

The research network for endogenous rural development in the Mediterranean region with special reference to Turkey

Isikli E., Türkekul B.

in

Stamataki E. (ed.), Clapan C. (ed.).
Endogenous rural development in the Mediterranean region

Chania : CIHEAM
Cahiers Options Méditerranéennes; n. 30

1998
pages 45-54

Article available on line / Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse :

<http://om.ciheam.org/article.php?IDPDF=CI020824>

To cite this article / Pour citer cet article

Isikli E., Türkekul B. **The research network for endogenous rural development in the Mediterranean region with special reference to Turkey.** In : Stamataki E. (ed.), Clapan C. (ed.). *Endogenous rural development in the Mediterranean region.* Chania : CIHEAM, 1998. p. 45-54 (Cahiers Options Méditerranéennes; n. 30)



<http://www.ciheam.org/>
<http://om.ciheam.org/>

THE RESEARCH NETWORK FOR ENDOGENOUS RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TURKEY

E. ISIKLI,
B. TÜRKEKUL,
Dept. of Agricultural Economics of the
Aegean University, Izmir - Turkey

ABSTRACT:

The purpose of this Report, which has been prepared within the framework of the collaborative "NEDMED" project carried out in the Mediterranean countries, is to give an overview of past Endogenous Development (ED) experiences, methods for identification of ED potential and practices, and to introduce some ED studies which could possibly be conducted, in Turkey in the future.

At the beginning of the report there is a brief description of the Turkish economy, with special emphasis on growth gaps between urban and rural areas. Subsequently, in the light of a review of past and ongoing Rural Development (RD) experiences, the Ed potential of Turkey is demonstrated and it is maintained that the importance of this subject has been neglected over the years.

However, through the contribution of information from some of the typical projects conducted in previous years in different regions of Turkey, the following criteria could be used for the identification of ED potential and practices: heterogeneity, farming styles, ecological agriculture, local groups of farmers (=social carriers), local agricultural systems, social organisation of farming. The main actions which are appropriate for the strengthening of ED in the light of the conditions prevailing in Turkey are stated. These are the identification of agricultural districts and their production patterns, farmers' initiatives and Farming Systems Research (FRS) and the provision of information to farmers. In the near future within the whole spectrum of ED through the application of both farm-oriented ED (local production area) and local system oriented ED (agri-industrial district level) it is considered that new research projects could be released in various localities of Turkey.

KEYWORDS:

Development policies, Rural development, Development projects, Regional Development, Socio-economic development, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this paper is to give an overview of past and on-going rural and endogenous development (ED) experience, to provide a brief examination of the methods used both to identify ED potential and practices and to reinforce their implementation in Turkey. This will be

followed by the introduction of some ED studies which may possibly be conducted in the future.

Turkey is a country with a population of 65 million, spread over an area of 780,000 sq. kms. Its topography, climate,

water and land resources are extremely variable, and there are 9 different agricultural regions with great diversity in the advantage they offer. Many types and varieties of agricultural products are grown on the 4.5 million farms of various sizes which are located in these regions. Thus, among the Mediterranean countries (MDC) Turkey has a typical, heterogeneous agricultural structure and farm organisation of its own.

However, where the levels of income and living standards are concerned, the gap and the main differences between rural and urban areas, and even between the rural areas themselves, have deepened with time, and given rise to some serious problems. Also, the development models from other countries which have been applied have not, for a number of reasons, been very well suited to local conditions, and the performance has not been up to expectations. Thus there is a great need to find new models and approaches in rural development (RD).

Where consideration of new models is concerned patterns for endogenous development take great priority and importance among the others. This is because they are founded mainly on locally available resources, such as the potential presented by the local ecology, the labour force, local knowledge and local patterns for linking production and consumption, local organisation of development, local control over the development process and the tendency towards a high level of retained benefits within local economies.

Given this general understanding of the ED process and the heterogeneous agricultural structure and existing resources of the country, both the farm-orientated ED (local production area) and local system-

orientated ED (agri-industrial district level) types of models constitute great alternatives for Turkish Agriculture; this has especially been the case over the last ten years.

1. IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Despite the overall economic developments of recent years, agriculture still continues to hold its place and importance in the Turkish economy, and the agricultural sector makes various contributions to the economy as a whole. However, the share of livestock production is rather low (16.7 %) as compared to that in the developed countries, and vegetable production constitutes the major share (68.7 %) of total production.

The relationship between agricultural land and population has suffered some setbacks due to a number of severe problems which have been faced in recent years, e.g. lack of efficient planning for usage of agricultural land, the increasing rate of land use for non-farm purposes, and erosion. Thus the share of small farms in the total has increased. There are 4.09 million farms and the great majority (80%) of them comprise 50 decars of farmland, or less. The statistics in 1991 show that 96% of all farms were engaged in crop production and animal husbandry, while the remainder (4%) were engaged only in animal production.

Moreover, it must be stated that the higher rate of inflation in the overall economy, the rapid rise in the public sector borrowing requirements, and some other defects of macro-economic policies have squeezed rural incomes in Turkey.

Given these explanations and in the light of some other parameters of the Turkish economy (Table 1), it should be emphasized that rural areas and the

agricultural sector still occupy a special and important place in the economy. Growth gaps persist between rural and urban areas.

Table 1: Some Parameters of the Turkish Economy

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Population (1990) | 56.5 million |
| Rate of increase of the Population(‰) | 21.7 |
| Rural Population (%) | 59 |
| Urban Population (%) | 41 |
| Urban Area (%) | 39 |
| Rural Area (%) | 61 |
| Per capita (\$) | 3004 |
| Share of Agriculture in GNP (%) | 14.7 |
| Share of Industry in GNP (%) | 27.0 |
| Share of Services in GNP (%) | 58.3 |
| Growth Rate For Agriculture (%) | -2.2 |
| Growth Rate For Industry (%) | 8.2 |
| Growth Rate For Services (%) | 6.6 |
| Exports (million \$) (1993) | 15345 |
| Imports (million \$) (1993) | 29428 |
| Balance of Foreign Trade (million \$) (1993) | -14083 |

TURKEY

| | <u>Population (%)</u> | <u>Area (%)</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Predominantly Rural Areas | 58 | 82 |
| Dominantly Rural Areas | 30 | 17 |
| Predominantly Urban Areas | 12 | 1 |

In order to provide a clearer picture of Turkish Agriculture, a comparison of some economic and social parameters has been

made for Turkey, the European Union, Germany and Greece, as follows:

Table 2. The Turkish agricultural sector

| | Pop. in (Million) | Rate of Population Increase (%) | Per Capita GDP \$ (1993) | Growth Rate of GDP (%) 1993 | Employment in Agriculture | Rate of unemployment (%) | Rate of Population in rural area (%) | Share of Rural Area (%) |
|---------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| EU | 370 | 0.3 | 20.100 | -0.5 | 5.8 | - | 24.6 | 79 |
| Turkey | 60 | 2.3 | 2.933 | 7.5 | 43.9 | 7.2 | 59.0 | 93 |
| Germany | 81 | 0.2 | 23.560 | -1.9 | 3.7 | 7.2 | - | - |
| Greece | 10.5 | 0.5 | 7.390 | 0 | 21.9 | 8.5 | - | - |

Source: Karabadiy, AlpKent 1995, p.97.

Given the above facts, it should again be clearly stated that there are major growth gaps between urban and rural areas, between the agricultural and other sectors, and most importantly in the relationship between agriculture today and the Turkish

economy. Although higher potential exists in rural areas, it has not been exploited to maximum efficiency and thus new models and approaches are required in order to obtain a greater contribution of these resources to the economy in the future.

2. A REVIEW OF PAST AND ON-GOING RURAL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES

It has been reported that over the last 30 years, and more particularly during the Planned Development Period which began in 1963, special efforts have been made to gain RD experience in Turkey. In each Five-Year Development Planning Period, particular goals and instruments of policy for both agricultural development and that of rural areas have been specified and determined.

Quite detailed Rural Development Projects (RDP) have been clearly set out in the programs of each of the Turkish political parties and all previous Turkish Governments. Indeed, over the last 30 years, many Rural Development Projects (RDP) have been implemented and some important successes have already been achieved.

Some of the Rural Development Projects (RDP) which have been implemented are financed only by the Turkish Government, while at the same time others also receive funding from international donor organizations, such as the World Bank and FAO.

