

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

Results of the 1988 Regional Farm Survey: North Dakota

Brenda L. Ekstrom, F. Larry Leistritz, and Timothy L. Mortensen'

This report summarizes data collected from a sample of North Dakota farm families as part of a larger study conducted in the twelve North Central states. These states included Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. This survey was conducted through the cooperation of North Dakota State University and the North Dakota Agricultural Statistical Service with funding from the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development.

The purpose of the survey was to

- 1. identify what adjustments farm families made during the 1980s in response to the farm crisis,
- 2. identify information and educational needs of farm families, and
- 3. assess farm families' opinions about several important agricultural and rural development issues.

Methodology

In February, 1989, a statewide random sample of 700 farm operators and spouses was contacted. A packet of two questionnaires was sent--one for the farm operator and the other for the spouse. One set of questions was answered by both operator and spouse; other questions were answered only by the operator or only by the spouse.

There were 273 operator surveys returned for a response rate of 39.4 percent, and 232 spouse surveys returned for a response rate of 33.1 percent. Of the total, 232, or 85 percent, were matched questionnaires for both the spouse and the operator. This paper presents the major findings from the mail survey on the status of farm families in North Dakota.

Results

The average age of operators, 49.5 years, compares quite closely with that reported by the census (Table 1). The majority of respondents had completed at least twelve years of formal education. Over one third of the operators and nearly half the spouses had gone on for postsecondary education.

In 1988, 8.2 percent of the respondents experienced a negative net family income, which includes both farm and nonfarm income. The average household had a net family income in the range of \$10,000 to \$19,999, and about 73 percent netted less than \$30,000.

Farm characteristics reported by survey respondents reflect farms that are similar in terms of acres and sales to the average reported by the census (Table 2). The average farm size of survey respondents, 1,265 acres, was slightly more than that reported by the census, 1,143 acres. Likewise, the distribution of gross farm sales of respondents matched the census fairly closely, although our survey included more operators with higher gross farm sales.

Ekstrom is Research Associate, Leistritz is Professor, and Mortensen is Research Assistant, Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo.

This paper was presented at the 1989 annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Seattle, Washington, August 5-8.

Table 1. Comparison of Respondents' Personal Characteristics to Personal Characteristics of Total Farm Population in North Dakota

	Sample of Operators	Sample of Spouses	Farm Population*
Personal Characteristics			
Average Age	49.5	46.7	48.3
		Percent	
18-30 years	9.1	13.1	NA
31-50 years	47.0	50.7	NA
51-65 years	30.6	26.2	NA
65+ years	<u> 13.3</u>	<u> 10.0</u>	NA
	100%	100%	
Average Years of Education	12.3	12.8	NA
		Percent	-4
1-8 years	15.4	6.8	NA
9-12 years	48.3	45.8	NA
13-16 years	33.7	44.8	NA
17+ years	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.6</u>	NA
·	100%	100%	
Net Family Income	-		
	44465460000000000	Percent	
A loss was realized	8.2	NA	NA
\$1-9,999	14.9	NA	NA
\$10,000-19,999	27.1	NA	NA
\$20,000-29,999	22.4	NA	NA
\$30,000-39,999	11.0	NA	NA
\$40,000-49,999	7.5	NA	NA
\$50,000-59,999	3.1	NA	NA
\$60,000-69,999	2.7	NA	ŊA
Over \$70,000	$\frac{3.1}{100\%}$	NA	NA

Note: * = North Dakota 1987 Census of Agriculture, Advance State Report

Table 2. Comparison of Respondents' Farm Characteristics to Farm Characteristics of Total Farm Population in North Dakota

	Sample of Operators	Farm Population*
Average Size Farm**	1,265	1,143
	Perce	nt
1-9 acres	0.8	2.5
10-49 acres	1.1	4.5
50-179 acres	3.8	8.6
180-499 acres	14.4	17.4
500-999 acres	26.5	24.5
1,000+ acres	<u>53.4</u> 100%	$\frac{42.5}{100\%}$
Gross Farm Sales		
	Perce	nt
Less than \$10,000	9.4	19.8
\$10,000-99,999	60.8	63.3
\$100,000 or more	<u>29.8</u> 100%	<u>16.8</u> 100%

