allow testing for different variables that might influence the two-sided utility maximization matching process.

Little empirical work on matching has been done that considers matching along more than one trait at once at the individual level. However, two papers empirically estimate the determinants of matching in the marriage market, to test for Becker's hypothesis of assortative mating. Jepsen and Jepsen (1999) estimate a conditional logit model, modeling the matching process as a choice by one of the partners, determined by the absolute value of the differences in traits to compare the traits of the choices to the traits of the chooser. They model the matching process as a one-directional decision process, and do not account for utility maximization of the other side, nor for competition in the market. In large markets, the effect of such competition (i.e., the probability that your preferred match is already matched with somebody else that he/she prefers) is likely to be negligible. Yet, in thinner markets this might not be the case. Furthermore, partner selection differs from a discrete choice problem because the choice of a spouse is mutual and because different individuals cannot choose the same alternative. Suen and Lui (1999) explore a method that does not build on such an assumption, but is instead directly derived from the Becker model of efficient competitive matching in the marriage market. Specifically, Becker's result that the marriage market maximizes marital output provides a framework for estimating a model of spouse selection. This model has the advantage that it takes the reservation utility of potential partners into account. However, it draws on the assumption of efficiency in the market and does not allow including the non-chosen alternatives in the estimation.

Based on the theoretical model in section 4.1., the landlord's choice of a tenant for each plot, based on utility maximization, is modeled in a conditional logit framework, but allowing for utility maximization by the tenants. The conditional logit allows estimating how the characteristics of the alternative (i.e., the tenant), as relevant for the landlord, affect the landlord's choice. The probability that a landlord chooses tenant *j* for his plot *i* is defined as:

$$P(\mu_{ij}=1)=\frac{e^{E(U_{ij})}}{\sum_{k\in I} e^{E(U_{ik})}}=\frac{e^{X_{ij}'\beta}}{\sum_{k\in I} e^{X_{ik}'\beta}}, \qquad (4)$$

where $E(U_{ij})$ is the expected utility the landlord derives from renting out plot *i* to tenant *j*, X_{ij} is the vector of characteristics of the partnership created by matching the landlord of plot *i* with tenant *j*, β is the vector of coefficients to estimate, and *I* the set of all potential partners for *i*. The set of potential partners are all households from the community who are renting land, and all the households in the community that are willing to rent land (at the most common contract in the community). Note that, by modeling the probability of a certain match as a function of all possible matches, the distribution of the relevant traits in the population is accounted for. All possible matches are obtained by matching the landlord-plot *i* with all potential tenants in the

community.[11] The landlord's expected utility depends on the probability of losing the land through squatting.

X_{ij} is specified based on equation (3), accounting for the fact that terms containing only landlord-plot characteristics or community characteristics will cancel out due to the conditional logit framework. A linear approximation for the term in square brackets in (3) is used. As a measure of social distance between the landlord and the tenant, the absolute value of the difference in living standard group ($DCLASS_{ij}$) or land ownership ($DLAND_{ij}$) is used.[12] As measures of insecurity of property rights, the dummy variables $TITLE_i$, $LOTFAM_i$, and $CONFLICTS_i$ are defined. $TITLE_i$ takes the value of 1 if the plot has a title and measures the formal strength of the property right to the plot. $LOTFAM_i$ takes the value of one if the landlord has a lot of family in the community, and is a proxy for the informal strength of the property right. $CONFLICTS_i$ takes the value of one if there were cases of squatting or land occupations during the last 5 years in the community. These terms enter as interaction terms, in keep with the hypothesis that social distance matters more when the insecurity of property rights is higher. Furthermore, the model predicts that social distance should also matter more when profit associated with the plot is higher, so interaction terms with SUP_i, the surface of the plot, and IRR_i, a dummy for whether the plot has irrigation potential, are included.[13] Finally, to allow for regional differences in the effects of social distance, an interaction term with the regional dummy RR_i (which equals 1 for the rice region) was added.

To account for the tenant's characteristics that determine expected profit for the landlord and the reservation utility of the tenant, variables measuring the tenants productive assets, education level ($EDUC_j$), age of the household head (AGE_j), number of adult household members ($LABOR_j$), machinery ownership ($MACH_j$), female household head ($FEMALE_j$), and a variable measuring the number of other plots the tenant is cultivating ($OPLOT_{ij}$), are added. The empirical specification of the model to estimate becomes (4) with

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{ij}'\beta = \\
&\beta_1 + \beta_2(1+\gamma_0^o TITLE_i + \gamma_1^o LOTFAM_i + \gamma_2^0 CONFLICT_i + \gamma_3^o SUP_i + \gamma_3^o IRR_i + \gamma_4^o RR_i) * DLAND_{ij} \\
&+\beta_3(1+\gamma_0^l TITLE_i + \gamma_1^l LOTFAM_i + \gamma_2^l CONFLICT_i + \gamma_3^l SUP_i + \gamma_3^l IRR_i + \gamma_4^l RR_i) * DCLASS_{ij} \qquad (5) \\
&+\beta_4 OPLOT_{ij} + \varphi_1 EDUC_j + \varphi_2 AGE_j + \varphi_3 MACH_j + \varphi_4 LABOR_j + \varphi_5 FEMALE_j
\end{aligned}
$$

[11] Given that the communities are located at small distances from each other, one could also consider all potential tenants in the region (or in neighboring communities). This approach was not followed because the number of across-community matches is rather small (37) and as this would increase the number of non-realized matches considerably. Furthermore, it would rely on the arbitrary definition of the geographically closed area of the survey as being the relevant region for matching of landlords and tenants.

[12] Unfortunately, information on kinship relationships with households other than the actual tenants could not be collected, and hence it is not possible to account for positive assortative matching along kinship. The difference in living standard class is defined as 1 for matches between people with a regular and high living standard, or with a low and regular living standard, and is defined as 2 for matches between high and low living standards.