The Development Plans state separately that special measures will deal with "Village Development" programs and, in addition, this particular issue has also been included in the Five Year Development Plan under the heading of "Integrated Rural Development Projects".

In addition to these types of integrated projects, some other typical rural development projects have also been implemented in line with the targets given in different Five Year Development Plans. Some examples of these typical projects are those concerning ÇORUM-ÇANKIRI,

ERZURUM, BINGÖL-MUS, ADANA-SEYHAN, YOZGAT and GEDIZ VALLEY.

All of the projects mentioned above have been prepared and implemented in order to gain greater benefit from local resources for the local rural population. Among the main targets of the projects are the increase in both yield and production of vegetable and animal products, improvements in agri-industry and agribusiness, the motivation of the rural population, the training of all people in the area, and particularly specific improvements in the infrastructure of the region.

Apart from those projects mentioned, the Southern Anatolia Project (SAP), with its greater area of coverage and resources, has been prepared for the development of the southern part of Turkey as a whole. It is an integrated project embracing 13 sub-projects. The project, basically multipurpose in nature, is aimed mainly at the supply of the plains with irrigation and various other services, as well as at the development of the soil and water sources of the region. The SAP will include dams, hydroelectric centres, irrigation systems and many kinds of infrastructural investments, communications, industry, education and health centres etc., and its emphasis is on fundamental development systems.

Furthermore, because of the main differences between potential natural resources and the conditions which prevail between the eastern and western regions, and in order to avoid the existence of development gaps between these regions, Special Priority Regions Development Programs - "PRIORITY REGIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT" - have been implemented in recent years. From the socio-economic standpoint, priority regions, although possessed of higher potential, were

underdeveloped areas in relation to other regions.

In brief evaluation of the agricultural development projects mentioned above, the following general points may be made. The first common feature of the projects was their orientation towards agricultural extension. Secondly, they were aimed at providing some extra off-farm income for the farmers through the programs of weaving, handicrafts, apiculture and sericulture, in addition to special measures aimed at infrastructural improvements. However, instead of the taking of initiatives in decision-making by the farmers and local people, there was a "top-to-bottom" approach, and sufficient attention has not yet been paid to the definition and resolution of differences which exist between agricultural development and rural development. The latter covers a number of other issues such as dependency on localities and local conditions, participation of local people in the development programs, provision of housing and education, social organisation among rural people, health and environmental problems of rural areas etc., along with other rural development objectives.

Therefore it can easily be observed that the target level determined at the beginning of the project has not been reached, intensification of services has decreased in relation to the duration of the program, and more importantly there has been no understanding of the reality of development, which is a continuous process.

As a result of this approach to rural development, the contribution of the rural sector and agriculture as a whole to the Turkish economy has not reached the desired level, and thus has not provided the

rural population with sufficient reward and welfare benefits for their efforts.

In order to achieve higher stability in economic and social development in any region it is necessary, during the course of project implementation, to define non-farm and farm sectors, revitalize human and physical resources, and establish a social and political framework for society through dynamic institutions, in addition to the achievement of higher agricultural production.

With regard to these facts and taking into account the special importance and problems¹ of the agricultural sector in the Turkish economy, the realization of sustainable agricultural development requires development studies both at macro and micro levels in various regions of Turkey. Thus Turkish agriculture and the rural sector are in dire and immediate need of endogenous development projects and studies.

3. IDENTIFICATION OF ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES AND POTENTIAL

As stated above, new methods and approaches have been necessary in Turkish agricultural development studies in recent years, because of the failure of some

¹ In recent years, Turkish Agriculture is faced to the following problems: a- Increased structural and organisational deficiencies, b- Higher level of erosion and non-farm usage of lands, c- Intensification of population and skewed distribution of lands, d- Lower level of yields and production for all subsections and more particularly livestock production, e- More dependency of agriculture to natural conditions, f- Lack of research, training and extension relations, g- Insufficient and wrong agricultural policies, h- Many deficiencies where farms and farmers are concerned.

Meanwhile, the percentage of the increase in agricultural imports is higher than that recorded for the total of all imports; the contrary is true in the case of exports. This is another parameter which shows that agricultural resources are not being used to maximum efficiency in Turkey.

development projects which were implemented after exogenous identification.