Note: * = North Dakota 1987 Census of Agriculture, Advance State Report

** = Average farm size is defined as land owned and operated plus land
rented from others minus land rented to others.

Respondents were asked to evaluate local services, facilities, and economic conditions as to whether they had improved, gotten worse, or stayed the same over the last five years. Overall, most respondents believed that local services and facilities had either remained the same or gotten worse (Table 3). Job opportunities, in particular, were perceived to have gotten worse; two thirds of the respondents felt they had deteriorated. Nearly half felt shopping facilities had deteriorated, and about 32 percent felt entertainment and recreation opportunities had gotten worse. On the positive side, over 20 percent believed that police and fire protection, adult education opportunities, and health care services had improved. But again, most respondents felt these areas had remained the same. Over 70 percent perceived that financial conditions for farmers and agribusiness had gotten worse over the last five years, and about 34 percent felt financial conditions for lenders had deteriorated. Overall, 43 percent of the respondents believed their farm's financial condition had gotten worse over the years.

Table 3. Farm Operators' Opinions on Local Services, Facilities, and Economic Conditions

How have the following services, facilities and economic conditions changed in your community over the past five years? Would you say they have generally "improved," "remained the same," or "gotten worse?"

	Improved	Remained The Same	Gotten Worse Percent	Uncertain	Not Available	Number Of Respondents
Quality of schools	15.3	57.1	20.5	5.2	1.9	268
Job opportunities	2.6	23.2	66.9	4.0	3.3	272
Health care services	22.4	46.7	25.7	2.6	2.6	272
Child care facilities	13.5	50.0	12.0	15.0	9.4	273
Shopping facilities	15.0	33.7	48.3	1.1	1.9	267
Police and fire protection	21.0	69.5	6.3	2.9	0.4	272
Adult education opportunities	22.2	48.9	10.7	10.4	7.8	270
Banking services	14.1	65.4	18.6	0.7	1.1	269
Opportunities for entertainment and recreation	9.3	54.1	31.5	2.2	3.0	270
The current financial condition of farmers has	5.5	17.3	74.9	1.8	0.4	271
The current financial condition of agribusiness firms in your area has	3.0	19.9	70.5	5.2	1.5	271
The current financial condition of lenders in your area has	7.1	47.2	34.2	10.4	1.1	269
Your farm's financial condition has	18.7	36.2	43.3	1.5	0.4	268

Respondents were also asked to evaluate the quality of life in their community. Here again, respondents believed most factors had remained the same (Table 4). Pessimism is reflected in the responses of nearly half the operators who believed the overall economic condition of farmers will become worse in the next five years; about one third felt their satisfaction with farming had deteriorated along with the tradition of neighboring. What is the likelihood the respondents will continue to farm for five years? About 30 percent felt that likelihood had become better, half felt it had not changed, and about 20 percent felt it had become worse. The spouses, who were asked identical questions, gave very similar responses.

Table 4. Farm operator and spouse opinions on quality of life in their community

Please circle the response that comes closest to your opinion about the quality of life in your community.

	Become Better Op* Sp*		Remained The Same Op Sp		Beco Wors Op	
	—					
	•••••		Per	cent		
During the past five years, your family finances have	31.9	34.5	30.0	31.4	38.1	34.0
During the past five years, the quality of life for your family has	29.4	34.5	50.0	46.3	20.6	19.2
In the next five years the overall economic condition of farmers will	26.8	18.4	25.3	26.3	47.9	55.3
Considering your farm's overall financial situation, the likelihood that you will continue to farm for at least the next five years has	29.1	17.6	50.0	64.9	20.9	17.6
Compared to farmers in your area, your financial situation has	27.5	24.2	58.0	56.1	14.5	19.7
All things considered, your satisfaction with farming has	21.0	17.1	46.5	45.8	32.4	37.0
Has "neighboring" over the past five years	7.1	10.9	57.4	64.3	34.5	24.8
Has neighbors helping each other over the past five years	12.5	17.4	59.2	66.4	28.3	16.2
Do you believe the things you have in common with people in your community has	13.0	13.6	75.6	73.4	11.5	13.1