[13] In this dataset, given that ownership of a title is largely determined by different historical events that were beyond the control of the current possessors, title can be treated as an exogenous variable. Conflicts are a community level variable and therefore also exogenous to the household. The irrigation variable reflects the proximity to an irrigation canal or natural stream and is hence also exogenous.

In order to test for other reasons for matching of tenants and landlords, an alternative specification is defined. Specifically, it allows for matching of landowners and tenants along productive assets. Given that productive assets are substitutable inputs in the agricultural production function (e.g., machinery of the landlord can substitute for machinery of the tenant), Becker's theorem of assortative mating (1973) would lead to negative assortative matching along productive assets in the tenancy market. The intuition behind such negative assortative matching comes from the fact that tenants who own a lot of assets (e.g., machinery or skill) will have a higher reservation utility, because there is competition among landlords for these tenants. Those tenants will still be preferred by landlords with little assets, since the marginal value of the tenant's assets to production is high. However, landlords who themselves own such assets, will prefer tenants with less productive assets, as the marginal value of the tenant's assets for production will be lower, and the reservation utility of these tenants is lower. Therefore, π_{ij} is expected to be a function of the absolute difference between the landlord's and the tenant's assets. Hence, in the alternative specification X_{ij} also contains variables capturing the difference in productive assets. Specifically, it contains the absolute value of the difference in labor endowment, $DLABOR_{ij}$, machinery ownership, $DMACH_{ij}$, and human capital endowment, $DEDUC_{ij}$ (level of education of the household head), and $DAGE_{ij}$ (as a proxy for experience with farming). A positive coefficient for these variables would be consistent with negative matching along productive asset.

Hence, the "Becker" specification becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{ij}'\beta = \\
&\beta_1 + \beta_2(1+\gamma_0^o TITLE_i + \gamma_1^o LOTFAM_i + \gamma_2^0 CONFLICT_i + \gamma_3^o SUP_i + \gamma_3^o IRR_i + \gamma_4^o RR_i) * DLAND_{ij} \\
&+ \beta_3(1+\gamma_0^l TITLE_i + \gamma_1^l LOTFAM_i + \gamma_2^l CONFLICT_i + \gamma_3^l SUP_i + \gamma_3^l IRR_i + \gamma_4^l RR_i) * DCLASS_{ij} \\
&+ \beta_4 OPLOT_{ij} + \varphi_1 EDUC_j + \varphi_2 AGE_j + \varphi_3 MACH_j + \varphi_4 LABOR_j + \varphi_5 FEMALE_j \\
&+ \chi_1 DEDUC_{ij} + \chi_2 DLABOR_{ij} + \chi_3 DAGE_{ij} + \chi_4 DMACH_{ij}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}
$$

In the above specifications, a possible endogeneity bias might result if there is an unobservable that is correlated both with the probability of the match and with one of the unobserved tenant characteristics. Therefore, in an alternative specification, tenant fixed effects are included instead of the tenant characteristics to account for the reservation utility of the tenant. In this specification, however, another potential problem arises with the conditional logit estimation due to the fact that in the tenancy market the choices of different landlords are likely to be correlated. If one landlord chooses a certain tenant, this reduces the probability of other landlords choosing the same tenant and hence errors across choosers are negatively correlated and not independent.[14] The estimates with the tenant fixed effects therefore are quasi-maximum likelihood estimations, giving consistent, but not efficient, results.

[14] This negative correlation does not occur in the first specification, due to the inclusion of the variable $OPLOT_{ij}$. This variable can however not be included together with the fixed effects, due to collinearity.

4.3. Estimation results

The first column in table 8 reports the results for the first specification.[15] In line with the main hypothesis, the presence of conflicts is found to reduce the likelihood of renting out to people whose living standard is different, and the presence of a lot of family within the community increases the likelihood of renting out to people from a different landownership class or living standard class. The presence of a lot of family in the community is likely to increase the possibilities of contract enforcement, both directly, because it increases the likelihood of renting out to a family member, and indirectly because the presence of a lot of family members in the community can help landlords enforce contracts with third parties, as it increases the costs (loss of social benefits) for tenants of squatting.

As expected, landlords are less likely to rent out to tenants who already cultivate other plots, while they are more likely to rent out to higher educated male household heads who own machinery. This suggests that the positive effect of productive assets on the expected profit of the landlord compensates the negative effect through the reservation utility. Finally, I find that large plots are less likely to be traded across living standard groups, which is consistent with the model. However, the results also show a positive effect of plot size on trading across landownership class.

In table 8, no significant effects for the interaction terms with title are found. However, if the model is estimated for the rice region separately, a significant effect of title is found (table 9). This can be explained by the fact that the results for the two regions together are largely driven by the results of the horticultural region, as there are many more land rental contracts there. On the other hand, the presence of a lot of family has no significant effect in the rice region. A possible explanation for this difference between regions is that in the rice region, where there is a long history of land conflicts, the role of traditional informal mechanisms to enforce property rights has eroded. In such an environment, the ownership of titles, and hence legally enforceable property rights, becomes more important.[16] Also, in the horticultural region, almost all the plots that are rented out (90%) have a title, which might further explain why there is no significant effect of titles found for this region (see table 10). Further comparison of the results in table 9 and 10 shows that the productive assets of the tenant have a stronger effect in the horticultural region. This is probably due to the fact that in this region with a very intensive production system, the productive assets of the tenant play a larger role in determining profits.

Testing for alternative reasons for matching in the tenancy market

The second column of table 8, 9 and 10 reports the results of the second specification, to test for assortative matching along productive assets. There is some evidence of landowners with machinery preferring tenants without, and vice versa, but only at the 10% level. For the other productive assets no significant results are found. The results in the second column of table 10 also show that landlords are more likely to match with tenants who have a similar number of household members. This result contradicts the Becker hypothesis, and might indicate again the role of informal contract enforcement, which might be more difficult if the tenant has many more household members than the landlord. The coefficients of the other variables are robust to the changes in specification.

[15] In the interpretation of the results, it is important to point out, that while measurement error is likely to be higher in data collected using the indirect survey approach, random measurement error will cause the estimates to be attenuated towards zero.