Taking into consideration the variations in the geography, topography, climate, and land, as well as the sociological and human-cultural differences among the various agricultural zones, 9 different agricultural regions have been determined in Turkey, in each of which the production-marketing and consumption patterns have changed. Thus the country exhibits a rather heterogeneous agricultural and socio-economic structure.

With its own peculiar characteristics, Turkey seems an ideal country in which to apply the powerful and promising concept of endogenous development studies, since it is a country strongly in need of development in order to realise its rural economic, political, cultural and social potential.

To achieve success in the future with the present structure of the agricultural sector in Turkey, it should always be remembered that sustainable agricultural development may be dependent upon different production patterns of the areas, on the local patterns for linking production, consumption and human sources, on the articulation between production, transformation and consumption, on the way in which agronomic, economic and technical research complement one another, and on the stimulation and establishment of decentralized socio-economic and cultural activities.

Therefore, the first important step towards the achievement of sustainability is the identification of endogenous development potential and practices through the employment of appropriate methods. Where the identification of endogenous development potential is concerned the

following criteria for approach have been mentioned in the references:

- a. Heterogeneity of rural regions and sub-regions
- b. Farming styles
- c. Tendencies in the historical development of agriculture
- d. Food chains in processing and marketing
- e. Territoriality
- f. Social carriers or local groups of farmers
- g. Specific products or ecological agriculture
- h. Local practices for agricultural systems
- i. Social organization of farming or social improvements for agriculture (Ploeg, 1994).

Some of these criteria have been used and a few research studies incorporating the stated approaches, but with some limitations, have already been conducted and completed in Turkey. Some typical examples of selected studies for the identification of ED potentials from different agricultural regions are as follows:

- a. Expansion of late season grape growing on the Yunt Mountain of Manisa Province in the Aegean Region.
- b. Application of ecological agricultural practices in 13 provinces of Turkey.
- c. Training of rural women for nursery handicrafts and the weaving of carpets in some regions.
- d. Development of small-scale farms of the TAURUS mountains in the Mediterranean region.

- e. In situ conservation of native wheat varieties in the transitional zone of Turkey.
- f. Leader-farmers project and the association for the provision of special services to villages in Tekirdađ, Marmara Region.

Although this list may be extended through the addition of some other examples, it would be appropriate here to mention other areas of Turkey with ED potential:

Among leading studies have been those for the Turkish Development Foundation concerned with contract-farming and bee-keeping, the village development project of ÇANAKKALE-BAYRAMIÇ relating to warehousing and fish farming, the carpet weaving project of Ayvacık-Süleymanköy, studies carried out by the Beyşehir Cooperatives concerning the manufacture of hunting-guns in Huglu-Uzunlu, the pilot leather industry of ACIPAYAM- Denizli, traditional wine-making and special efforts towards village tourism in SIRINCE-SELÇUK, the growing of a variety of tobacco of higher quality in hilly areas of the Aegean Region, and some pilot studies for forestry products and dairies by forestry-village cooperatives in various sub-regions of Turkey.

On the other hand, with a view to the identification of ED potential in the future, it is considered that, in addition to the continuation of the studies mentioned above, some other projects should also be proposed, for example in the field of handicrafts and carpet weaving based on natural dyes, by rural women from the mountainous villages in Balıkesir, Denizli, Muđla and Aydın provinces of the Aegean Region, in the planting of orchards and vineyards with special varieties of fruit and

grapes on high plateaus, in typical localities such as Yunt Dađy, Kozak, Kiraz of Ýzmir Province, and in the growing and processing of medicinal herbs in the coastal areas of ÇESME-KARABURUN, IZMIR.

Accordingly, it would be reasonable to suggest heterogeneity, farming styles, territoriality, ecological farming, local agricultural practices, social organization of farming, local grouping of farmers, and tendencies in the historical development of the region as the appropriate criteria for an identification of ED potential and practices. This has been proven through some studies in which the above criteria have been given limited application.

4. THE STRENGTHENING OF ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

The ED model may also be described as self-centered and self-supporting; it belongs to the larger group of local development models. Local development approaches represent the broad spectrum of rural community interests, support community-based leadership, stimulate self-reliance and promote an entrepreneurial society (Ploeg, 1944).