 $^{^{\}circ}$ Op = Operator (N = 265-273)

 $^{^{}b}$ Sp = Spouse (N = 223-230)

How have farmers adjusted to these changing economic conditions? Over half have postponed major household purchases, changed their transportation patterns, and cut back on charitable contributions (Table 5). Between 40 percent and 50 percent had used savings to meet living expenses, changed food shopping or eating habits, decreased money saved for their children's education, and reduced household utility usage. Over one fourth had fallen behind on bill-paying, and about 38 percent of respondents and 31 percent of spouses had sought off-farm employment. Over 20 percent had cut back on health and life insurance during the past five years.

Table 5. Farm family adjustments reported by operator as made in 1985-1989 because of financial need

Has your family made any of the following adjustments because of financial need in the past five years?

		Yes Pero		Number of Respondents
a.	Used savings to meet living expenses	48.2	51.8	272
b.	Sold possessions or cashed in insurance	26.5	73.5	272
c.	Purchased more items on credit	30.9	69.1	272
d.	Postponed major household purchase(s)	65.7	34.3	271
e.	Let life insurance lapse	21.6	78.4	268
f.	Cut back on charitable contributions	51.5	48.5	270
g.	Changed food shopping or eating habits to save money	46.3	53.7	270
h.	Changed transportation patterns to save money	53.5	46.5	269
i.	Reduced household utility use, such as electricity, telephone	40.2	59.8	271
j.	Postponed medical or dental care to save money	38.4	61.6	271
k.	Cancelled or reduced medical insurance coverage	20.3	79.7	271
l.	Borrowed money from relatives or friends	17.7	82.3	271
m.	Fallen behind in paying bills	27.5	72.5	269
n.	Decreased money saved for children's education	44.2	55.8	251
0.	Children have postponed education	11.7	88.3	247
p.	Spouse has taken off-farm employment	37.7	62.3	257
q.	You have taken off-farm employment	31.1	68.9	267

As stated earlier, many operators and spouses had sought off-farm employment over the last five years. In 1988, 32 percent of operators and 39 percent of spouses worked off the farm an average of 33.4 hours and 31.8 hours per week, respectively (Table 6). Over half worked full-time during part of the year. Operators worked an average of 34 weeks in 1988, and spouses, 41 weeks.

Table 6. Off-farm employment of operator and spouse in 1988

	Oper	ator	Spouse		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
1-9 hours per week	9	10.2	12	12.0	
10-19 hours per week	13	14.8	7	7.0	
20-29 hours per week	13	14.8	12	12.0	
30-39 hours per week	6	6.8	18	18.0	
40+ hours per week	47	53.4	51	51.0	
Average hours worked Number of respondents	33.4 88		31.8 100		

Comparisons were made between 1984 and 1988 regarding changes in the farm operation. Most respondents had not changed the size of their operation or the hours worked on the farm by the operator or the family (Table 7). Nevertheless, over 30 percent had increased the number of acres in their operation and the percent of labor contributed by their family.

Farming is often described as a high-risk industry in which the operator has little control over major factors that can determine success or failure-weather and prices. Still, there are some adjustments farmers can make to reduce their risk. Over 70 percent reported they had paid closer attention to marketing in the last five years, had postponed major farm purchases, kept more complete financial records, and bought crop insurance (Table 8). Many had also reduced their long- and short-term debt, shared labor or machinery with neighbors, and reduced expenditures for hired help. Diversification into other crops or livestock is another risk-reducing adjustment made by nearly 40 percent of the respondents. Over the next five years 9 percent of the operators thought they would quit farming, and another 18 percent thought they might quit.