[16] In their study on urban squatting communities in Ecuador Lanjouw and Levy (2002) also find that informal property rights can substitute for formal ones in more stable communities.

By measuring the social distance as an absolute value of the difference between the landlord and the tenant characteristics, I have assumed the effect of social distance to be independent from the direction of the difference. To test for possible asymmetries, the model was estimated allowing the coefficient of each difference to differ depending on the direction (not reported). Only the coefficients of the interaction terms with the plot size were significantly different from each other. Table 11 reports the estimations for the horticultural region, allowing the coefficient for these interaction terms to differ. First note that this does not alter the effects of the insecurity of property rights. Moreover, these estimations show that the positive effect of plot size on difference in landownership is due to smaller landowners giving their larger plots to larger landowners. This pattern of reverse rental can also be seen from poor landowners to richer tenants, and is likely to be driven by the need for large asset endowments to work those larger plots. The negative effect of plot size on matching between richer landlords and poorer tenants is consistent with rich landlords preferring to trade within their circle of confidence for plots with higher values.

I also tested whether there is an asymmetric effect of differences in assets between tenants and landlords. The coefficients of the difference in education and the difference in machinery ownership vary significantly depending on the direction of the difference. The signs in the 2nd column of table 11 however mainly confirm earlier findings, i.e., that all landlords prefer renting out their land to tenants with higher education and machinery ownership. In this specification, the coefficient of the difference in the number of household members is also allowed to differ. Although the hypothesis that the 2 coefficients are equal cannot be rejected, the result does show that the negative sign of the difference in the number of household members in table 10 is driven by the fact that landlords with small households prefer not to rent out to tenants with large households. This is consistent with the interpretation of this variable as capturing another informal enforcement mechanism.

Robustness checks

Table 12 and 13 report the results of the estimates with the tenant fixed effects. In these estimations, the set of potential matches for each landlord is restricted to the actual tenants in the community since the fixed effects cannot be identified for the households that don't rent from any landlord. In addition, one cannot estimate the effect of land conflicts on the matching across group, because of within-group collinearity with the fixed effects. Focussing hence on the plot specific tenure security measures, the estimations show that the effect of title on matching across landownership class in the rice region, and the effects of family protection on matching across landownership and living standard class in the horticultural reason, are robust to including the fixed effects. Also the significance of the other variables remains.

To further test the robustness of the findings, the model was estimated with alternative measures of the distance in land ownership (not reported). I re-estimate the model taking the logarithm of the difference in landownership or the square root of the difference, because taking the absolute value of land ownership might lead the results to be driven by a few very large distances. The results are robust to these different specifications. Estimating the model excluding the 5% largest differences in landownership also does not alter the findings, further showing that the results are not driven by a few large outliers.

The results are also robust to estimating the model with each of the measures of social distance (land owned and living standard) separately. This indicates that the results are not driven by a potential correlation between land owned and living standard. Also, one could hypothesize that the total amount of other land cultivated, or the total amount of other land per

capita cultivated, could be a better measure of the reservation utility of the tenant. However, when estimating the model replacing the variable measuring the number of other parcels cultivated with these variables, their coefficients are shown to be insignificant. Importantly, the results for the other variables are robust to this alternative specification. The results are also robust to replacing the conflict dummy, with an index of conflicts, which accounts for the presence of different types of conflicts in the community. Finally, the results are robust to exclusion of the interaction terms with the regional dummy.

Absentee landlords

In the results discussed so far, only matches between tenants and landlords living in the same community were considered. However a lot of rental transactions actually occur with absentee landlords, i.e., typically landowners who live in the provincial or national capital or even abroad. The choice of tenant by these absentee landlords is likely to be affected by different factors, as they cannot rely on the threat of the loss of other benefits of social interactions as an enforcement mechanism. Given that only very limited information about these absentee landlords (i.e., only their living standard and the total amount of land owned, aside from the plot information) could be collected, their decision process cannot be fully modeled. However, the estimation in table 14 for the rice region shows that indeed the matching of absentee landowners with potential tenants cannot be explained by the same processes as for the present landlords. In particular, I do not find any evidence of assortative matching along land ownership class or living standard class. Interestingly however, a significant positive effect of the age of the potential tenant is found. This could be explained by the fact that many absentee landowners are people who migrated out of those communities in the past, and only trust renting out their land to older people who they still might know.[17]

6. Conclusions and Policy Implications

This paper has been motivated by the observation that land rental markets in Latin America are small and segmented. In other regions, land rental markets have fulfilled important efficiency and equity functions. The observed atrophy and segmentation in Latin America suggests that there exists an important missed opportunity to improve the performance of agriculture and to combat rural poverty through rentals. As opposed to other parts of the world where access to land has been promoted through the regulation of land rental contracts, the issue of access to land in Latin America has focused on a long history of state-led expropriative land reforms and, more recently, on land market-assisted land reforms (Deininger, 1997), focusing in all cases on access to land in ownership and suppressing access to land through rental arrangements. The observation of relatively inactive and segmented land rental markets suggests that the policy focus on access to land needs to go beyond land reform and land ownership toward enhancing contractual forms of access to land that are less politically demanding than expropriative land reform, cheaper than land market-assisted land reform, and more progressive than the free operation of land sales markets.

To understand the determinants of access to land through the land rental market in a Latin American context, this paper uses new survey data from the Dominican Republic. Results from

[17] Note that for the estimation in table 14, the potential tenants living in the community of the actual tenant are considered to be the pool of potential tenants of interest for the particular landlord. There is no information on the location of each plot, but assuming that the plot is located in that particular community, this seems to be a reasonable definition of the pool of potential tenants for these plots.

these surveys show that while the land rental markets play an equalizing function between the distribution of land in ownership and use, the likelihood of renting is increased by the security of property rights in the community and a lower incidence of conflicts over access to land. Moreover, insecurity of property rights constrains the equalizing potential of the land rental market as it induces positive assortative matching along socio-economic group. Hence, in the absence of secure property rights, a segmented rental market results, limiting access to land for the landless and the poor. The results also show that access for the poor is further constrained because of the need for working capital (especially machinery) and some education to rent. Land rental markets thus concentrate land among a middle class of endowed tenants.