Simultaneously within this model, consideration is given jointly to the target for sustainable agricultural development; this includes local determination of development options, local control over the development process, retention of the benefits from development within the locality, development of specific technology for the localities instead of its transfer from outside, conservation of wildlife and protection of the environment, and in particular the solution of socio-economic problems facing local people.

The distinguishing characteristics of the ED model are: the creation of mutual

trust and solidarity both amongst the farmers themselves and between them and others, the mutual interaction of external and internal factors for development, the stimulation of regional competition providing a higher quality and standard of living, and the creation of new links between production, processing and consumption. It requires the existence of efficient institutions which could play a crucial role in the creation of favourable conditions for ED and the interaction of these components. Here three major areas of action to be carried out by institutions could be suggested: Such areas are: the local organisation of development, co-ordination between research, extension, training and information, and the development of appropriate support mechanisms and programs (Ploeg, 1994).

Thus, the first step to be taken towards the strengthening of ED practices should be the location of people with an understanding of the original meaning and extent of the ED model. This type of approach has also been considered necessary in the case of public as well as private organisations and for the farmers themselves, all over Turkey. Secondly, the identification of appropriate methods and approaches for the strengthening of ED practices should be considered.

The following approaches and their special characteristics have been explained, in detail, in the literature related to the issue:

- a. The examination of agricultural regions and districts which could illustrate the notion of heterogeneity
- b. Farmers' initiatives and more particularly Farming Systems Research (FSR)
- c. Building trust at all levels, namely trust between the farming and other

sectors and among the farmers themselves

- d. Giving timely information to all the related components. In addition, successful applications of the methods in some Mediterranean countries are also described (CERES-CAMAR Project Seminar, Cordoba, 1994).

As far as the methods used for the strengthening of the ED process in Turkey are concerned, it could be said that some of those mentioned above are being employed though not, of course, in a way entirely similar to that in other countries. However, as in the Mediterranean countries, it would easily be possible to use all the methods presented, with their completely sound, methodological and theoretical basis, given scientific understanding of the ED model and its extent.

Some examples of selected studies which have already applied the methods stated above are:

- 1- An examination of agricultural regions and districts in the light of the notion of heterogeneity in 9 different agricultural regions of Turkey
- 2- Farming Systems Research (FSR) in Sivas - Kayseri conducted by ICARDA and the Ministry of Agriculture
- 3- Farming Systems Research (FSR) for the Taurus Mountains' Small Scale Farmers' Project
- 4- Turkish agricultural extension projects for the provision of timely information to all related components.

SOME SUGGESTIONS

In conclusion to this description and overview of Turkish agricultural development

studies, it should at first be stated that Turkey evidently has great potential where the application of ED studies and practices are concerned, due to the heterogeneity of Turkish agricultural structure and organization which stems from the variations in the potential natural, socio-economical, climatic and agricultural resources of localities in different agricultural regions.

In order for these types of studies to be carried out, the emphasis should be at the outset on the scientific understanding and coverage of ED as a whole, and then on the preparation of appropriate project proposals. It is only through this integrated approach that the social, economic and technical benefits expected from ED practices could be achieved.

The next stage must be the establishment of specific policies with their important goals and the determination of the best policy instruments to complement project proposals, with reference to the policy goals, for the achievement of ED in relevant localities. All of these should, of course, be the most important components of general RD policy.

Furthermore, with regard to the various localities of Turkey designated for ED practices, precedence should be assigned to the regions which have been given special mention in other parts of this paper and to the studies and applications

which have been determined. The support of all institutions will speed the process.

It is considered that the collaborative NEDMED Project - the Research Network for ED in the Mediterranean Countries - affords a great opportunity for the orientation and strengthening of ED practices, and it would provide great incentives and contributions for future project proposals.

As far as the new proposals are concerned, priority should be given to the most appropriate localities in the Aegean region and transitional zones of Central Anatolia in which some studies are already being conducted. In particular, special attention should be paid to the exploitation of rural, female labour for handicrafts and to the ecological potential of the areas for the growing of early or late varieties of grapes; these should constitute the first group of pilot projects.

