



*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](mailto: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.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

## Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



847M  
p. 2

LIVESTOCK  
Agriculture  
-URE

# LEVELS OF LIVING OF U.S. FARM FAMILIES

SELECTED ANNOTATED REFERENCES  
1940-1955

Compiled by JANET R. STANTON  
and ROBERT R. MOUNT

Agricultural Marketing Service

Miscellaneous Publication No. 746

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

November 1957

WASHINGTON, D.C.

## PREFACE

Interest in the levels of living of farm people has increased during recent years. This interest is shown in the publication of numerous reports on the levels of living of farm and nonfarm residents and in the development of techniques used to measure the sociological and economic conditions that affect rural people. Private organizations as well as State and Federal agencies have financed surveys and studies that show trends in rural living.

The list of references in this volume was prepared to help current reasearch workers in the study of levels of living of farm families in the United States. It is limited to publications that describe or analyze (1) the content of family living or of levels of living achieved, (2) the measurement of levels of living through indexes or socio-economic scales, (3) farm family-living expenditures, or (4) rural housing and home conveniences. The references in the main body of this list are arranged alphabetically by authorship within each year; the years are listed in reverse chronological order from 1955 back through 1940. In many instances annotations are composed of statements taken directly from a summary or from parts of the publications cited, but are not indicated as quotations.

Publications that appear in certain well-known, frequent series have not been included in this list. Among the series that contain material in the levels-of-living field are the Family Living Outlook Charts prepared by the Household Economics Research Branch of Agricultural Research Service, the annual report of the Federal Extension Service, annual estimates of electrification prepared in the Rural Electrification Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture series in cooperation with the University of Delaware on family spending, and the Farm Income Situation. With few exceptions, references covered by the bibilographies listed under "Related Bibliographies" are not given in our annotated references.

This bibliography was originally assembled by Janet R. Stanton with the assistance of Velna L. Motely, both formerly of the Agricultural Marketing Service. Robert R. Mount completed it under the direction of Gladys K. Bowles. The authors acknowledge the advice and assistance of the Bibliography Division, U. S. Department of Agriculture, and of Mrs. Elsie S. Manny of the Farm Population and Rural Life Branch of the AMS.

LEVELS OF LIVING OF U. S. FARM FAMILIES

SELECTED ANNOTATED REFERENCES, 1940-1955

Compiled by Janet R. Stanton and Robert R. Mount  
Farm Population and Rural Life Branch  
Agricultural Economics Division  
Agricultural Marketing Service

CONTENTS

	Page
Annotated references . . . . .	2
Authorship index . . . . .	47
Related bibliographies . . . . .	50
Related bibliographies index . . . . .	52



Annotated References

1955

1. AURBACH, HERBERT A. A Guttman scale for measuring isolation. Rur. Sociol. 20: 142-45.

Summary paper of a Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station study designed to develop classification schema for counties of the State. Aspect of study reported on is concerned with development of a Guttman scale for ranking counties as to relative isolation.

2. BERTRAND, ALVIN L. Cultural changes in American rural life. National Education Association Yearbook, 1955: 306-331. Washington.

General discussion of various cultural changes. The section on institutional changes takes up improvements in levels of living.

3. COATES, CHARLES H., and BERTRAND, ALVIN L. A simplified statistical methodology for developing multimeasure indexes as research tools. Rur. Sociol. 20: 132-141.

Outlines steps in a simplified index methodology for which speed, reliability, and economy are claimed. Example is shown of an index of mechanization for 58 State economic areas.

4. DUNCAN, OTIS D. Economic changes in American rural life. National Education Association Yearbook, 1955: 316-326. Washington.

Discusses trends associated with the rising levels of living of farm families, and factors positively and negatively correlated with the index of level of living.

5. NELSON, LOWRY. Levels of family living. In his "Rural sociology," pp. 301-321. New York. American Book Co.

Discusses the factors influencing level of living, including money income, formal education, pattern of settlement, ethnic differences, the life cycle of the farm family, social significance of the family cycle, the problem of rural housing, etc.

6. STAAB, JOSEPHINE. The effect of classification on the coefficient of income elasticity of farm family expenditures. Tenn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 243. Knoxville. 31 pp.

Discusses three bases of classification of farm income: Gross cash income, family socio-economic status (Sewell's scale), and disposable net cash income. Conclusion is that the three methods correlate about equally well with family income.

7. STANTON, JANET R. Farm-operator family level-of-living indexes for States, 1950-54. U. S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Mktg. Serv. (AMS-26). Washington. 10 pp.

Presents annual farm-operator family level-of-living indexes for States, regions, and geographic divisions for 1951-54. The indexes are comparable with the county indexes published earlier (see items 42, 110, 150), and show a continued upward trend of farm-family level of living.

8. STANTON, JANET R. Looking at living standards among farmers. Agr. Situation 39 (8): 4-5.

A commentary on a map prepared from projected State level-of-living indexes for 1954 (see item 7). Discusses trends on national, regional, and State levels.

9. U. S. DEPT. AGR. Development of agriculture's human resources. A report on problems of low-income farmers prepared for the Secretary of Agriculture. Washington. 44 pp.

Description of listed problem areas, discussion of ameliorating influences, recommendations for improvement. Uses 1950 level-of-living indexes in delineation of areas.

#### 1954

10. ANDERSON, C. ARNOLD. Economic status differentials within southern agriculture. Rur. Sociol. 19: 50-67.

An exploration of economic elements in the stratification of southern agriculture. Factors studied include size of operations, income distribution, value of land and buildings, tenure, use of hired labor, and household facilities and housing conditions. These are analyzed by race for North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi.

11. BERTRAND, ALVIN L. Rural locality groups: Changing patterns, change factors, and implications. Rur. Sociol. 19: 174-179.

Change factors discussed are technology, population shifts, prosperity, and legislative programs. States that the community, rather than the neighborhood, is now the basic locality-identification unit in rural areas in the United States.

12. CHARLTON, JESSE L. Social aspects of farm ownership and tenancy in the Arkansas coastal plain. Ark. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 545. Fayetteville. 85 pp.

Subjects discussed are characteristics of tenure classes, tenure as a process, and land tenure and related socio-economic factors. Tables include, among other items, measures of education, farm-property values, income, mobility, high school attendance, social participation, housing, and socio-economic status.



13. CORRELL, MYRTLE G. Farm income and living costs for certain Kansas farm families, 1946-50. Kans. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 363. Manhattan. 54 pp.

Third of a series initiated in 1934, using records kept by Farm and Home Management families--possibly a sample well above average in management ability. Data show direct reflection in family-living expenditure of rises or drops in farm income.