Table 7. Changes in farm operation reported by farm operator--1984 and 1988

	Acres Owned	Acres Rented	Total Acres Operated	Operator Hours Worked on Farm	Percent Family Labor on Farm
Increase	19.2	29.6	Percent 32.1	16.7	12.3
Decrease	4.7	16.0	13.7	12.3	19.4
Stayed the same	76.1	54.4	54.2	71.0	68.3

Table 8. Farm operator's report of risk reduction behaviors for 1984-1988 and behaviors planned for 1989-1993

Many farmers believe that the risk in farming has increased during the last five years. Please indicate if you have made any of the following adjustments.

		Changes Made 1984-1988			Changes 1988-	
		Yes -Percent-	Number of Respondents	<u>Yes</u>	Maybe reent	Number of Respondents
a.	Diversified farm by adding new crops	38.4	268	19.6	31.8	255
b.	Diversified farm by raising livestock	39.1	266	26.9	16.7	245
c.	Paid closer attention to marketing	84.7	268	74.8	8.9	246
d.	Postponed major farm purchase	76.8	267	47.0	28.5	249
e.	Reduced long-term debt	61.3	253	56.5	15.6	237
f.	Reduced short-term debt	65.2	256	57.8	11.8	237
g.	Bought additional land	17.5	268	13.7	27.8	248
h.	Sold some land	5.2	268	2.8	9.3	248
i.	Rented fewer acres	20.5	263	11.2	12.4	242
j.	Rented more acres	27.2	265	22.8	25.6	246
k.	Started a new business (not farming)	9.7	268	5.3	17.8	247
1.	Used the future markets to hedge prices	13.4	269	18.0	22.0	245
m.	Shared labor or machinery with neighbors	49.8	267	38.6	14.2	246
n.	Transferred land back to lender	3.7	267	1.2	6.1	247
o.	Sought training for new vocation	3.7	268	5.3	13.9	245
p.	Reduced expenditures for hired help	44.5	265	34.3	10.3	242
q.	Kept more complete financial records	72.8	268	67.6	6.1	247
r.	Changed from cash rent to crop share	9.2	262	13.2	14.0	242
8.	Bought crop insurance	72.6	266	61.9	11.9	244
t.	Reduced machinery inventory	26.1	268	16.4	14.8	244
u.	Sought off-farm employment	28.7	265	23.4	15.6	244
v.	Retire from farming	6.8	266	15.4	15.4	254
w.	Quit farming	3.4	262	8.9	18.2	247

Many government programs exist to aid farmers. Respondents were asked whether they participated in these programs and the level of help the program offered. As expected, nearly 90 percent received help from the 1988 Drought Assistance Act, and most felt the aid was helpful

(Table 9). Similarly, over 75 percent had federal all-risk crop insurance, and the majority felt it was beneficial. Other than the federal government commodity programs, few farmers took part in other programs, such as job training, food stamps, fuel assistance, and mental health or financial counseling. In most cases, respondents felt they did not need to participate. Interestingly, about 14 percent filed Chapter 11 bankruptcy or Chapter 12 reorganization, but nearly all felt it did not help to do so.

Table 9. Farm operators' report of participation in government programs and their opinions on how helpful the programs were

There are a number of government programs and laws designed to assist farmers. Please indicate whether you have participated in them over the past five years and how much help they provided.

