

*An Exploratory Comparative Study of Catholic and Protestant Farmers in the Republic of Ireland**

M. P. A. MACOURT

THE present paper stems from an examination of data from those Censuses of Population of the Republic of Ireland which have incorporated a Religious enquiry. Summary data for the whole country in these censuses indicate that, since 1926, a higher percentage of farmers in the larger farm-size were returned as Protestants (as opposed to Catholics) than is the case for the smaller farm-size categories. Further, throughout the period, the percentage of Protestants in each farm-size increases as the mid-point of the category increases [Table 1A]. This was true both of the whole country and of County Kildare specifically [Table 1B].

This exploratory study of a small area of the country was undertaken to see if this relative superiority of Protestants already noted in farm size, was also observable in other farming (agricultural) characteristics. Three characteristics were considered for this purpose, namely: quality of land; efficiency of farming methods and use of farm land. Farmers resident in the survey area were interviewed,¹ for the purpose of obtaining information on these three characteristics.

Area Studied

The area of study comprised the District Electoral Divisions of Belan, Burtown, Grangemellon, Kilkea, Moone and Narraghmore in the Rural² District of Athy No. 1, County Kildare. This area was chosen for the following reasons:

*Thanks are due to Mr J. M. Bochel and Mr D. P. Kerr for their invaluable comments and suggestions; and to Mr D. E. B. Pollard for his comments on syntax, and for proof reading.

1. The interviews for this study were conducted while the author was a student at the University of Birmingham. I would like to thank Mr C. J. A. Chambers for his assistance with the interviewing.

2. Rural Districts were abolished as administrative areas in County Kildare in 1925, although they have been retained as units in Census publications.

1. It had a substantial minority of Protestants³ as recorded in the Census of 1961 (11.2 per cent). This, coupled with a density of population close to the average for the whole country, gave a substantial number of Protestants residing in a relatively small geographical area (approx. 240 in 40 sq. miles).
2. The nature of the farming. The land was farmed for a variety of purposes: livestock rearing, dairy farming and many sorts of arable farming were to be found, singly or in combination.
3. Communications with and within the area. The area is centred some 40 miles South-West of Dublin, straddling the main Dublin to Waterford trunk road; internally it was well served by roads with good surfaces. Consequently individual respondents' holdings were readily accessible.
4. (Perhaps the primary reason.) Personal contacts—being related to one of the Protestant farmers in the area. His farm provided a base from which to work, and his contacts provided much valuable (if subjective) information upon the people and the general characteristics of the area.

The District Electoral Divisions were so chosen as not to include any villages within the area. Such inclusion would have necessitated the elimination from the frame of many extra households in service occupations.

Survey Methods Used

June 1st, 1967, was fixed as the date for which information was to be collected. The co-operation of certain people with detailed knowledge of the area was obtained. These informants included some of the local clergy, some of the locally based Garda Síochána, and some farmers and farm labourers resident in various parts of the area.

These informants updated the Electoral Register by specifying deaths, removals and incomers known to them. Following this updating, the total number of households was found to be 420. After naming the head of each household, the informants further gave the supposed religious profession of these persons. Of the 420 heads of household 56 were stated by the informants not to claim allegiance to the Catholic Church; and of these, 50 were categorised as Church of Ireland, five as Presbyterian and one as Methodist. The results of the enquiry into religious profession in the Censuses of 1936 and 1961 are included [Table 2]. During the subsequent interviews, none denied affiliation to one of the four named communions.⁴ The number of Protestants in each of the six District Electoral Divisions

3. Protestant here is used to refer generally to those not returning their religious profession as either Catholic or Roman Catholic in Census enquiries. Catholic refers to those returning themselves as either Catholic or Roman Catholic. Those returning themselves as Church of Ireland, Presbyterian, or Methodist comprised together 97.1 per cent of non-Catholics in Athy No. 1 R.D. at the 1961 Census.

4. The latest Census for which there has been published details of Catholics, Church of Ireland (described as Protestant Episcopalians at that time), Presbyterians, Methodists and "others" by DED was taken in 1936. At that time the entire population of the study area was returned as one of the four above-named communions.