14. DUNCAN, OTIS D. Factors related to levels of living of Oklahoma farm families. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. B-429. Stillwater. 19 pp.

A study of how basic changes in farming patterns and the management of individual farms have affected the level of living. The shift from cultivated field crops to livestock farming, the increase in size of farms, technological improvements, reduction of farm population, hiring of outside labor and machines, rise in education level, and other influences share a positive relationship with a higher level of living for Oklahoma farm families.

15. GEE, WILSON. The farmer's standard of living. In his "The social economics of agriculture," pp. 398-422. New York. Macmillan Co.

Defines "level of living" and "standard of living." Discusses the determinants of living standards and of incomes and standards. Notes that income is a major determinant of level of living. Describes the diet, housing, and other elements affecting the farm family's level of living. Points out that improvement of the level of living of farm people is the final objective of official agricultural and rural life agencies.

16. GREEN, JAMES W. House building by farm owners. N. C. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 391. Raleigh. 115 pp.

This study is based on a field investigation of the social process by which a statewide sample of 266 North Carolina farm families built their houses during 1948-50. Each phase in the process--decision to build, causes of delay, sacrifices made, types of farmhouses constructed, planning procedures, contracts let, labor employed, materials used, and costs and financing--is analyzed by life cycle of the family and by an index of housing quality.

17. HILLMAN, CHRISTINE H. Factors influencing the lives of a group of young farm families. Ohio Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 750. Wooster. 63 pp.

A study of economic and personal problems of 150 young farm families of central Ohio. The sample was of families with relatively high level of living, and relatively high formal schooling for both men and women. An interesting aspect of this report is its examination of the problems of the farm wives with nonfarm backgrounds.

18. NELSON, LOWRY. The farm family. In his "American farm life", pp. 68-83. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Univ. Press.

Among other aspects of contemporary farm-family life in the United States, discusses dramatic rise in levels of living since World War II, expenditure trends, and improvements in housing.

19. PENNOCK, JEAN L., BREW, MARGARET L., and TILLINGHAST, ROSE C. Farm family spending and saving in Illinois...with a comparison of survey and home-accounts data. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 101. Washington. 92 pp.

Conclusions indicate that account-keeping families differ from total population in not including extremes, in being a relatively well-to-do group, in spending and saving more. The study suggests that account data may be used, but entail a thorough description of the account-keeping segment in relation to total population.

20. RATCHFORD, CHARLES B., ROLLINS, MABEL A., and HUNTER, STARLEY M. How farm families are meeting the "cost-price squeeze." J. Home Econ. 46: 5-9.

Discusses financial and economic adjustments of farm families in North Carolina, New York, and Missouri. Authors report that the level of living among farm families was being lowered in North Carolina, maintained with difficulty in Missouri, and not yet threatened in New York.

21. REAGAN, BARBARA B. Condensed vs. detailed schedule in expenditure surveys. Agr. Econ. Res. 6: 41-53.

Methodology of an experiment conducted in 1947 by the former Bureau of Agricultural Economic and the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, when both agencies simultaneously surveyed a sample of Illinois farm-operator families. BAE used a condensed schedule with "global" questions, BHNHE a detailed schedule. "Global" schedules were generally unsatisfactory beyond a single lump estimate in total spending. Author discusses briefly possible improvements in condensed schedules.

22. RUTTAN, VERNON W. The relationship between the BAE level-of-living indexes and the average incomes of farm operators. J. Farm Econ. 36: 44-51.

Argues that this level-of-living index is not closely related to another measure of rural welfare--average net income per farm operator--except in the South. States that, as the average net income of farm operators from agriculture and Government payments increases, the relationship between income and the level-of-living index becomes increasingly tenuous, and thus the two measures are closely related only in the lower-income States and counties. Suggests addition to the index of factors which reflect the higher levels of living in the more commercial sectors of American agriculture.

23. TROTTER, VIRGINIA Y., and LISTON, MARGARET I. Farm family housing needs and preferences in Nebraska. Nebr. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Bul. 175. Lincoln. 122 pp.

Presents results of a survey of Nebraska farm family preferences, activities, and possessions as they are related to housing needs. Purpose of the study was threefold: (1) To interpret the housing needs of farm families in terms of their preferences, activities, and possessions; (2) to determine the difference in housing needs and preferences of farm families residing in different areas of the State and those varying in family income, family composition, and farm tenure; and (3) to identify the ways in which the housing needs and preferences of Nebraska farm families are different from those of the North Central Region.

24. WILKENING, EUGENE A. Techniques of assessing farm family values. Rur. Sociol. 19: 39-49.

An attempt to compare four different techniques of assessing farm family values: (1) Direct questioning; (2) choosing between alternative expenditures of time or money; (3) verbal ranking of family goals; and (4) behavioral data in the form of material possessions, family expenditures, and social participation. The three verbal indexes were highly correlated, but were dependent upon the type of value measured. It was concluded that behavioral indexes are valid only when not highly influenced by immediate situational factors. Choices between alternatives in expenditure of time or money appeared to furnish a reliable as well as valid means of measuring family values which involve such expenditures.

25. WILLS, JOHN E., and KOELLER, HAROLD L. Employment and income of rural families in southern Illinois. Ill. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 580. Urbana. 24 pp.

Survey was made in Wayne and Franklin Counties, where small farms, low farm incomes, and off-farm work are relatively common. Wayne County is predominantly agricultural, but coal mining is important in Franklin County. Findings on farm production, trends in farming operations, and source of family income are given.

### 1953

26. CHAPMAN, PAUL W. Better-farm-living gains. Prog. Farmer (Texas ed.) 68: 40-42.

Based on farm-operator family level-of-living indexes for 1950 (see item 42). Shows gains made in South for 5-year period prior to 1950.



27. COWLES, MAY L., and IRWIN, MARGARET H. Factors affecting farm housing in the North Central Region. Wis. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 499. Madison. 51 pp.

Data given on climate of the region and its effect on farm-house design, on economic and social patterns affecting farm housing--the rural-farm population, the income of farm families, and the proportion of tenancy--and on characteristics of existing houses.

28. FESSLER, DONALD R. Development of measurement techniques for the comparative sociological analysis of rural communities (abs.). Iowa State Col. J. Sci. 27: 170-171.

From a dissertation completed in 1951. Data collected for a study of Iowa farmers' cooperatives served as the basis for measuring significance of differences between communities with and without cooperatives.

29. GRADY, ETHYL R., SMITH, GRACE H., and KUSCHKE, BLANCHE M. Rhode Island rural housing and family leisure. R. I. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 315. Kingston. 47 pp.