The insecurity of property rights that induces fear among landlords to lose their land is not unique to the Dominican Republic, but characterize many Latin American countries that share the common features of unequal land ownership distribution, agrarian laws put in place during the state-led expropriative land reforms, and institutional weaknesses in the land administration and juridical systems. The agrarian laws in some countries cause property right insecurity because of regulations and restrictions on the one hand, and because of inconsistencies with the Civil Code on the other. Lack of titles, outdated or overlapping titles, and slow, costly and inaccessible justice systems further impede property rights security (Macours et al., 2002). This paper has shown how such property rights insecurity leads to small and segmented land rental markets. More generally, the paper illustrates how insecurity of property rights might cause market distortions and, by limiting access to a productive asset, might impede socio-economic mobility for the rural poor.

The findings of this paper point to specific policy recommendations to enhance the scope of Latin American land rental market and make these markets more effective for efficiency gains and poverty reduction. The first is to reconsider lingering land reform legislation where it has fallen into disuse from its initial purpose of land redistribution in ownership. Such legislation often remains a threat for renting land to tenants, as it opens the possibility of rewarding squatting or land occupations. It is urgent to revise this legislation which is creating a loss-loss situation: it no longer helps the poor gain access to land through ownership, and it blocks them from accessing land in rental. Weakness of property rights is often also due to incomplete land titling programs. However, property rights are often enforced through informal mechanisms. The results in this paper suggest that the establishment of secure formal titles is particularly important in regions where a history of land conflicts might have eroded the role of informal enforcement mechanisms. Furthermore, it is important to explore and enhance reliable, low-cost conflict resolution mechanisms. The empirical results show that the existence of conflicts over land in a community is a major deterrent to rentals. Contracting cannot occur without anticipating the emergence of conflicts and the mechanisms through which they may be resolved.

Finally, if the land rental market is to serve as an effective instrument for poverty reduction, the performance of this market needs to be "assisted" on behalf of poor tenants, in the same perspective as land market-assisted land reform does this for access to land in ownership. This would include helping poor candidates secure the threshold asset endowments needed to enter this market. Credit programs tailored towards potential tenants could help poor rural households pass this threshold. It would also include the initiation or strengthening of alternative institutional arrangements for property rights enforcement such as community supervision of rental transactions that could both secure the rights of the landlord and enhance the bargaining position of the tenant.

References

Ackerberg, Daniel, A., and Maristella Botticini, 2002, "Endogenous Matching and the Empirical Determinants of Contract Choice", *The Journal of Political Economy*, 110(3): 564-91.

Baland, Jean-Marie, Frederic Gaspart, Frank Place and Jean-Philippe Platteau, 2000, "The Distributive Impact of Land Markets in Central Uganda", mimeo, CRED, University of Namur, Belgium.

Bardhan, Pranab K., 1984, *Land, Labor and Rural Poverty: Essays in Development Economics*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Barro, Robert, 1996, "Democracy and Growth", *Journal of Economic Growth,* 1(1): 1-27.

Becker, Gary S., 1973, "A Theory of Marriage: Part I", *The Journal of Political Economy*, 81(4): 813-846.

Bell, Clive, 1988, "Credit Markets and Interlinked Transactions", in H. Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan, (eds.), *Handbook of Development Economics*, Amsterdam: North Holland 763-830.

Besley, Timothy, 1995, "Property Rights and Investment Incentives: Theory and Evidence from Ghana", *The Journal of Political Economy*, 103(5): 903-37.

Bisin, Alberto, Giorgio Topa and Thierry Verdier, 2000, "An Empirical Analysis of Religious Homogamy and Socialization in the US", mimeo, New York University.

Burdett, Kenneth and Melvyn G. Coles, 1999, "Long-term Partnership Formation: Marriage and Employment", *The Economic Journal*, 109(June): F307-F334.

Carter, Michael and Juan S. Chamorro, 2001, "The Economics of Liberalizing Segmented Land Markets: Theory and Evidence from Nicaragua", paper presented at the AAEA meeting, August 2001, Chicago.

Deininger, Klaus, 1997, "Making Market-Assisted Land Reform Work", mimeo, Washington D.C.: The World Bank

Deininger, Klaus and Gershon Feder, 2001, "Land Institutions and Land Markets", in B.L. Gardner and G.C. Rausser, *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 1A. Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Deininger, Klaus and Jean S. Chamorro, 2000, "Land Markets, Land Access, and the Impact of Policy: The Case of Nicaragua", mimeo, The World Bank and University of Wisconsin.

DeSilva, Sanjaya, 2000, "The Role of Skills in the Land Leasing Markets", mimeo, Yale University.

de Soto, Hernando, 2000, *The Mystery of Capital. Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*, Basic Books: New York.

Feder, Gershon and David Feeny, 1991, "Land Tenure and Property Rights: Theory and Implications for Development Policy", *The World Bank Economic Review*, 5(1): 135-153.

Foster, Andrew D., 1998, "Marriage-Market Selection and Human Capital Allocations in Rural Bangladesh", mimeo, University of Pennsylvania.

Gill, Margarita, 2000, "República Dominicana: Tenencia y Mercado de la Tierra". Santo Domingo: Inter-American Development Bank.

Jepsen, Lisa, K. and Christopher A. Jepsen, 1999, "An Empirical Analysis of Same-sex and Opposite-sex Couples: Do 'Likes' Still Like 'Likes' in the '90s?" Northwestern University Institute for Policy Research Working Paper WP-99-5.

Knack, Stephen and Philip Keefer, 1995, "Institutions and Economic Performance: Cross-Country Tests Using Alternative Institutional Measures", *Economics and Politics,* 7(3): 207-27.

Lanjouw, Jean O., 1999, "Information and the Operation of Markets: Tests Based on a General Equilibrium Model of Land Leasing in India", *Journal of Development Economics*, 60: 497-527.