TABLE IA: Republic of Ireland†

Farmers—Males

Size of farm	1926				1936				1946				1961			
	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent
*Under 15 acres ...	56,128	27.9	1,765	11.2	47,086	24.1	1,360	9.5	38,328	20.0	1,076	8.2	23,717	14.0	649	5.7
	97.0%		3.0%		97.2%		2.8%		97.3%		2.7%		97.3%		2.7%	
15 and < 30 ...	59,220	29.4	3,450	21.9	57,791	29.5	2,886	20.1	57,098	29.8	2,469	18.7	44,349	26.3	1,650	14.4
	94.5%		5.5%		95.2%		4.8%		95.9%		4.1%		96.4%		3.6%	
30 and < 50 ...	39,747	19.7	3,399	21.6	42,169	21.6	3,142	21.9	44,575	23.2	2,830	21.4	44,464	26.3	2,399	20.9
	92.1%		7.9%		93.1%		6.9%		94.0%		6.0%		94.9%		5.1%	
50 and < 100 ...	30,918	15.4	3,588	22.8	32,661	16.7	3,554	24.7	34,813	18.2	3,509	26.6	38,116	22.6	3,435	29.9
	89.6%		10.4%		90.2%		9.8%		90.8%		9.2%		91.9%		8.1%	
100 and < 200 ...	11,756	5.8	2,161	13.8	12,292	6.3	2,159	15.1	13,372	6.9	2,220	16.8	14,728	8.7	2,283	19.9
	84.5%		15.5%		85.1%		14.9%		85.8%		14.2%		86.6%		13.4%	
200 and over ...	3,566	1.8	1,371	8.7	3,516	1.8	1,248	8.7	3,701	1.9	1,093	8.3	3,625	2.1	1,057	9.2
	72.2%		27.8%		73.8%		26.2%		77.2%		22.8%		77.4%		22.6%	
TOTAL ...	201,335	100	15,734	100.0	195,515	100	14,349	100	191,887	100	13,197	100	168,999	100	11,473	100
[of stated acreage]	92.75%		7.25%		93.16%		6.84%		93.57%		6.43%		93.64%		6.36%	

*For 1926, 1936 and 1946: one and under 15 acres.

†Sources: 1926 Census of Population Vol. 3 (1), Table 17, 1936 Census of Population, Vol. 3 (1), Table 17.
1946 Census of Population, Vol. 2, Table 13B, 1961 Census of Population, Vol. 7 (1), Table 11A.

It will be noted that in 1926 the percentage of farmers holding less than 15 acres who were Protestant was 3.0 whereas of those holding more than 200 acres was 27.8. In 1961 the percentage in these two categories was 2.7 and 22.6 respectively.

TABLE 1B: County Kildare

Farmers—Males†

Size of farm	1926						1936						1961* Total	Per cent	1966 Total	Per cent
	Total	Per cent	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent	Total	Per cent	Catholic	Per cent	Protestant	Per cent				
*Under 15 acres ...	58,723	1	574	25.9	13	4.0	353	14.5	346	16.2	7	2.2	138	5.5	101	4.1
	100.0%		97.8%		2.2%		100.0%		98.0%		2.0%					
15 and < 30 ...	455	17.9	435	19.6	20	6.2	445	18.3	431	20.2	14	4.5	405	16.2	359	14.4
	100.0%		95.6%		4.4%		100.0%		96.9%		3.1%					
30 and < 50 ...	392	15.4	353	15.9	39	12.0	455	18.6	421	19.8	34	10.9	586	23.4	582	23.4
	100.0%		90.0%		10.0%		100.0%		92.5%		7.5%					
50 and < 100 ...	469	18.4	404	18.2	65	20.0	496	20.3	429	20.1	67	21.5	599	23.9	671	27.1
	100.0%		86.1%		13.9%		100.0%		86.5%		13.5%					
100 and < 200 ...	388	15.3	294	13.3	94	28.9	437	17.9	338	15.9	99	31.7	514	20.5	773	31.0
	100.0%		75.7%		24.3%		100.0%		77.4%		22.6%					
200 and over ...	251	9.9	157	7.1	94	28.9	254	10.4	163	7.8	91	29.2	263	10.5		
	100.0%		62.5%		37.5%		100.0%		64.2%		35.8%					
TOTAL ...	2,542	100.0	2,217	100.0	325	100.0	2,440	100.0	2,128	100.0	312	100.0	2,505	100.0	2,486	100.0
[of stated acreage]	100.0%		87.2%		12.8%		100.0%		87.2%		12.8%					