This study indicates that a house should provide areas of sufficient size for leisure activities both for the family group and guests; areas for independent activities in more than one room in the house; and generous, conveniently-located storage facilities which may be adapted to the particular equipment and materials used by the family.

30. HUNTER, STARLEY M., and BOTTUM, J. CARROLL. Living expenditures and income of farm and city families. Ind. Agr. Expt. Bul. 588. Lafayette. 39 pp.

Based on data obtained in 1946 from 100 farm and 100 city families in Miami County, Indiana. Comparisons are made of family expenditures, goods and services consumed, and social participation. Average cash expenditure for family living was about a fourth higher for city than for farm families, and savings of farm families were considerably higher than those of city families. Farm families tended to accent education, recreation, and clothing in increasing expenditures, whereas city-family expenditures increased in all categories with increased income. Participation in organized social groups was more closely related to income class for city families than for farm families.

31. JEHLIK, PAUL J. How high are we living? Iowa Farm Sci. 7: 13-14.

A discussion of the changes in the levels of living of Iowa farm families between 1930 and 1950 as shown by county indexes (see item 42).

32. JEHLIK, PAUL J. Techniques for analyzing farm family level of living and related factors in Iowa. Iowa State Col. J. Sci. 27: 196-197.

Reviews methods used to analyze differences in farm-family levels of living in Iowa, including: (1) Correlation-and-regression analysis of 12 selected variables and level of living; (2) test of criterion of type-of-farming area for usefulness in level-of-living-area delineations; (3) determination of variations in levels of living within and between principal soil-association areas, and the relationship of selected variables to levels within each; (4) delineation of homogeneous level-of-living areas and determination of the relationship of selected variables to level of living within the combined homogeneous areas and the nonhomogeneous portion of the State; and (5) determination of the ecology of level of living and of related variables, and identification of areas in which there is general correspondence in the rank of level of living in relation to each of the variables.

33. PECHENUIK, OLGA, and LISTON, MARGARET I. Selected indicators as measures of economic status of farm families in the North Central Region. J. Home Econ. 45: 187-190.

Selected data from the 1948 survey of housing needs and preferences of farm families in the North Central Region are used to explore a method of classifying farm families by economic status.

Results indicate classification of farm families by economic indicators (unweighted) would be an appropriate method for distinguishing families of middle economic status from those of extremely low or high economic rank. This method might also be used for grouping farm families to contrast and compare selected aspects of family behavior at high and low economic levels.

34. SMITH, T. LYNN. The sociology of rural life. Ed. 3. New York. Harper & Bros. 602 pp.

A general textbook with discussions pertinent to farm-family levels of living: In chapter 5, physical characteristics and health; chapter 6, psychological characteristics and mental health; chapter 12, land tenure; chapter 16, social stratification; chapter 18, rural education and educational institutions; and chapter 21, competition and conflict in rural society. Bibliography.

35. STIEBELING, HAZEL K. Are farm families catching up? J. Home Econ. 45: 9-12.

Farm people are not yet on a par with urban people in consumption of many goods and services, and the urban standard itself is not static. As they can afford it, farm families evidently use retail food markets. In housing and household equipment, great gains were made during the past year, principally through electrification. Farm families increasingly demand improved community services.



1952

36. ANDERSON, ANTON H. Changes in farm population and rural life in four North Dakota counties. N. Dak. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 375. Fargo. 38 pp.

Findings of a study of how the loss of a third of the State's farm population affected farm family-living, and how level of living was related to out-migration.

37. ANDERSON, W. A. A study of the values in rural living. Part VII: Summary of findings. N. Y. (Cornell) Agr. Expt. Sta., Dept. Rur. Sociol. Publ. 34. Ithaca. 25 pp.

States the broad findings from a detailed study of opinions about rural living begun in 1944. Various sections of the population in two parts of the nation were studied. Two scales devised and tested for the collection of opinions. Data were tabulated by sex and residence for each of six sample groups.

Results indicated all groups more favorable than unfavorable to rural living; the undecided were more numerous in the Northeast than in the Northwest. The large increase in rural non-farm population is mentioned as contributing to favorable opinions about rural life. All groups were more favorable toward farming as enjoyable work than toward farming as a means of gaining a satisfactory living; in rating rural areas as more favorable to wholesome family living adults outnumbered youths.

Six reports on this study were published previously under the same authorship by the experiment station at Ithaca. They are:

Part I: A scale for the measurement of values in rural living. Memoir 277. 1947. 77 pp.

Part II: The opinions of youth and adults. Memoir 286. 1949. 109 pp.

Part III: The construction of a short scale for measuring the opinions about rural living. Dept. Rur. Sociol. Mimeog. Bul. 21. 1949. 15 pp.

Part IV: Rural living opinion scale (short form). Dept. Rur. Sociol. Mimeog. Bul. 22. 1949. 8 pp.

Part V: The opinions of university students. Memoir 302. 1950. 75 pp.

Part VI: How to use the rural living opinion scale  
Rur. Sociol. Publ. 23. 1950. 9 pp.

38. BELCHER, JOHN C., and SHARP, EMMIT F. A short scale for measuring farm family level of living. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. T-46. Stillwater. 22 pp.

Reexamines the validity of the Sewell Socio-Economic Scale, Short Form (see item 156). Presents a revised 10-item scale; states that the scale is primarily a measure of level of living rather than one of socio-economic status.

39. BEYER, GLENN H. Rural housing in New York State. N. Y. (Cornell) Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 893. Ithaca. 40 pp.

Points out that housing in rural areas is likely to be related to the quality of land in the area; ratio of farm to non-farm occupation; proximity of urban areas; the nature, size, and degree of stability of industrial and commercial activities in needy urban areas; and history of area, composition of its population, and trends of population growth.

Important factors found to affect rural housing and housing facilities in this study of five New York counties were: Occupation of the head of the family; farm or nonfarm residence; age and condition of housing; and relative proximity to urban areas.

40. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Housing of farm-owner-operator families in the Mississippi Lower Coastal Area. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 490. State College. 28 pp.

Reports results of survey of 161 farm-owner-operator families in the area, recording preferences, possessions, and activities as they relate to housing needs. Characteristics of farm dwellings in this area and activities and attitudes affecting housing desires were studied.

41. FLAGG, GRACE L., and LONGMORE, T. WILSON. Trends in selected facilities available to farm families. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 87. Washington. 15 pp.

Presents charts and tables on the availability to farm families of such facilities as electricity, electrical equipment, refrigeration, radios and television, telephones, running water in the farm dwelling, central heating, automobiles, and all-weather roads.

42. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Farm-operator family level-of-living indexes for counties in the United States 1930, 1940, 1945, and 1950. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 83 pp.

Indexes for 1950 published in this bulletin are comparable with those published in 1947 for the years 1940 and 1945 (see item 110). In addition, newly-computed indexes for 1930 are given. The same four items from the Census of Agriculture used in the 1947 report form the basis for these indexes, with minor differences in definition. This report is the first in its series to give indexes for State economic areas. An appendix explains methods used in construction of the indexes and some of the theory behind them.

43. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Farm-operator families are living better, report shows. Agr. Situation 36 (7): 5-6.

Summarizes important findings in the newly-released Farm-Operator Family Level-of-Living Indexes, 1950 (see item 42). Explains bases of the indexes, and includes map of all counties by quintiles.

44. HOWARD, MILDRED S., WOOLRICH, AVIS, and HOLMES, EMMA G. Housing needs and preferences of farm families . . . a comparison of data from studies in four regions. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 96. Washington. 63 pp.

Brings together data on activities and preferences from regional housing studies previously published in four separate reports.

45. JEHLIK, PAUL J., and WAKELEY, RAY E. Are all our farm families "well off?" Iowa Farm Sci. 6: 14.

To find if there was a direct tie-up between crop productivity and levels of living in Iowa townships that had relatively low level-of-living indexes, indexes of grain-and-seed-producing capacities were correlated with township level-of-living indexes. The correlation for the whole State was 0.78, but in southern Iowa townships it was higher than average.

46. KOLB, JOHN H., and BRUNNER, EDMUND deS. Standards of living and the rural home. In their "A study of rural society," pp. 283-312. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co.

A text which includes the rural home as a social institution and consumer center, early studies of level of living, recent trends of living in rural homes, and a summary of factors influencing rural ways of living.

47. ORSHANSKY, MOLLIE O. Equivalent levels of living: farm and city. In National Bureau of Economic Research: "Studies in income and wealth". 15: 175-200. New York.

Problems concerning measurement of differences in the cost of living on farms and in cities; specifically the problem of knowing at what points to equate the two income distributions



for comparisons of family expenditure and levels of living. The author proposes that since farm and city families use different kinds of goods and services, a comparison can best be made in terms of two sets of items or budgets which, though different in content, are equivalent in satisfaction. The possibility of using the income elasticity of consumer purchases to investigate differences in the cost of living for farm and urban families is suggested.

48. RAPER, ARTHUR F. A graphic presentation of rural trends. U. S. Dept. Agr., Ext. Serv. and Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 33 pp.

A brief report which analyzes a few basic economic and social changes which have taken place in rural America in recent years, especially in rural population, occupations of rural people, technological advancements in farming, crop and livestock yields, levels of living of farm people, and rural community life.

49. SCHULER, EDGAR A., and McKAIN, WALTER C., JR. Levels and standards of living. In Taylor, Carl C. and others, "Rural life in the United States," pp. 295-308. New York. Alfred A. Knopf.

Distinguishes between "levels" and "standards" of living and discusses the interrelationship of the two concepts. Points out rural-urban differences in levels and standards of living in transportation, communication, education, health and medical facilities, income, public services, and politics.

50. TAVES, MARVIN J. Farm versus village living: a decade of change. Rur. Sociol. 17: 47-55.

This article summarizes data for Isanti County, Minnesota, which indicate that both rural-farm and rural-nonfarm women experienced improvements in living conditions between 1940 and 1950, the former in greater proportion than the latter. An attempt is made to test the hypothesis that there is a direct relationship between such environmental improvements and improvement in living satisfaction among rural women. Conclusion drawn is that there is a direct association between living conditions and living satisfactions, but not necessarily a one-to-one relationship. Farm women who reported a lower level of living in 1950 than that reported by village women in 1940 nevertheless had definitely higher living-satisfaction scores in 1950 than the village women had in 1940.

51. U. S. DEPT. AGR., BUR. HUMAN NUTR. and HOME ECON. Housing needs and preferences of farm families . . . a comparison of data from studies in four regions. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 96. Washington. 63 pp.

This report brings together data on activities and preferences from regional housing studies previously published in four separate reports. It discusses the differences in the sample used and in the method of selecting interview families. It presents a summary of the standard features wanted and household activities performed.

52. U. S. DEPT. COMMERCE, BUR. CENSUS and U. S. DEPT. AGR. Farms and farm people--population, income, and housing characteristics by economic class of farm. A special cooperative study. Washington. 98 pp.

Brings together data showing characteristics of farm-operator families, their housing, food production, and amounts and sources of family income by farm characteristics, particularly economic class of farm and income class of farm families. Data were obtained from the 1950 Censuses of Agriculture, Population, and Housing, and included estimates based on a sample of 11,000 farms and farm operators.

53. WATSON, ELIZABETH S. Observations on a rural family living study in York County, S. C. Address given at the 30th Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference. Washington. October 22, 1952. 6 pp.

Summarizes findings of a South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station study covering expenditures of 208 white families in rural, open-country York County.

### 1951

54. BELCHER, JOHN C. Evaluation and restandardization of Sewell's socio-economic scale. Rur. Sociol. 16: 246-255.

Questions current validity and reliability of Sewell's Socio-economic Status Scale, which was originally formulated for use in Oklahoma from 1937 data. This procedure evaluates the original scale and constructs a new one using schedules taken from Oklahoma farm families in 1947. Sewell's technique was followed. Eight of the original 36 items were removed as they no longer differentiate sufficiently among socio-economic classes. Weights were calculated for the remaining items. The correlation between the resulting scale and the original was 0.99; it was concluded that the Sewell Scale is still a valid and reliable measure of socio-economic status for the farm families of Oklahoma (see items 38, 156, 193).



55. BERTRAND, ALVIN L. Agricultural mechanization and social change in rural Louisiana. La. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 458. Baton Rouge. 48 pp.

Among other major objectives, this study attempted to find out the number and nature of socio-economic changes in agricultural Louisiana attributable to the adoption of mechanical power on farms. Mechanization of farms was directly associated with a higher level of living; with an increase in livestock other than workstock, owner-operated farms, absentee ownership, size of farms, and total value of farms products produced; and with a decrease in draft animals, number of sharecroppers and laborers, and number of farms.

56. BONSER, HOWARD J., and DAVIS, JOSEPH F. Electricity on farms and in rural homes in the East Tennessee Valley. Tenn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 221. Knoxville. 63 pp.

Inquires into what uses farmers are making of electricity, tries to ascertain consumption of power to be expected in rural areas, and appraises impact of electricity on farm organization and operation.