		Participa	ated		Did Not Participate				
	No Help	Some Help	A Lot of Help	Not <u>Needed</u>		Not Available		Number of Respondents	
Federal government com- modity programs (e.g. Feed Grain, Dairy Support)	6.8	Percen 42.4	35.2	7.6	8.0	o.0	0.0	250	
Conservation reserve program (CRP)	11.7	19.7	12.6	36.4	18.8	0.8	0.0	239	
Loans from FmHA	12.6	10.5	13.9	44.1	16.8	1.7	0.4	238	
Farmer/lender mediation service	13.9	6.7	0.8	66.0	4.2	1.7	6.7	238	
1988 Drought Assistance Act	4.7	40.2	44.5	55	3.9	1.2	0.0	256	
Federal all-risk crop insurance	6.4	40.6	29.9	20.3	0.8	0.8	1.2	251	
Chapter 11 bankruptcy (debt reorganization)	13.7	0.4	0.0	82.5	2.5	0.0	0.8	240	
Chapter 12 (debt restructuring for farmers)	13.1	1.3	0.0	82.2	2.1	0.4	0.8	236	
Vocational retraining/ education program for self or family member	13.1	4.6	0.4	72.2	1.3	1.7	6.8	237	
Job Partnership Training Act or other off-farm job search assistance program	13.5	1.3	0.4	73.4	0.4	3.0	8.0	237	
Mental health counseling for yourself or family member	12.6	1.7	0.4	76.6	0.4	2.5	5.9	239	
Food stamps	13.1	0.8	1.6	72.1	11.5	0.0	0.8	244	
Fuel assistance	12.7	2.0	1.2	70.5	11.9	0.0	1.6	244	
Unemployment benefits	13.1	3.3	0.8	66.8	12.3	1.6	2.0	244	
Income assistance (e.g., AFDC, SSI)	11.9	2.0	0.8	67.6	11.9	0.8	4.9	244	
Financial analysis or counseling by Extension Service	11.2	5.8	1.7	70.1	2.9	1.2	7.1	241	

As stated previously, about 80 percent of the respondents believed they would continue farming for another five years. What types of information and training would these operators desire? Topping the list of information items that were highly or very highly needed was marketing skills, information on available government assistance, and information on reducing costs through low-input farming (Table 10). At the bottom of the list of needs was processing farm products prior to sale and information on diversification (nearly 40 percent had already done some diversification over the last five years--Table 8).

Table 10. Farmers' opinions on their information and training needs to continue farming in the next five years

	Not <u>Needed</u>	Low Need	Moderate Need	High Need	Very High Need	Number of Respondents
			Percent			
Marketing Skills	17.1	9.1	38.0	23.6	12.2	263
Diversification of farm operation by adopting new crops and livestock	25.6	16.4	40.5	13.0	4.6	262
Available government assistance	14.8	13.6	38.5	21.8	11.3	257
Bookkeeping and financial systems	22.8	16.7	35.4	17.9	7.2	263
Using appropriate conservation techniques	17.6	17.6	43.5	17.6	3.8	262
Using new technologies as they become available	10.3	12.6	49.2	22.5	5.3	262
Using new machines and chemical inputs to increase my production	18.7	12.6	42.0	19.1	7.6	262
Reducing production costs through low-input farming methods	11.5	14.2	44.8	21.5	8.0	261
Processing farm products on farm before selling	37.8	26.7	22.5	8.0	5.0	262

Labor assistance from farm spouses can be one key to the success or failure of an operation. Spouses were asked if they performed various farm duties and whether the time spent on the duty had changed over the last five years. Results reveal that spousal participation in the farming operation ran very high (Table 11). Over 90 percent sometimes or always performed household and child care tasks in addition to running farm errands and tending the garden or animals for family consumption. Nearly 80 percent maintained the farm records and financial books, 65 percent did field work, and about 58 percent milked cows or tended the livestock. At some time, nearly 60 percent had also worked off the farm. Answers were mixed as to whether the time spent on these farm duties had changed. Most felt the time spent had stayed the same, although over 20 percent said the time spent on bookkeeping, farm errands, housekeeping and child care, and off-farm employment had increased.