*Data for the religions of farmers by country was only published for the 1926 and 1936 Censuses.

†Sources: 1926: Census of Population Vol. 3 (1), Table 21; 1936 Census of Population, Vol. 3 (1), Table 21.

1961: Census of Population Vol. 3, Table 5; 1966 Census of Population Vol. 5, Table 4.

TABLE 2: *Total and Protestant population of the area of study*

<i>District Electoral Division</i>	1936		1961		1966	1967
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Protestant</i>
Belan	273	13	245	26	209	25
Burtown	302	45	295	45	287	29
Grangemellon	474	47	572	49	519	41
Kilkea	386	36	377	38	385	37
Moone	363	60	351	55	346	46
Narraghmore	330	37	329	29	332	55
<i>Total</i>	2,128	238	2,169	242	2,078	233
Percentage Protestant	11.2		11.2		11.2	

Sources: 1936 Census of Population Vol. 3 (1), Table 12.

1961 Total: Census of Population Vol. 1, Table 11.

1961 Protestant: Unpublished data from the Central Statistics Office.

1966 Total: Census of Population Vol. 1, Table 11.

1967 Protestant: from survey.

I am grateful to the Director of the Central Statistics Office, Dublin, for permission to use some unpublished material for the Census of Population 1961.

was ascertained as a by-product of the survey, and the results are included [Table 2].

The definition of "household" used was "a group of people living in the same dwelling having a blood or other close relationship with one another". A "head of household" was "the person to whom the household looked to provide its main means of material support". This definition was supplemented, in explanation, by saying that in cases where the "man" of the house had died, the "woman" of the house was to be regarded as the head of the household if there were no male making a living which provided the main means of material support for the household.

Although the definition of household used here is not the conventional British Census working definition,⁵ to make it more complicated by the introduction of a catering provision might have jeopardised the co-operation of the informants and reduced the reliability of their information. Suspected instances of two

5. British Census definition of household: "A household is [a person] or a group of persons (who may or may not be related) living at the same address with common housekeeping." *Instructions for Census Enumerators*, 1971.

households (British Census definition) were few: the major difficulty concerned married children continuing to live with the parents of one of the marriage partners. Informants showed initial reluctance to regard such cases as comprising two households with (for our purposes) two heads; and since in most cases the married son was thought to be assisting his father on his farm, the given definition was adopted.

The survey was limited to those holding agricultural land, and difficulties in collecting information on others limited consideration to the heads of households. The informants (above mentioned) were asked to place into one of three categories all those heads of household known to them. These categories were: landholder; farm labourer; other.

Landholder: A head of household was classified as a landholder if he (or she) held land and regarded that holding of land as providing his (or her) principal source of material support. The land could be owned, rented or held in some other way.⁶

This category included those who were engaged in other employment (e.g. as farm labourers) but who regarded their landholding as being more important as a source of material support than all their other activities. It also included those who let their land, and who regarded the income from letting as their principal source of income. But it did not include those who held land but whose main source of material support was the state or other retirement pension or unearned income not derived from landholding.

Farm labourer: A head of household was classified as a farm labourer if his principal source of material support came from working as such for a landholder or landholders. **Other:** all others whether employed or unemployed. This category included those who worked in the local market town (Athy), or in one of the two neighbouring villages (Ballitore and Castledermot), or in a service industry or who were in retirement. Many problems arose in the occupational information so categorised. The most important one was the determination of the size of allowance to be made for error in the classifications assigned by the informants. The study concerned "landholders", and resources did not permit any of those not so assigned to be interviewed; however, by using a screening question in the interview schedule those assigned "landholder" in error could be removed, whereas those properly "landholders" but incorrectly assigned by the informants could not be re-classified.