Lanjouw, Jean O. and Philip I. Levy, 2002, "Untitled: A Study of Formal and Informal Property Rights in Urban Ecuador," *The Economic Journal,* 112(482): 986-1019.

Liu, Pak-Wai and Junsen Zhang, 1999, "Assortative Mating Versus the Cross-productivity Effect", *Applied Economics Letter*, 6: 523-525.

Macours, Karen, 2002, "Comparing a Direct with an Indirect Approach to Collecting Household Level Information: Who tells the truth?", mimeo, University of California at Berkeley.

Macours, Karen, Manuel Diaz, Javier Molina and Hector Robles, 2002, "Legal and Institutional Impediments to the Development of Efficient Land Rental Markets in Latin America", paper prepared for the FAORLC workshop on land rental markets, Santiago, August 1-2.

Mortensen, Dale T., 1982, "Property Rights and Efficiency in Mating, Racing and Related Games", *American Economic Review*, 72: 968-79.

Olson, Mancur, 2000, *Power and Prosperity: Outgrowing Communist and Capitalist Dictatorships*, Basic Books: New York.

Pissarides, Christopher A., 1990, *Equilibrium Unemployment Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rosenzweig, Mark R., 1999, "Welfare, Marital Prospects, and Nonmarital Childbearing", *The Journal of Political Economy*, 107(6) part 2: S3-S32.

Shetty, Sudhir, 1988, "Limited Liability, Wealth Differences, and the Tenancy Ladder in Agrarian Economies", *Journal of Development Economics*, 29: 1-22.

Skoufias, Emmanuel, 1995, "Household Resources, Transaction Costs, and Adjustment through Land Tenancy", *Land Economics*, 71(1): 42-56.

Suen, Wing and Hon-Kwong Lui, 1999, "A Direct Test of the Efficient Marriage Market Hypothesis", *Economic Inquiry*, 37(1): 29-46.

Takasaki, Yoshito, Bradford L. Barham, and Oliver T. Coomes, 2000, "Rapid Rural Appraisal in Humid Tropical Forests: An Asset Possession-based Approach and Validation Methods for Wealth Assessment among Forest Peasant Households", *World Development*, 28(11): 1161-77.

Temple, Jonathan, 1999, "The New Growth Evidence", *Journal of Economic Literature,* 37(1): 112-56.

Table 1. Importance of land rentals in the Dominican Republic

% distribution of farmland by province and for the country

Province Includes		Duarte San F. de Macoris	La Vega Constanza	Dominican Republic
Rented	Fixed rent	3.6	4.6	3.2
	Share rent	3.1	6.4	3.9
	Loaned	2	11.9	7.2
	Total	8.7	22.9	14.3
Owned	With title	47.1	38	29
	Without title	19.9	8.9	28.4
	In succession	11.2	12.7	12.6
	Total	78.2	59.6	70
Public		2.5	4.5	7.4
Other		10.5	12.9	8.4

Source: Registro Nacional de Productores, 1998.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for the two survey regions

	Horticultural region Constanza	Rice region SF de Macoris
HOUSEHOLDS		
Total number of households	1092	1431
% landlord households	20	10
% tenant households	25	11
% autarkic households	11	21
% landless households	43	58
% land constrained households	45	63
LAND		
Total number of plots	667	658
% plots owner-operated	36	64
% plots rented out	64	36
% plots rented out to family	32	53
% plots rented out to non-family	68	47
% plots in land reform	9	68
% plots with registered public title	75	33
% plots with registered public or land reform title	84	71
COMMUNITIES		
Total number of communities	8	10
% communities with "fear" as main reason for non rental	0	90
% communities with few invasions/occupations	25	30
% communities with a lot of invasions/occupations	0	20
% communities with a few cases of squatting	50	50
% communities with a lot of cases of squatting	0	10
% communities with few other conflicts	50	20
% communities with a lot of other conflicts	0	20

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for all households

	landlord	autarkic[o]	tenants	landless[o]
No. observations	365	207	463	703
DEMOGRAPHICS				
Average age of head	58	53	43	43
% female headed households	29	17	6	30
HUMAN CAPITAL				
Average education of head*	1.61	1.52	1.89	1.61
Average number of adults in household	2.34	2.57	2.39	2.05
Average number of international migrants	0.32	0.19	0.07	0.08
LAND AND PHYSICAL CAPITAL				
Average land owned/adult member (ha/pers)	2.27	1.09	0.31	0
Average land cultivated/adult member (ha/pers)	0.97	1.09	1.48	0
Average number of cattle	3.17	0.95	1.19	0.02
% of households with machinery	15	16	18	3
SOCIAL CAPITAL				
Average number of years lived in community	46	43	35	36
% of households that are member of a community organization	39	56	41	32
% of households that are leader of a community organization	16	19	16	9
LIVING STANDARD				
% of households with good living standard	22	11	20	3
% of households with regular living standard	40	46	48	25
% of households with bad living standard	30	38	27	55
% of households with very bad living standard	7	5	6	13
Average "Living standard index"**	2.79	2.63	2.82	2.19
LAND RENTAL MARKET CONSTRAINT				
% of households that want to rent (more) land	-	52	76	67
% of households that want to rent out (more) land	4	9	-	-

º Data are weighted to account for sampling probabilities

* Education is ranked from 1 to 4 (1 =less than primary school, 2 = primary school; 3 = secondary school, 4 = higher education)