In order to achieve the successful implementation of the projects, determination of the institutions which should take an executive and collaborative role during the course of ED studies has to be made on the basis of their view and understanding of ED, and also on the basis of former experience and approaches to ED. In particular, in addition to the universities and public organizations of the region, the participation and contribution of local institutions and the farmers of the localities have to be secured.

REFERENCES

- ABAY, C. et al, 1996, Kadın Esitimine Yönelik Hizmetlerin Kadın Ystihdamına Etkileri, Bornova, Basılmakta olan Araştırması.
- AKGÜNGÖR, S., 1996, Türkiye'de Ekolojik Yöntemlerle Üretilen Çekirdeksiz Kuru Üzüm Verimi, Maliyeti ve Pazarlaması, YZMYR.
- AKGÜNGÖR, S., et al, 1995, "An Overview of Organic Farming in Greece and Turkey, With Particular Emphasis on Extension and Marketing, E.Ü.Z.F. Dergisi, Cilt 32, Sayı 3, Bornova-YZMYR.
- AKSOY, S. et al, 1988, Türkiye'de İnsan ve Toprak Yıllıkları, Gelişme Sürecinde Tarımsal Yapı, Ankara.
- BRUSH, S. & İPKLİ, E., 1992, In situ Conservation of Wheat Landraces in Turkey, Joint Study of UC DAVIS and Ege University- Agricultural Faculty, Bornova- YZMYR.
- CERES/CAMAR Project Seminars, Cordoba, 1994, Spain.
- DPT, 1993, Kırsal Sanayi Sempozyumu, Ankara.
- ELLIS, F., 1994, Agricultural Policies in Developing Countries, Cambridge Senior Press, England.
- ERKAN, O., 1994, Çiftçilik Sistemleri Araştırmaları, Toros dağ Köylerindeki Örnek Çalışmaları, Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi, Cilt 2, Eylül, Bornova-YZMYR.
- GIBBON, D., 1991, "Farming systems Research For Sustainable Agriculture", Endogenous Regional Development in Europe, Proceedings of Seminar Held in Villa Real, Portugal.
- GÜNDÜZ, M., 1994, "Dünya Tarım Ürünleri Ticaretinde Organik Ürün Piyasası ve Türkiye Yhracatı Açısından Değerlendirilmesi", Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi, Cilt 2, Eylül, Bornova-YZMYR.
- ISIKLI, E. et al, 1989, "Recent Developments in Turkish Agriculture", Ergebnisse Deutsch-Türkischer Universitaetspartnerschaften, September, İzmir.
- KARABAGLI, A. & ALPKENT, N., 1996, Türk Tarımının Avrupa Birliği Ortak Tarım Politikasına Uyumu ve Gümrük Birliği Yılıpkişi, MPM Yayınları, 573, Ankara.
- KASNAKOĐLU, H. & ÇAKMAK, E., 1995, "The Impact of The Uruguay Round on Agricultural Policies in Turkey", Expert Consultation Paper, 18-21 December, FAO, RNO, Cairo, Egypt.
- PLOEG, J.D. & LONG, A. (Eds.), 1994, Born From Within, Practice and Perspectives of Endogenous Rural Development, Assen, the Netherlands.
- TUGAY, E. 1985, "Kuraklık Kavramı ve Türkiye", Atatürk Üniversitesi Çevre Sorunları Araştırma Merkezi, Sempozyumu 7, Erzurum.
- TÜRKEKUL, B. & İPKLİ, E., 1996, Türkiye Ekonomisi ve Kırsal Kalkınmaya Yönelik Bazı Çalışmalar, İzmir, 1996, Basıma Hazır.
- YILDIRAK, N. & ERAKTAN, G., 1989, Türkiye'de Kırsal Kalkınma Stratejileri ve Politikaları, Friedrich Ebert Vakfı, İstanbul.
- ILTER, E. & KUMUK, T., 1989, Bazı Üzüm Çeşitlerinin Yunt Dağı Yöresinde Yetiştirme ve Yayım Olanakları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma, E.Ü.Z.F., Bornova, Basılmamış Rapor.
- İNAN, H., 1994, Tekirdağ Önder Çiftçi Projesi, Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi, cilt 2, Eylül, Bornova-YZMYR.