57. DAVIES, VERNON, and WOOD, ANNA L. Construction of a farm family level-of-living scale for the 11 western States. J. Home Econ. 43: 109-112.

The scale described in this article was constructed according to procedures developed by Chapin, Sewell, and others, with some modifications because of the nature of the sample data.

58. DICKINS, DOROTHY. The rural family and its source of income. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 481. State College. 34 pp.

Family living data for 1945 obtained from 578 families in Jones County and 613 in Lee County, were used to compare the manner of living of rural families according to their source of family income: (1) Farm; (2) off-farm; (3) part-farm; and (4) other. Families were classified into two net-income classes and this manner of living compared.

59. HARRIS, MARY J., and STAAB, JOSEPHINE. The relationship of current net income to the socio-economic status of northern farm families. Rur. Sociol. 16: 355-358.

This study is an investigation of the relationship between socio-economic score and current net income. Complete 1947 income data and socio-economic ratings for the year were obtained from 909 farm families interviewed for the Southern

Regional Farm Family Food Consumption Study. The relationship between socio-economic status score and current net income was determined by regression and correlation.

Results indicated that current net income and socio-economic status are positively correlated, but the relationship is not great enough for the socio-economic score of a farm family to be used to predict its current net income with any degree of accuracy.

60. LONGMORE, T. WILSON, and TAYLOR, CARL C. Elasticity of expenditures for farm-family living, farm production, and savings, United States, 1946. J. Farm Econ. 33: 1-19.

A test of the validity of the hypothesis that, of the three major expenditure groups--farm operation, family living, and investments or savings--those for farm family living are least flexible. This analysis does not explain why the level of living to which farm families are accustomed is a standard of living which they tend to maintain. It indicates only that this tendency is so strong that it greatly influences investments and savings, and to a considerable degree expenditures for production.

61. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. Factors associated with recent changes of farm income in Alabama. Rur. Sociol. 16: 147-153.

Selected socio-cultural factors are observed to study the relationship to sharp rises in gross per capita farm income for counties of Alabama between 1940 and 1945. The 1945 Census of Agriculture and earlier censuses supplied the data for this research. Changes in six factors were found to be closely associated with variations in farm income increases for the entire State during the period studied. These factors reflect the interaction of population, technology, social organization, and natural resources in effecting changes of farm income.

62. PETERSON, A. W., PHILLIPS, VELMA, and STEVENSON, AILSIE. Rural family life pattern in relation to land class. Wash. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 529. Pullman. 83 pp.

Five land classes were set up by economic productivity, and such economic and social factors as income, expenditures for food, physical environment, conveniences, home management, family relations, social participation, and cultural resources were scored according to these classes. This is followed by a discussion of implications for educational programs.

63. REAGAN, BARBARA B., and GROSSMAN, EVELYN. Rural levels of living in Lee and Jones Counties, Mississippi, 1945, and a comparison of two methods of data collection. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 41. Washington. 164 pp.

The purpose of this study was to provide information on how the industrial development of a rural area affects sources of income and the ways of living of rural families. Current expenditures, home-produced food, housing facilities, durable goods owned, and average dietary level attained were the indicators used to measure level of living. Analysis of the available information indicated that the rural nonfarm consumer units appeared to have higher levels of living than the farm consumer units. Farm consumer units that sold little or no farm produce appeared to have higher levels of living than those that sold \$200 worth of produce, and to fare better than either of the other groups in diet quality.

64. TURNER, W. L., RATCHFORD, CHARLES B., JAMES, H. B., FORSTER, GARNET W., GORDON, PAULINE E., POWELL, J. C., and VAN LANDINGHAM, EUGENIA. Better living for land owners and tenants. N. C. Agr. Ext. Serv. Ext. Cir. 359. Raleigh. 11 pp.

In January 1946 work was resumed on an experiment (begun in 1940 but discontinued during World War II) in methods of improving landowner-tenant relations in North Carolina. The pilot county was Edgecombe. Objectives of the program were: (a) To raise the farm-family level of living; (b) to increase the efficiency of farm production; (c) to promote greater population stability; and (d) to increase cooperation between landowners and tenants. These objectives were to be achieved through development of a farming system based upon farm-management research, use of recommended technical practices, and development of a farm-home program. Thirteen Edgecombe County landowners who had 138 tenants (white and Negro) participated. This study reviews the benefits of the program evident by January, 1949.

65. U. S. DEPT. AGR., BUR. HUMAN NUTR. and HOME ECON. (In cooperation with Agr. Expt. Stations of Ala., Ark., Ga., Miss., S. C., Tenn., and Va.) Farm housing in the South. Southern Regional Publ. 14. Washington. 273 pp.

A study of household activities, facilities, and family preferences of 1,507 homemakers in selected areas of the South as a basis for development of functional farmhouse plans. The inquiry covered the activities carried on in farm homes, types and quantities of possessions requiring storage in the house, homemakers' preferences as to location of activities, areas, and features of construction.



1950

66. DICKINS, DOROTHY and others. Family food consumption in three types of farming areas of the South. Southern Coop. Ser. Bul. 7. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. State College. 142 pp.

Incidental to the main purpose of this study, data on current net income and socio-economic status were collected. The data were scored on the short Sewell scale and used to classify families in the analysis of food-consumption data. The scale was found insufficiently correlated to net income figures (on a one-year basis) to be used for prediction.

67. DICKINS, DOROTHY. The southern farm family in an era of change. Rur. Sociol. 15: 232-241.

Rapid technological development in agriculture, increased urbanization, and scientific discoveries and developments are discussed. With technological improvement, changes include higher incomes for some farm families, less need for wife and child labor in production work, and decrease in number of families with farming as an occupation. With increased urbanization in the South, consumption patterns of farm and urban families are becoming more nearly alike. Developments in housing have not affected the rural South in the same degree. Rural farmhouses are smaller than formerly, owing to increase in cost of construction. But efficient use of available space is attracting more attention than previously.

68. NOLAN, FRANCENA L., HONEY, RUTH R., and WASMUTH, GLADYS. Family housing on owner-operated farms in Pennsylvania. Pa. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 534. State College. 39 pp.

The purpose of this study was to learn the characteristics of existing farm dwellings and to discover activities and attitudes that affect housing requirements of Pennsylvania farm families. Records were obtained from 438 families living in 53 counties throughout the State. Farms of all sizes from all the major types-of-farming areas were included. The houses were predominantly large, old frame structures not suited to present needs. It appeared that changes within the houses were needed, rather than additions to buildings.

Such changes would make possible more effective use of existing space and provide flexibility to meet changing family needs.