Summary data from informants on occupations of heads of household by religion is included [Table 3]. Scarcity of resources did not permit the checking of this information (except from the 98 interviews undertaken), so it must be recognised that this data is subject to this error. The lack of discrepancy between

6. In comparing the results from the survey with Census data we must remember that the Census data refers to all those who gave their occupation as farmer, whether or not they are heads of household. The only advice given by the Census Office is to note that a person is appropriately described: the census return as a farmer if that is his principal occupation. *Statistics* (see for example) (*Census of Population*) Order, 1926, *Statutory Rules and Orders*, Saorstát Éireann, 1926, No. 76.

TABLE 3: *Occupations of heads of household.**

Occupation	Religion		Total
	Catholic	Protestant	
Landholder	142	49	191
Farm labourer	205	—	205
Other	17	7	24
<i>Total</i>	364	56	420

*Information from informants only.

informants, and the extent and nature of discrepancies noted on interviewing, suggest that errors were few.

A significant observation which can be made from this table, based as it is on information received from informants only, is the complete absence of Protestant farm labourers heads of household. This can be compared with national Census data where it can be seen that 2.8 per cent of all agricultural labourers returned themselves as Protestants.⁷ On this absence being pointed out to informants none of them expressed any surprise at all. Some of the Protestant informants were further asked to name any Protestant farm labourers heads of household known to them in surrounding areas. This they were unable to do.

Sample Design

In the time available 191 interviews seemed to be impossible even with the help of another interviewer (who had to be given some elementary training). 100 interviews to be completed in 10 days seemed to be an attainable target. The sample scheme decided upon was:

- (a) a complete enumeration of all Protestant landholders, and
- (b) a sample of the same size (49) of the Catholic landholders.

As the study was concerned with a "deviant" group, identifiable by religion, it could be argued that a control group would be useful. The sample of Catholic landholders does not match the population of Protestants as closely as would be required for the full application of control group testing.

It did not seem desirable or necessary to stratify the population, although information was readily available on one characteristic which could have been used for stratifying and information might have been obtainable on another. These were (a) location of residence and (b) size of holding.

7. Census of Population, 1961, Vol. VII (1), Table 11.

- (a) Location of residence: the Electoral Register was compiled by District Electoral Division, so a division here would have been possible, but it was rejected because of the small size of the resultant sample in many divisions.
- (b) Size of holding: here reliance would have to have been placed on information from informants. It did not appear that the benefits (such as they would be) of stratifying would outweigh the difficulties of the collection of information, the inherent lack of accuracy, and the (possibility of) systematic error.

Cluster sampling was rejected because of the ease of communication within the area and because of the small size of the sample. Consequently simple random sampling was the method chosen.

The Interview Schedule and the Interviewing

From the outset a question on income was excluded from the scope of the enquiry. Because of the nature of local contact established it was important to avoid enquiries of a personal nature, even though assurances could be given about confidentiality. It was important that the only information requested was the sort that friends of the respondent could be expected to know. It would appear that very few of the landholders could have answered the question meaningfully since they were not required to furnish income tax returns. The accounting difficulties of separating capital expenditure from current expenditure in accounts and the complexities of accounting are beyond most of those who do not have specialist training.

The purpose of the enquiry was stated (to the respondents) to be the study of agriculture in the area. No attempt was made to explain the exact purpose as it was felt that this might arouse disquiet in some, and it might encourage exaggeration of answers. Since the purpose of the survey was to provide evidence upon which "bigger and better" hypotheses concerning the differences between Protestant and Catholic farmers could be tested, the interview schedule had to be devised to allow for the collection of information on relevant variables. The spheres of interest considered for inclusion in the interview schedule were (a) size or value of holding, (b) use of land, (c) livestock, (d) farm machinery and (e) labour.