** Living standard is ranked from 1 to 4 (1 = very bad; 2 = bad; 3 = regular; 4 = good)

Table 4: Determinants of renting land: weighted probit estimation

	Mean	Marginal Effect	Marginal Effect
Tenant's assets			
Amount of land owned (ha)	1.16	-0.003	-0.003
		(1.36)	(1.29)
No land owned (dummy)	0.65	0.090***	0.094***
		(4.75)	(5.00)
Education household head (index 1-4)	1.65	0.193***	0.183***
		(4.04)	(3.80)
Square education household head	3.18	-0.032***	-0.030***
		(2.89)	(2.69)
# of household members living abroad	0.13	-0.019	-0.014
		(0.92)	(0.70)
Own machinery of younger than 35 (dummy)	0.03	0.181***	0.170***
		(3.14)	(3.00)
# of household members	2.24		0.009
			(1.14)
Member of a community organization (dummy)	0.54		0.053***
			(3.21)
Age of household head	46.81	0.000	0.000
		(0.63)	(0.09)
Female household head (dummy)	0.23	-0.140***	-0.136***
		(7.25)	(6.92)
Insecurity of property rights			
Share of parcels without title in community	0.24	-0.096**	-0.094*
		(1.98)	(1.94)
Land conflicts in community (dummy)	0.72	-0.128***	-0.127***
		(5.73)	(5.68)
Many family members in community (dummy)	0.60	0.016	0.013
		(0.95)	(0.75)
# of parcels owned by the same living standard	39.42	0.002***	0.002***
		(5.67)	(5.55)
Control variables			
# off community members with off-farm employment	33.63	-0.001***	-0.001***
		(3.01)	(2.98)
Distance to market (minutes)	23.41	0.003***	0.002***
		(3.18)	(2.89)
Rice region (dummy)	0.57	-0.101***	-0.112***
		(3.62)	(3.89)
Observations		1688	1688
LR chi^2		279.85	297.73
Pseudo R^2		0.16	0.17
Average predicted probability if prob=0		0.16	0.17
Average predicted probability if prob=1		0.32	0.33

Robust z statistics in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

Table 5: Determinants of renting land: willingness and opportunity (weighted heckit estimation)

	Mean	Prob. of wanting to rent Marg. Effects	Prob. of renting, if want to Marg. Effects
Tenant's assets			
Amount of land owned (ha)	1.16	-0.009	-0.005
		(1.15)	(0.54)
No land owned (dummy)	0.65	0.325***	-0.053
		(8.15)	(0.59)
Education household head (index 1-4)	1.65	0.321***	0.113***
		(2.98)	(3.91)
Square education household head	3.18	-0.081***	
		(2.98)	
# of household members living abroad	0.13	0.018	-0.064
		(0.56)	(1.3)
Own machinery of younger than 35 (dummy)	0.03	-0.118	0.295***
		(1.17)	(2.88)
# of household members	2.24	0.061***	-0.019
		(3.39)	(0.81)
Member of a community organization (dummy)	0.54	0.114***	0.001
		(3.36)	(0.03)
Age household head	46.81	-0.010***	0.005*
		(7.48)	(1.93)
Female household head (dummy)	0.23	-0.362***	-0.079
		(8.43)	(0.71)
Insecurity of property rights			
Share of parcels without title in community	0.24	0.159	-0.329***
		(1.53)	(3.1)
Land conflicts in community (dummy)	0.72	-0.007	-0.157***
		(0.16)	(3.3)
Many family members in community (dummy)	0.60	-0.043	0.030
		(1.26)	(0.82)
# of parcels owned by the same living standard	39.42	0.000	0.002***
		(0.24)	(3.75)
Control variables			
# of community members with off-farm employment	33.63	-0.002**	-0.001
		(2.39)	(1.24)
Distance to market (minutes)	23.41	0.000	0.005***
		(0.05)	(2.9)
Rice region (dummy)	0.57	0.312***	-0.327***
		(5.76)	(4.63)
Observations		1688	889
Selection coefficient			-0.606
Wald chi^2			224.09
Wald test of independent eqns. Prob > chi^2 =			0.1458
Average predicted probability if prob=0		0.38	0.31
Average predicted probability if prob=1		0.69	0.50

Robust z statistics in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

Table 6: Determinants of renting out land: weighted probit estimation

	Mean	Marginal Effects	Marginal Effects
Landlord's assets			
Amount of land owned (ha)	5.44	0.006*	0.005*
		[1.88]	[1.84]
Education household head (index 1-4)	1.63	-0.055	-0.067
		[0.51]	[0.62]
Square education household head	3.06	0.018	0.020
		[0.74]	[0.81]
# of household members living abroad	0.30	0.039*	0.041*
		[1.71]	[1.80]
Age of household head	56.63	0.008***	0.008***
		[5.46]	[5.40]
Female household head (dummy)	0.21	0.292***	0.300***
		[6.13]	[6.41]
# of household members	2.55	-0.05***	
		[2.95]	
Member of a community organization (dummy)	0.60	-0.106**	
		[2.57]	
Plot characteristics			
Plot size (ha)	2.58	-0.024***	-0.021***
		[3.65]	[3.34]
Irrigated plot (dummy)	0.45	0.062	0.053
		[1.47]	[1.27]
Insecurity of property rights			
Plot with title (dummy)	0.77	0.09*	0.106**
		[1.81]	[2.11]
Land conflicts in the community (dummy)	0.75	-0.129***	-0.115**
		[2.65]	[2.43]
Many family members in the community (dummy)	0.54	-0.036	-0.051
		[0.91]	[1.29]
# of potential tenants with the same living standard	50.91	0.003***	0.002***
		[3.80]	[3.64]
Control variables			
# of community members with off-farm employment	31.51	-0.001	-0.002
		[1.36]	[1.42]
Distance to market (minutes)	22.75	-0.002	-0.002
		[0.94]	[1.29]
Rice region (dummy)	0.52	-0.285***	-0.300***
		[4.04]	[4.46]
Observations		860	860
LR chi^2		206.44	205.86
Pseudo R^2		0.21	0.19
Average predicted probability if prob=0		0.31	0.32
Average predicted probability if prob=1		0.57	0.56

Robust z statistics in brackets

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

Table 7a. Distribution of transactions by living standard of tenant and landlord in communities with recent land occupations

		Living standard tenant			
		Low	Regular	High	Total
Living standard landlord	Low	52%	41%	7%	100%(46)
	Regular	21%	52%	27%	100% (70)
	High	7%	33%	60%	100% (45)
Total		26%	43%	30%	100%(161)

Table 7b. Distribution of transactions by living standard of tenant and landlord in communities without recent land occupations