Table 11. Farm spouses' report on types of farm duties and changes in the amount of time spent on these duties

			Perform			Time on These Duties Has			
	Always	Some- times Perce	Never	Not Done	Number of Respondents	In- creased	Stayed the Same Percent-		Number of Respondents
Field Work	12.3	52.9	26.4	8.4	227	16.6	55.8	27.6	199
Milked or cared for farm animals	15.6	42.0	20.1	22.3	224	9.7	58.3	32.0	175
Run farm errands	34.6	60.1	4.8	0.4	228	23.3	64.3	12.4	210
Purchased major farm supplies and equipment	5.4	23.9	59.0	11.7	222	6.5	82.2	11.2	169
Marketed farm products through wholesale buyers or directly to consumers	2.2	15.4	65.2	17.2	227	4.4	85.6	10.0	160
Bookkeeping and maintained records	43.7	35.8	17.9	2.6	229	30.1	63.1	6.8	206
Done household tasks and/or child care	96.1	3.1	0.9	0.0	228	23.1	64.6	12.3	212
Supervised the farm work of others	4.9	35.0	49.1	11.1	226	6.4	78.6	15.0	173
Took care of a vegetable garden or animals for family consumption	69.9	22.3	5.2	2.6	229	12.6	69.1	18.4	207
Worked at an off- farm job	30.1	29.2	28.3	12.4	226	21.7	59.2	19.0	184

How involved are spouses in decision-making? Few make major decisions by themselves on any of the items listed (Table 12). Between 50 percent and 60 percent of the spouses were involved jointly with the operator or another person in making decisions about land purchases or sales, land rentals, and major farm equipment purchases, and between 25 percent and 37 percent were involved with production and marketing decisions. For some, however, the matter of decision-making had never come up. Nearly 25 percent had not had to make a decision about buying or selling land.

Table 12. Farm spouses' opinions on family decision-making behavior

For each of the following decisions, please indicate whether you usually make the decision, your spouse/someone else makes the decision, or you make the decision together with your spouse/someone else.

	Usually Myself	My Spouse or Someone Else	Myself and Spouse or Someone Else Percent	Decision Has Never Come Up	Number of Respondents
Buy or sell land	0.9	20.4	54.0	24.8	226
Rent more or less land	0.4	25.8	56.0	17.8	225
Buy major household appliances	10.4	11.7	77.0	0.9	230
Buy major farm equipment	1.8	42.5	50.9	4.8	228
Produce a crop or livestock	0.9	49.8	31.1	18.2	225
When to sell your agri- cultural products	1.8	54.8	36.8	6.6	228
Try a new agricultural practice	1.3	53.7	28.2	16.7	227

Farming is a high-risk industry, and with risk often come conflict and adjustment. Spouses were asked how often they experienced various stressful situations. Over 30 percent felt daily pressure because of a lack of control over the weather and commodity prices, and about 25 percent responded that they daily experienced pressures in balancing work and family responsibilities (Table 13). Over half experienced occasional pressures from adjusting to new government policies, conflicts with spouse or children, and lack of control over the weather and prices. On the positive side, 43 percent felt they almost always received sufficient support from their spouse, and between 30 percent and 35 percent felt they almost never were pressured over child care arrangements, conflicts with spouse and children, and lack of farm help.

Table 13. Farm spouses' report on frequency of life pressures

There are many pressures on farm families	. How frequently do you experience the following pressures?						
	Almost Never	Occasionally Perce	Daily	Does not Apply	Number of Respondents		
Problems in balancing work and family responsibilities	18.6	48.7	25.2	7.5	226		
Conflict with spouse	32.0	56.4	8.0	3.6	225		
Conflict with children	31.0	50.0	6.2	12.8	226		
Adjusting to new government policies	21.5	59.2	9.4	9.9	223		
Difficulty with child care arrangements	35.3	16.5	0.4	47.8	224		
No farm help or loss of help when needed	30.1	41.6	1.8	26.5	226		
Lacking control over weather and commodity prices	10.2	51.3	31.4	7.1	226		
Insufficient support from spouse in farm or family duties	43.0	40.4	7.0	9.6	228		
Indebtedness and debt-servicing problems	29.3	42.8	12.6	15.3	222		

What coping mechanisms do spouses employ to meet these pressures? Many participate in church activities a great deal or often, remind themselves that there are good things about farming, focus on others with more problems, tell themselves that successful farming is not the only thing in life, or just put up with the pressures as long as they can remain farming (Table 14). Interestingly, many do not share their problems with others or seek counseling.