(a) Size and rateable valuation of holding: After confirming that the named person was the head of household and that that person was a "landholder" and after checking his religious profession, the size of his holding was established. Three conditions of holding were identified: land owned, including land held under the conditions contained in the several Land Purchase Acts, 1870-1903; land held under lease for farming; land owned but leased to others. Many of the respondents used "Irish" measure of land area rather than "Imperial" or "Statute" measure, in these cases conversion from Irish acres to statute acres was necessary

to establish conformity.⁸ Some of the land held by landholders interviewed was situated outside the area. On the assumption that there was no special factors concerned in residence within the study area, it was taken that little bias would be introduced by including all land held, wherever located. The survey was of the land held by landholders residing in the area, rather than of the land in the area.

The Rateable Valuation seemed the only available index of value of land. Agricultural land is still rated and, although the land has not been revalued since 1852, that valuation was based on the theoretical profitability of each field. The valuers' assessments may be out of date, as for example major drainage works inaugurated since the valuation may have affected the relative value of an area.

(b) Use of land: Eight categories of land use were identified: wheat, barley, (sugar) beet, oats, (commercially grown) vegetables and fruit, other crops, grazing and hay, unproductive land (permanent or temporary).

(c) Livestock: Numbers and nature of livestock on the land were collected. There may be some inaccuracies here as it was difficult to establish the holdings as of a given date. Many farmers insisted at first on giving their "normal" holdings of livestock, as they felt that this was what was required, others may have given such "normal" holdings without noting that these were not their holdings on the given date.

(d) Farm Machinery: The original intention was to obtain details of all machine-driven implements, perhaps thereby obtaining a measure of farm mechanisation and possibly a measure of capital employed. But it became apparent during the piloting of the interview schedule that, while many farmers owned tractors, there were, in or near the area, several engaged in the hiring of agricultural machinery and in contracting. It appeared that these people were all landholders (both Catholic and Protestant), some of whom are included in the sample. The existence of these people made the collection of meaningful statistics about farm mechanisation impossible.

(e) Labour: The basic enquiry here concerned the number of those (not being members of the household) employed full-time on the farm throughout the year. The number in the household employed on the farm was not noted, as it was felt that it would be too difficult to define the conditions under which farmers' assisting relatives were employed full-time. For example, a farmer's wife may well take her turn on the tractor during harvest time; many schools are closed at certain times of the year specifically to allow children to assist their parents on

8. Using the conversion 5 Irish Acres = 8 statute acres as given in P. M. Austin Blake, "Notes on some agricultural units of measurement in use in pre-Famine Ireland", *Irish Historical Studies* 14 (55) March 1965, p. 237, rather than the Conversion 3 Irish Acres = 5 statute acres suggested in, for example, *Statistics (Census of Population) Order, 1936, Statutory Rules and Orders, Saorstát Éireann* 1936, No. 96.

their home farms; allegedly full-time brothers and sons often obtain casual employment elsewhere in slack times.

Some of the original informants formed a sample for piloting the interview schedule. Several wording amendments were suggested, these were useful particularly as they used the local idiom, an important consideration when the interviewer is an outsider. The field work was carried out mainly between 10th and 20th June, 1967, and was completed by the end of that month. It became obvious that it was unwise to attempt any interviews during the day, as the weather was excellent and consequently the landholders were not available to discuss the finer details of their farm.

The response rate was 100 per cent. Perhaps the major reason for this was that I was introduced to all those respondents I interviewed by a close relation who accompanied me, but who took no part in the interviewing. This relation was well known throughout the area as a prominent figure in political, social and religious activities. As noted before personal questions were avoided as it would have been very difficult to allow for the bias introduced by this connection with the area. The other interviewer was a local resident.

Interviews were completed with 46 Protestant landholders, and with 45 Catholic landholders. Three of the original sample of Protestants had recently retired, and of the four "missing" Catholic landholders, one had recently disposed of his landholding, one had left the area, and two did not regard landholding as their principal source of material support. There were no instances of the person named by the informants as such, not being the head of household, and there were no cases of incorrect religious profession.