1949

69. BEYER, GLENN H. Farm housing in the Northeast. N. Y. (Cornell) Agr. Expt. Sta. Memoir 292. Ithaca. 458 pp.

Presents findings of a survey of facilities, activities, possessions, and preferences of families on owner-operated farms, providing new and refined data to guide in planning farmhouses more functional in design and adequate in space. Housing requirements of farm families in the region were studied in relation to the effects of such factors as the economic levels of the families, stages of the family cycle, size of household, and location of farms with relation to climate and topography.

70. DAVIS, JOSEPH F. Electrification of U. S. farms nears the three-quarter mark. Agr. Situation 33 (3): 8-9.

Commentary on factors affecting increase in rural electrification, chiefly REA cooperative loans.

71. DOUGLAS, EDNA. An economic appraisal of Iowa farm housing. Iowa Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Bul. 367. Ames. 114 pp.

This bulletin reviews the basic differences between non-farm and farm housing, examines the status of farm housing in Iowa in 1940, estimates the extent of construction from 1940 to 1943, and proposes certain means for achieving improvement in the State's farm dwellings. It points out that the basic distinction between farm and nonfarm housing is that the farm dwelling bears a close economic and functional relationship to the farm. One section summarizes the relation between the value of a house and presence of facilities. It ranks counties according to a scale of housing adequacy based on percentage of rural-farm dwellings with 12 characteristics related to structure and occupancy, utilities and facilities, and value.

72. FLAGG, GRACE L., and LONGMORE, T. WILSON. Trends in rural and urban levels of living. U. S. Dept. Agr. Inform. Bul. 11. Washington. 75 pp.

An analysis of significant trends in selected rural level-of-living items for the United States and the nine geographic regions. Data cover the years 1930, 1940, and 1945, and more current figures when available. The purpose is to learn how influential a factor in the level of living is the dominance, or lack of dominance, of farming as a way of life in a county. All counties of the United States were sorted into class intervals according to percentage of rural-farm population in 1940. Each level-of-living item was tabulated by class of counties. Ratios for each class of counties were



calculated for selected level-of-living items. Ratios were also computed for regions, and for the rural-farm, rural-nonfarm, and urban population for specific items (in cases where county data were not available.)

73. GUNSELMAN, MYRTLE A. Farm incomes and living costs for certain Kansas families, 1941-45. Kans. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 338. Manhattan. 40 pp.

Data from the 1941-45 income and expenditure records of 322 Kansas farm families were analyzed. Both income and expenditures increased during the five-year period, reflecting the increase in farm production, the higher prices farmers received for their products, and the higher prices they paid for consumers' goods. Kansas farmers' gains substantially outstripped their increased expenses, which included a 44-percent increase in clothing purchases and a doubled average medical bill.

74. HOUSER, PAUL M., and GALLOWAY, ROBERT E. Use and acceptance of public library services in a rural area. Rur. Sociol. 15: 233-243.

Correlates use of library services in Prince Georges County, Maryland, with certain factors, including "level-of-living traits."

75. KOFFSKY, NATHAN M. Farm and urban purchasing power. In National Bureau of Economic Research, "Studies in income and wealth." 11: 153-178. New York.

A thorough discussion of practices used in developing "parity indexes" and theory behind them. Suggests ways of improving analyses of purchasing-power differentials.

76. LONGMORE, T. WILSON, and FLAGG, GRACE L. Farm living varies with distance to city. Agr. Situation 33 (10): 3-4.

Brief report on a study made by the former Bureau of Agricultural Economics to learn how adequately the needs of farm families were met with respect to health, education, household facilities, and living conditions (see item 72).

77. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. A study of farms in Oklahoma by size and economic class. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. B-330. Stillwater. 11 pp.

Data on productivity and possession of conveniences are given by size and value of farm resources of Oklahoma farms.

78. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. Social aspects of farm mechanization in Oklahoma. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. B-339. Stillwater. 35 pp.

Data taken from the 1920 to 1945 Federal censuses were compared by counties arranged according to the amount of farm mechanization (as measured by number of tractors per 100 farms with 3 acres and over in 1945). Factors found to be associated with increased farm mechanization in Oklahoma are presented.

79. MEISSNER, FRANK. You can help plan for better living. Iowa Agriculturist 48 (3): 12-13.

Discusses Iowa's ranking on U. S. Department of Agriculture level-of-living indexes for 1940 and 1945, and tries to arouse desire for improvement.

80. PENNOCK, JEAN L., and SPEER, ELISABETH L. Changes in rural family income and spending in Tennessee, 1943-44. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 666. Washington. 106 pp.

A study of adjustments in family-living expenditures, saving, occupation, and residence in response to wartime changes in farm production, family income, off-farm employment, and other influences. Rationing, price controls, and scarcities affected the established consumption patterns, changed buying habits, and influenced home production of food. Among other changes, families moved more than usual, tenancy rate fell, and income rose. Changes in family size and in place of residence were less frequent than changes in income. Families whose income decreased kept their living expenses the same or cut them back; those whose incomes increased reported increases in consumption expenditures as well.

81. ROBERTSON, LYNN, and AMSTUTZ, KEITH. Telephone problems in rural Indiana. Ind. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 548. Lafayette. 44 pp.

Furnishes data on existing telephone service and gives suggestions for extension and improvement.

82. WEISS, GERTRUDE S. The farm family living situation. Address given at the 27th Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference. Washington. 6 pp.

Explains the effect that prospective lower farm income would have on family-living expenditures. States that higher family-living expenditures appear to follow increased incomes, though the reverse is not true. Discusses some of the more elastic categories of farm-family expenditures.

### 1948

83. BERTRAND, ALVIN L. The social processes and mechanization of southern agricultural systems. Rur. Sociol. 13: 31-39

Summarizes both factors that contribute to delay and to eventual progress in mechanization of the rural South. Discusses roles of the depression of the 1930's, (the Delta "sharecroppers' revolt",) the AAA, and World War II in changing traditional social patterns.

84. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Consumption patterns of cotton-farm families and an agricultural program for the South. Rur. Sociol. 13: 22-31.

Discusses importance of considering consumption patterns among southern cotton-farm families in connection with planning a more effective agricultural program for the South. Uses suggested for consumption studies include predicting the number of workers in nonagricultural pursuits which a more efficient system of agriculture could support, and showing the kind and amount of goods furnished the family by the farm, thus allowing minimum family budgets to be worked out.

Expenditure data for this study were obtained from cotton-farm families and four other types of farm families included in the Consumer Purchases Study.