One means of support and social activity is membership in farm or local organizations. About 56 percent of the spouses and 67 percent of the operators were members of some organized group (Table 15). Nevertheless, the vast majority of spouses and operators had *never* been a member of a commodity organization, a marketing cooperative, or a farm political action group.

Table 14. Coping strategies used by farm spouses

ķ

How often do you use any of the following coping strategies?

How often do you use any of the following coping strategies?								
	Use a Use Quite Use Great Deal a Bit Somewhat		Never Use	Number of Respondents				
	Percent							
Participate in church activities	33.0	30.4	25.7	10.9	230			
Become more involved in activities outside the farm	12.2	29.7	46.7	11.4	229			
Notice people who have more diffi- culties in life than I do	13.5	40.6	40.6	5.2	229			
Tell myself that success in farming is not the only important thing in life	23.3	31.3	35.7	9.7	227			
Remind myself that for everything bad about farming, there is also something good	23.2	40.4	27.2	9.2	228			
Put up with a lot as long as I make a living from farming	22.4	31.8	30.9	14.8	223			
Go on as if nothing is happening	10.4	24.3	39.2	26.1	222			
Make a plan of action and follow it	12.6	32.7	43.5	11.2	223			
Try to make myself feel better by eating, drinking, smoking, using medication, etc.	3.1	9.3	27.8	59.9	227			
Refuse to think about it	3.6	10.3	43.3	42.9	224			
Keep problems secret from others	10.1	12.3	51.5	26.0	227			
Seek support from friends and/or relatives	7.5	18.1	48.9	25.6	227			
Seek spiritual support from minister, priest, or other	6.2	15.0	35.4	43.4	226			
Talk to a family counselor or other mental health professional	0.4	2.7	9.8	87.1	224			
Don't expect to get much income from farming	11.6	16.4	43.1	28.9	225			
Try to keep my feelings to myself	13.7	18.9	48.5	18.9	227			
Talk to someone who can do something concrete about the problem	3.6	9.8	41.1	45.5	224			
Wish that the situation would go away or somehow be over with	11.7	12.6	47.1	28.7	223			

Table 15. Operator and farm spouse membership in farm and local organizations

There are a number of farm and local organizations. Please indicate spouse and operator's activity in these organizations.

organizations.	Spouse				Operator			
	Member	Former Member Percent		Number of Respondents	Member	Former Member Percent	Never Member	Number of Respondents
Any organization, such as National Farmers Organizations, Grange, Farm Bureau, National Farmers Union, Young Farmers and Farm Wives	56.3	4.9	38.8	224	67.3	6.8	25.9	220
Any women's branches of general farm organizations, such as Farm Bureau Women	9.5	3.6	86.9	221	4.0	1.1	94.9	175
Any commodity producers' associations, such as the American Dairy Association or National Wheat Producers Association	9.6	3.2	87.2	219	22.6	7.7	69.7	208
Any women's branches of com- modity organizations, such as the Cattlewomen or the Wheathearts	3.2	1.8	94.9	217	2.8	0.0	97.2	180
Women's farm organizations, such as Women for Agriculture, American Agri-Women, or Women Involved in Farm Economics	1.4	1.4	97.2	218	1.1	0.6	98.3	179
Farm political action groups, such as a state Family Farm Movement or National Save the Family Farm Coalition	1.3	0.4	98.2	223	2.5	0.5	97.0	199
Local governing board, such as school board or town council	11.0	5.9	83.1	219	25.0	14.0	61.0	200
Marketing Cooperative	7.2	1.8	91.0	221	16.9	4.0	79.1	201
Farm Supply Cooperative	17.3	1.8	80.9	220	33.8	5.0	61.2	201