Data Checking

Checks were possible on four sections of information: (a) rateable value; (b) land ownership; (c) land use; (d) numbers of livestock.

(a) Rateable Value. This could be checked as access was obtained to the County Valuation Register. Information was rarely available from landholders whose land had a rateable valuation of less than £20, as rates were levied on a sliding scale, the first £20 not being charged. Such information was available in some cases where the holding had been created as the result of a split from a larger holding. All such cases were excluded. There were no major errors that could not be explained by changes since the compilation of the register.

(b) Land Ownership. Access was also obtained to the County Council records of land ownership, so checks on acreage of holding were made. Again the records were found to be out of date, but otherwise no major errors were found.

(c) Land use. The acreages given in each of the land use categories were required to sum to the total acreage of the holding. Apart from errors of rounding no mistakes were detected.

(d) Numbers of livestock. It was suggested by some informants that the ratio of the statistics (cattle + $\frac{1}{4}x$ sheep) to acreage under grazing and hay should approximate to unity. In the few cases where this ratio was outside the range 0.7 to 1.3 reinterviews took place.

Formulation of Hypotheses

The three characteristics noted at the beginning can only be considered if from them testable hypotheses can be formulated. The first—quality of land—[Do the Protestants have the better quality land?]—can be considered if we have an adequate measure of quality of land, we have measurements on all the relevant land in the area, and we know the religious professions of the landholders. Despite the reservations mentioned before, the rateable value was taken as an index of value of land, and because of the basis of the valuation the rateable value per acre can be taken as an index of the quality of land.

The second—efficiency of farming methods—[Do the Protestants use more highly developed methods of farming?—presents more problems. A composite index of intensity of land use, labour use and capital use would have been required for an adequate measure of farming methods. Insufficient information was available on these three to allow for attempts at the creation of such an index, however, information was available on acreage under grazing and hay as were totals of various livestock, so this acreage can be compared with livestock totals taking due account of religion.

The third—use of farm land—[Is there any religious difference in the types of farm enterprise?]—can be simplified to consideration of arable based farming versus livestock based farming. For each farm the percentage of acreage held under crops can be calculated, and these percentages taken with the religion of the landholder can be used to give an answer to the question.

Results

Self-assessment of status by heads of household (i.e., whether or not he is a “landholder”) after informant screening, enforces the inclusion in the category of landholder of many who might be regarded by an outside observer as semi-retired, or as farm labourers, but who themselves regard their own holding as more important than others as a source of material support [Table 4].

For the first question, valuation of acreage owned as a dependent variable was regressed on acreage owned, with dummy variables included for each DED and for religion. The coefficient of the religious dummy variable was found not to be significant.⁹ [Table 5].

On the second question, if we are to regard the contention that Protestants stock their farms more heavily than Catholics as a replacement for more complex contentions about farming methods then we must be able to state clearly that to

9. The results of such multivariate analyses as were computed are not included here. It is beyond the scope of this paper to consider the techniques of analysis used.

TABLE 4: *Acreage owned*

<i>Farm size</i>	<i>Protestant</i>	<i>Catholic</i>
under 15 acres	—	10
15 and < 30	1	7
30 and < 50	2	2
50 and < 100	9	8
100 and < 200	16	8
200 and < 400	13	10
400 acres and above	5	—

Rateable valuation was not obtained for any of those in the under 15 acres, 15 and under 30 acres categories, and was obtained for only one of the Catholics in the 30 and under 50 acres category.

stock one farm more heavily than another is an indication of more developed methods of farming. This can only be stated in a limited sense, land can be so prepared as to increase the optimum number of a given sort of animal that can be kept on that land. We must assume that all landholders stock their farms optimally or relatively optimally given the preparation of their land. This permits a stocking ratio to be established for each farm, this can be calculating if we convert all relevant types of livestock into a common unit. The technique used was to relate all these types of livestock to acreage used (say acreage under grazing and hay), giving a mean amount of land used for a unit of each type. Stocking ratios so calculated were compared, taking into account the religion of the landholder, and no significant difference in stocking ratios by religion was found.