		Living standard tenant			
		Low	Regular	High	Total
Living standard landlord	Low	33%	48%	19%	100% (54)
	Regular	25%	45%	30%	100% (47)
	High	41%	36%	23%	100%(39)
Total		33%	43%	24%	100%(140)

Table 7c. Distribution of area transacted by living standard of tenant and landlord (all communities)

		Living standard tenant			
		Low	Regular	High	Total
Living standard landlord	Low	24%	42%	24%	100%
	Regular	18%	46%	36%	100%
	High	11%	27%	61%	100%
Total		19%	37%	43%	100%

Table 8: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in 2 regions in the DR

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social Distance (and interaction terms)		
|Δ land owned|	-0.085	-0.093
	(0.69)	(0.76)
| Δ land owned|*title	0.028	0.033
	(0.31)	(0.35)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	0.097*	0.102*
	(1.81)	(1.89)
| Δ land owned|*land conflict	-0.031	-0.037
	(0.39)	(0.47)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	0.032**	0.032**
	(2.04)	(2.02)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	-0.033	-0.032
	(0.56)	(0.53)
| Δ land owned|*rice region	-0.013	-0.013
	(0.20)	(0.20)
| Δ living standard|	0.353	0.324
	(1.11)	(1.02)
| Δ living standard|*title	-0.244	-0.218
	(0.80)	(0.71)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.510**	0.488**
	(2.47)	(2.35)
| Δ living standard|*land conflict	-0.583***	-0.559***
	(2.75)	(2.62)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.079	-0.094*
	(1.46)	(1.71)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	-0.070	-0.048
	(0.28)	(0.19)
| Δ living standard|*rice region	-0.097	-0.084
	(0.37)	(0.32)
Tenant's assets and characteristics		
# other parcels cultivated	-0.099*	-0.086
	(1.71)	(1.47)
Age household head	-0.009	-0.005
	(1.58)	(0.64)
Female household head	-0.577**	-0.559**
	(2.11)	(2.04)
Education household head	0.491***	0.540***
	(4.95)	(3.92)
Machinery ownership	1.024***	0.829***
	(6.24)	(4.31)
# of adults in household	0.004	0.042
	(0.05)	(0.52)
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head|		-0.097
		(0.70)
| Δ # household members|		-0.102
		(1.19)
| Δ age household head|		0.008
		(0.94)
| Δ machinery ownership|		0.320*
		(1.84)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	290	289
Average # of potential tenants per plot	80	80
LR chi^2	126.96	130.07
Pseudo R^2	0.05	0.05

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses; * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
All potential tenants in same community included

Table 9: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in the rice region

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-0.873*	-0.868*
	(1.81)	(1.79)
| Δ land owned|*title	0.943**	0.938**
	(2.41)	(2.40)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	-0.108	-0.112
	(0.50)	(0.51)
| Δ land owned|*land conflict	0.021	0.025
	(0.08)	(0.10)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	0.048	0.045
	(0.46)	(0.44)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	0.128	0.132
	(0.49)	(0.51)
| Δ living standard|	0.246	0.260
	(0.34)	(0.36)
| Δ living standard|*title	-0.273	-0.261
	(0.48)	(0.46)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.366	0.368
	(0.90)	(0.90)
| Δ living standard|*land conflict	-0.842*	-0.851*
	(1.86)	(1.87)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.000	-0.007
	(0.00)	(0.05)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	0.062	0.063
	(0.13)	(0.13)
Tenant's assets and characteristics		
# other parcels cultivated	0.066	0.062
	(0.58)	(0.54)
Age household head	-0.018	-0.018
	(1.59)	(0.87)
Female household head	-0.194	-0.180
	(0.57)	(0.53)
Education household head	0.419***	0.516*
	(2.63)	(1.95)
Machinery ownership	0.727*	0.733*
	(1.88)	(1.88)
# of adults in household	0.282**	0.224
	(2.01)	(1.35)
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head|		-0.116
		(0.43)
| Δ # household members|		0.115
		(0.65)
| Δ age household head|		0.000
		(0.00)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	86	86
Average # of potential tenants per plot	58	58
LR chi^2	39.53	40.11
Pseudo R^2	0.06	0.06

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
All potential tenants in same community included

Table 10: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in the horticulture region

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-0.085	-0.084
	(0.71)	(0.71)
| Δ land owned|*title	0.006	0.010
	(0.07)	(0.12)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	0.106*	0.109*
	(1.91)	(1.96)
| Δ land owned|*land conflict	-0.004	-0.016
	(0.04)	(0.19)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	0.028*	0.028*
	(1.74)	(1.70)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	-0.044	-0.043
	(0.72)	(0.69)
| Δ living standard|	0.339	0.304
	(0.91)	(0.82)
| Δ living standard|*title	-0.270	-0.238
	(0.72)	(0.63)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.593**	0.559**
	(2.48)	(2.32)
| Δ living standard|*land conflict	-0.476**	-0.434*
	(1.97)	(1.78)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.091	-0.106*
	(1.54)	(1.74)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	-0.204	-0.186
	(0.68)	(0.62)
Tenant's assets and characteristics		
# other parcels cultivated	-0.198***	-0.189***
	(2.84)	(2.69)
Age household head	-0.005	-0.001
	(0.74)	(0.14)
Female household head	-1.117**	-1.105**
	(2.19)	(2.16)
Education household head	0.547***	0.584***
	(4.25)	(3.52)
Machinery ownership	1.159***	1.001***
	(6.28)	(4.85)
# of adults in household	-0.116	-0.066
	(1.30)	(0.68)
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head|		-0.077
		(0.46)
| Δ # household members|		-0.227**
		(2.18)
| Δ age household head|		0.008
		(0.88)
| Δ machinery ownership|		0.279
		(1.53)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	204	203
Average # of potential tenants per plot	89	89
LR chi^2	110.91	115.19
Pseudo R^2	0.06	0.07

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
All potential tenants in same community included

Table 11: Determinants of matching in the horticulture region-specification allowing for asymmetries