85. FERRISS, ABBOTT L. Rural-farm level-of-living indexes for two southeastern States. Social Forces 26: 420-430.

Divides the concept of level of living into three component parts: Self-sufficing resources, material possessions, and agricultural income. The county instead of the family is the elemental unit. The study sets forth the items utilized in construction of the three components, the method of combination, and the argument for validation, including a comparison with other level-of-living indexes.

86. HAMILTON, ARTHUR B., and McGEE, CHARLOTTE K. The economic and social status of rural Negro families in Maryland. Md. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. X4. College Park. 36 pp.

A picture of life among Maryland Negro farm families. Topics include facilities, tenure, income, size of family, production of food, participation in community activities, and rural-urban migration. Data were taken from approximately 2,000 Negro families, equally divided between rural farm and rural nonfarm.

87. LIONBERGER, HERBERT F. Low-income farmers in Missouri. Mo. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Bul. 413. Columbia. 32 pp.

Significant characteristics such as income, tenure, facilities and equipment, age of operator, and education of 459 low-income farm operators from four Missouri counties are reported in this bulletin.

Most reported that they liked farming, and three-fourths said they would choose it again as an occupation. Problems mentioned most frequently were declining soil fertility, poor quality and scarcity of feed, lack of farm machinery, and poor health.



88. MacNAUGHTON, MARGARET A. Family living levels measured by standardized rural socio-economic scales. Econ. Annalist 18: 9-16.

A review of some of the basic assumptions and limitations of rural socio-economic scales.

89. McCHAREN, WILLIAM K. Improving the quality of living. George Peabody Col. Div. Surveys and Field Serv. Nashville, Tenn. 67 pp.

Twenty-two stories of southern school programs that attempt to serve the needs and interests of the people living in and around their communities. Study illustrates the close relationship between better education and a higher level of living in rural communities.

90. McKAIN, WALTER C., JR. and FLAGG, GRACE L. Differences between rural and urban levels of living. U. S. Dept. Agr. Bur. Agr. Econ. Part I, 17 pp. Part II, 12 pp. Washington.

Compares urban and rural levels of living on the basis of measurable components such as (1) income and expenditures, (2) nutrition, (3) material possessions, (4) health and medical services, (5) education, (6) retail stores and sales, and (7) local government expenditures.

Part I compares the level of living of rural and urban people for the United States as a whole. Part II makes the same comparisons on a regional basis.

91. NELSON, LOWRY. Can farmers afford to live better? Natl. Planning Assoc. Planning Pam. 65. Washington. 32 pp.

The author's answer is that farmers cannot afford not to live better. This pamphlet indicates where improvements are needed in farm living, and suggests that farmers invest in their improvements rather than in land at inflated prices. It stresses inadequacies of farm homes, poor diet of rural families, disparity between owners and tenants, the problems of medical care, and the plight of rural education. A growing dissatisfaction with rural life as a consequence of low levels of living is noted.

92. REID, MARGARET G. Changing levels of living among farm families in the South. Assoc. of Southern Agr. Workers, Abs., Proc. of Annual Conv. 45: 56-58.

Discusses types of data that may be used to ascertain changes in levels of living. Includes a list of the groups interested in consumption data for farm families. States that existing data on farm families in the South are inadequate, but that evidence available indicates farm families in the South are using higher incomes for purchased foods and improved housing.

93. THOMPSON, WARREN S. Differentials in fertility and levels of living in the rural population of the United States. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 13: 516-534.

Calls attention to the considerable data on differential fertility in the United States (especially between urban and rural populations, different economic and social groups, and a few broad groups in different geographic areas) as compared with scarcity or lack of data on the differences in fertility of rural groups in the same State or region that have different levels of living. This study uses level-of-living indexes according to color where non-whites constitute 10 percent or more of the rural population, or where there are 150 or more nonwhite children of ages 0-4. Level-of-living and replacement indexes are discussed by areas. Emphasizes different level-of-living index scores, rather than regional differences, as a factor affecting fertility.

94. TWICHELL, ALLAN A. An appraisal method for measuring the quality of housing. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 13: 278-287.

Describes and evaluates American Public Health Association method of appraising rural housing.

95. U. S. DEPT. AGR., BUR. HUMAN NUTR. and HOME ECON. How families use their incomes. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 653. Washington. 64 pp.

Includes considerable information on trends in farm-family expenditures and savings.

96. U. S. DEPT. AGR., FED. EXT. SERV. Suggestive outline for discussion of how a farm family may use economic information to better its level of living. Washington. 2 pp.

A brief outline divided into three parts: What is the farm family like? What does it want to be like? What can the family do to be more like what it wants to be?

1947

97. ANDERSON, ANTON H. Population distribution and rural services in the Northern Great Plains. Colo. State Col. Libr. Bul. 18. Fort Collins. 13 pp.

Considers effect on rural services of sparse farm population, recent population changes, adaptations to socio-economic factors, and wartime changes.



98. BARTON, SAMUEL G. A working system for the socio-economic classification of a national sample of families. J. Mktg. 11: 364-366.

Describes "economic classification" of families in a national sample by a system that recognizes: (1) Differences in cost of living (which is assumed to be related primarily to city size within regions); (2) spendable income for food products (assumed to be related to income per capita in the family); and (3) spendable income for personal-care items (assumed to be related to income per wage earner in the family).

99. BLIZZARD, SAMUEL W., JR. The attitudes of rural and urban high school students toward the values of rural living (Ithaca and Trumansburg, New York, September 1945) (abs.) Cornell Univ. Abs. of Theses..for the Ph. D. degree, 1946: 85-89. Ithaca. Cornell Univ. Press.

A dissertation growing out of ths study directed by W. A. Anderson at Cornell (see item 37). In addition to analysis of attitudes of high school students, the author reports upon a test of the rural-life attitude scale developed by Anderson.

100. BURCHFIELD, LAVERNE. Our rural communities . . . a guide-book to published materials on rural problems. Chicago. Public Administration Service. 201 pp.

Pictures major rural problems and provides a guide to literature concerning them. Attention is centered largely upon the programs and activities of national agencies and organizations, public and private. Includes information on schools, Agricultural Extension Service, libraries, rural churches, medical care and health services, welfare services, housing, recreation, community organization, land use, and other problem areas of rural communities.

101. CHARLTON, JESSE L. Social aspects of farm ownership and tenancy in the Arkansas Ozarks. Ark. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 471. Fayetteville. 80 pp.

This study is based primarily on information ascertained from personal interviews with 101 farm owner-operators and 88 farm renters in Boone County, Arkansas, considered representative of the general tenure situation in the State's Ozark area. Family income, economic measures, and social measures are used to evaluate ownership and tenancy. Primary consideration is given to the competition for the use and control of land and to the stages of the process represented by older and younger operators. Discusses agricultural ladder, migration, factors leading to ownership, renting vs. ownership, and advantages enjoyed by farm owners.