Size of farm was found to be a major factor in the determination of the proportion of acreage under crops. The coefficient of the religious dummy variable in the relevant regression analysis was not significant. Tabular presentation here presents boldly the result that size of farm is important, while religion is not [Table 6A and Table 6B].

Conclusions

The use of a panel of local informants provided much information which was useful for the operation of the survey. Connection with the area probably increased the response rate obtained by the interviewers, although this connection had an inhibiting effect on the range and depth of questions asked.

There appeared to be no evidence for any of the hypotheses derived from the questions posed above. It did not appear that Protestants held better quality land, nor that they stocked their farms more intensively with livestock. Differences in farm use were explained far more satisfactorily by size of farm than by religion.

University of Dundee.

TABLE 5: *Rateable Valuation*
Holdings with R.V. of £20 and over by religion of landholders

District Electoral Division	Protestant					Catholic				
	Number	Total Valuation	Total Acreage Owned	Valuation per Acre	Average Acreage	Number	Total Valuation	Total Acreage Owned	Valuation per Acre	Average Acreage
		£		P			£		P	
Belan	5	456	769	59.5	153.8	2	333	508	65.5	254.0
Burtown	8	848	1,515½	55.8	189.4	9	858½	1,796½	47.8	199.6
Grangemellon	7	1,214½	2,226½	54.5	318.1	2	191½	384½	49.8	192.2
Kilkea	4	1,336½	2,196	60.9	549.0	5	395	708	55.8	141.6
Moone	9	668½	1,137	58.8	126.3	5	536	834	64.3	166.8
Narraghmore	12	1,088	1,856½	58.6	1,547	4	162	268½	60.3	67.1
Total	45	5,611½	9,700½	57.9	215.5	27	2,476	4,499½	55.0	166.3
					[S=					[S=
					189.4]					76.8]
Farms with Valuation of less than £20	1		19½			18		287½		
All Farms	46		9,720		212.3	45		4,787		106.3
					[S=					[S=
					189.6]					104.4]

It can be seen that there is wide variation between DED,^s from an average of 47.8p for Catholics in Burtown, to average of 65.5 for Catholics in Belan. In three of the six DED^s the average valuation per acre is greater for Catholic landholders than for Protestants, and in three the reverse is true.

It will be remembered that this information was rarely available from landholders whose land had a rateable value of less than £20.

TABLE 6A: *Acreage under Crops*

District Electoral Division	Protestant					Catholic				
	Number	Total Acreage Held	Acreage Under Crops	Percentage Under Crops	Average Acreage	Number	Total Acreage Held	Acreage Under Crops	Percentage Under Crops	Average Acreage
Belan	5	929	307	33·0	185·8	3	541	203	37·5	180·3
Burtonn	8	1,542	688½	44·6	192·8	11	1,798	615	34·2	163·5
Grangemellon	7	2,226½	879½	39·5	318·1	9	557	348	62·5	61·9
Kilkea	4	2,196	1,146½	52·2	549·0	5	753½	366	51·4	150·7
Moone	10	1,219½	337½	27·7	121·9	8	873½	203½	23·3	109·2
Narraghmore	12	1,872½	616½	32·9	156·0	9	432	79½	18·4	48·0
Total	46	9,985½	3,975½	39·8	217·1	45	4,945	1,813½	36·7	109·9

TABLE 6B

Size of Farm	Protestant					Catholic				
	Number	Total Acreage Held	Acreage Under Crops	Percentage Under Crops	Average Acreage	Number	Total Acreage Held	Acreage Under Crops	Percentage Under Crops	Average Acreage
Under 30 acres	—	—	—	—	—	14	160	39½	24·7	11·4
30 and < 100 acres	13	899½	225	25·0	69·2	12	730	178½	24·5	60·8
100 and < 200 acres	15	2,255	722	32·0	150·3	8	1,070	410½	38·4	133·8
200 acres and above	18	6,831	3,027½	44·3	380·6	10	2,884	1,184½	41·1	288·4