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	
Social distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-0.073	-0.066
	(0.64)	(0.59)
| Δ land owned|*title	0.009	0.007
	(0.11)	(0.09)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	0.096*	0.101**
	(1.92)	(1.98)
| Δ land owned|*land conflict	-0.005	-0.018
	(0.06)	(0.22)
| Δ land owned|*plot size if from big to small	0.001	0.001
	(0.99)	(0.91)
| Δ land owned|*plot size if from small to big	0.002**	0.002**
	(2.13)	(2.12)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	-0.025	-0.027
	(0.48)	(0.50)
| Δ living standard|	0.049	-0.001
	(0.13)	(0.00)
| Δ living standard|*title	-0.209	-0.175
	(0.55)	(0.46)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.519**	0.489*
	(2.10)	(1.96)
| Δ living standard|*land conflict	-0.567**	-0.514**
	(2.26)	(2.03)
| Δ living standard|*plot size if from rich to poor	-0.009**	-0.011**
	(2.07)	(2.31)
| Δ living standard|*plot size if from poor to rich	0.051***	0.050***
	(4.19)	(4.16)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	-0.260	-0.220
	(0.83)	(0.70)
Tenant's assets and characteristics		
# other parcels cultivated	-0.267***	-0.259***
	(3.66)	(3.52)
Age household head	-0.006	-0.005
	(0.78)	(0.75)
Female household head	-1.015**	-0.991*
	(1.98)	(1.93)
Education household head	0.471***	
	(3.63)	
Machinery ownership	0.843***	
	(4.39)	
# of adults in household	-0.134	
	(1.47)	
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head| if from high to low		-0.559*
		(1.87)
| Δ education household head| if from low to high		0.421***
		(2.83)
| Δ machinery ownership| if from with to without		-0.297
		(0.87)
| Δ machinery ownership| if from without to with		1.003***
		(4.67)
| Δ # household members| if from many to few		-0.114
		(0.76)
| Δ # household members| if from few to many		-0.312**
		(2.26)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	204	203
Average # of potential tenants per plot	89	89
LR chi^2	151.59	156.46
Pseudo R^2	0.09	0.09

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses; * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

Table 12: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in the rice region: Estimation with tenant fixed effects

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-1.732	-1.126
	(1.36)	(0.61)
| Δ land owned|*title	1.949**	4.214**
	(2.13)	(2.06)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	0.466	2.266
	(0.77)	(1.27)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	-0.042	-0.504
	(0.21)	(1.22)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	0.866	0.669
	(0.89)	(0.47)
| Δ living standard|	0.967	0.753
	(1.09)	(0.83)
| Δ living standard|*title	-1.192	-1.146
	(1.44)	(1.34)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.067	-0.007
	(0.12)	(0.01)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.165	-0.138
	(0.78)	(0.64)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	-0.833	-0.770
	(1.17)	(1.07)
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head|		0.246
		(0.80)
| Δ # household members|		0.552
		(1.63)
| Δ age household head|		0.022
		(0.70)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	86	86
Average # of potential tenants per plot	10	10
LR chi^2	39.67	48.41
Pseudo R^2	0.11	0.13

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
Only actual tenants in same community included; fixed effects are not reported

Table 13: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in the horticulture region
Estimation with tenant fixed effects

	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-0.124**	-0.132**
	(2.00)	(2.07)
| Δ land owned|*family protection	0.121*	0.122*
	(1.75)	(1.71)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	0.051**	0.050**
	(2.43)	(2.42)
| Δ land owned|*ırrigated plot	-0.081	-0.071
	(1.06)	(0.96)
| Δ living standard|	-0.264	-0.229
	(1.20)	(1.02)
| Δ living standard|*family protection	0.459*	0.454*
	(1.75)	(1.71)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.091	-0.105
	(1.38)	(1.57)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	-0.006	-0.022
	(0.02)	(0.07)
Difference in productive assets		
| Δ education household head|		-0.258
		(1.38)
| Δ # household members|		-0.244**
		(2.06)
| Δ age household head|		0.019*
		(1.64)
| Δ machinery ownership|		0.230
		(1.05)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	204	203
Average # of potential tenants per plot	30	30
LR chi^2	70.19	83.82
Pseudo R^2	0.0526	0.0633

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
Only actual tenants in same community included; fixed effects are not reported

Table 14: Determinants of matching in the tenancy market in rice region of present and absentee landlords

	Present landlords	Absentee landlords
	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j	Cond. prob. match between landlord-plot i and tenant j
Social Distance (and interaction terms)		
| Δ land owned|	-0.918**	0.030
	(1.97)	(0.09)
| Δ land owned|*title	0.907**	-0.158
	(2.35)	(0.57)
| Δ land owned|*land conflict	0.000	-0.007
	(0.03)	(0.53)
| Δ land owned|*plot size	0.045	0.039
	(0.46)	(1.05)
| Δ land owned|*irrigated plot	0.148	-0.103
	(0.59)	(0.43)
| Δ living standard|	0.330	-0.724
	(0.47)	(1.09)
| Δ living standard|*title	-0.157	0.431
	(0.29)	(0.91)
| Δ living standard|*land conflict	-0.794*	-0.059
	(1.79)	(0.13)
| Δ living standard|*plot size	-0.005	-0.009
	(0.03)	(0.46)
| Δ living standard|*irrigated plot	0.081	0.190
	(0.17)	(0.43)
Tenant's assets and characteristics		
# other parcels cultivated	0.073	0.159
	(0.65)	(1.50)
Age household head	-0.018	0.022**
	(1.60)	(2.20)
Female household head	-0.205	-0.746
	(0.61)	(1.57)
Education household head	0.419***	0.380**
	(2.63)	(2.15)
Machinery ownership	0.728*	0.194
	(1.88)	(0.47)
# of adults in household	0.276**	0.090
	(1.97)	(0.60)
Observations		
# of landlord-plots	86	71
Average # of potential tenants per plot	58	57
LR chi^2	38.61	33.68
Pseudo R^2	0.06	0.06

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
All potential tenants in same community included