102. COWLES, MAY L., DICKSON, MARGARET W., and WOOD, LOUISE E. Rural housing improvement in southern Wisconsin. Wis. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Bul. 161. Madison. 31 pp.

A study of housing improvement based on information supplied by 45 farm families in southern Wisconsin regarding remodeling or modernization since 1935. Presents data on order of improvements, proportions of specific improvements, time involved, payments, and relation to family income. Improvements discussed with reference to family life cycle, and to sacrifices made to obtain them.

103. DAVIES, VERNON. Farm housing needs. Minn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 393. St. Paul. 20 pp.

The 1940 Census of Population is the chief source of information for this bulletin. Data given on the number of Minnesota farm homes, size and composition of farm households, number of rooms per person. Contains discussion of State's ranking by various aspects of farm housing and conveniences.

The bulletin compares regional differences within the State on the basis of type of farming area. The northern half of the State had a generally unfavorable ranking on household facilities, overcrowding, and state of repairs. The northern cutover area showed the highest proportion of homes needing major repairs.

104. CUSHING, HAZEL M. Farm marriage preferences of college women. Wash. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 490. Pullman. 27 pp.

Preference data from more than 1,000 women students at two State colleges yielded conclusion that college education is not detrimental to attitudes concerning farm life.

105. CUSHING, HAZEL M. Intelligence, personality adjustment, and physical status of rural children in relation to land class. Wash. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 489. Pullman. 49 pp.

Study used data from Otis Mental Ability Test, California Test of Personality, school health cards, and certain background information gathered from subjects for analysis by five land classes and by town or rural residence.

106. FRYER, LEE (LELAND N.). An American living yardstick for farm families. In his "The American farmer--his problems and his prospects." pp. 14-22. New York. Harper and Bros.

A review of disparities in rural-urban levels of living, with an incidental critique of the measurements of the Census of Agriculture. Foresees a drift toward "factory farming" unless farm families' levels of living are raised.

107. GALLOWAY, ROBERT E. The level of living of farm operators in Washington counties, 1940 and 1945. Wash. Agr. Expt. Sta. Cir. 27. Pullman. 4 pp.

Presents data for Washinton counties based on Farm-Operator Family-Level-of-Living Indexes. Compares levels of living of Washington counties with one another, and with those of other parts of the country.

108. GRIEDER, CALVIN, and BALLOU, STEPHEN V. Colorado rural teachers--their living and working conditions. Colo. Assoc. School Bds. Boulder. Univ. Colo. Press. 109 pp.

Presents certain aspects of rural education in Colorado, including a discussion of the general problems of rural education and the salaries and living expenses of rural teachers. Chapter IV is devoted to living conditions of rural teachers in Colorado and chapter V covers their working conditions.

109. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Construction of county indexes for measuring change in level of living of farm operator families, 1940-45. Rur. Sociol. 12: 139-150.

Explains development of 1945 indexes and comparable 1940 indexes, and problems involved (see items 110, 150).

110. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Farm operator family level-of-living indexes for counties of the United States, 1940-45. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 42 pp.

Indexes of farm-operator family level-of-living by counties were constructed from data on four items from the 1940 and 1945 Censuses of Agriculture. The four items used were: (1) Percentage of farms with electricity; (2) percentage with telephone; (3) percentage with automobiles; and (4) average value of products sold or traded in the preceding year per farm reporting (adjusted for changes in purchasing power).

The indexes reflect only the average level of living among farm operator families in a county, and do not register differences within it. The index base for both the 1940 and 1945 indexes is the average index for all counties in the United States in 1945. Methods used in construction of the index are given in the appendix (see items 7, 42, 150).

111. MARIS, PAUL V. The present position of the family farmer. Statement given at a meeting of the Rural Church and Land Tenure Commission, Rochester, New York, Nov. 4-6, 1947. 4 pp.

A paper "designed to stimulate discussion." Considers geographic, economic, social, political, and legislative aspects of the situation of the family farmer.



112. POND, GEORGE A. Farm family living costs rising. Minn. Farm and Home Sci. 5 (1): 10-11, 15 pp.

This article was based on records kept by about 100 farm families on rather large farms over a period of 16 years, 1931 to 1946. Food was the largest item in the cash budget of the farm family. Families in the upper third in income had more than three times as much income available as those of the families in the low-income group, but their personal and household expenditures were less than 50 percent higher. During the 16-year period, net farm income increased by 84 percent, expenses by 51 percent.

113. SCHULER, EDGAR A., and SWIGER, RACHEL R. Trends in farm family levels and standards of living. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 30 pp.

Analysis of trends in facilities and services used by farm families, on a nation-wide basis.

114. U. S. DEPT. AGR. FARMERS HOME ADMIN. Strengthening the family farm. A report on activities of the Farmers Home Administration in the 1946-47 fiscal year. Washington. 18 pp., plus appendix.

Covers loans for farm operating necessities, for purchase, enlargement or development of farms, and for water facilities. Describes organization of FHA and its programing.

115. U. S. DEPT. AGR., RUR. ELECTRIFICATION ADMIN. Electricity comes to rural America. Washington. 23 pp.

A brief description of how electricity was brought to the farmers. Includes the history of REA and its operations.

116. U. S. DEPT. INTERIOR, BUR. RECLAMATION. Standards and levels of living--Columbia Basin Joint Investigations. Washington. 48 pp.

Problem 9 for the investigations was (1) to help insure an adequate level of living, and (2) to minimize the financial commitments of needy settlers in providing suitable and essential improvement. Bureau of Agricultural Economics did study at request of the Department of the Interior to provide data for securing ends indicated. Findings are in two parts:

(1) Fisher, Lloyd H. Standards and levels of living of prospective settlers on new irrigation projects.

To gauge average level of living by the area's standards, which could be expected to influence the standards and levels of newcomers, relation between net income and level of living for



existing farm population in the Basin was measured. It was found that about \$1,000 per annum was the breaking point between savings and debt for family-operated farms in the three sample counties. Expenditures rose along with income until the \$2,500 bracket was reached, then leveled off. Food, housing improvements, and maintaining an automobile, in that order, appear to be ranking items of expenditure.

(2) Swiger, Rachel R., and Schuler, Edgar A. Farm family levels and standards of living in the Plains and the Northwest.

This study is a comparison of levels of living in the Columbia Basin as against those of regions from which the new settlers were expected. Expenditures were classed as "necessities," "luxuries," or "substitutes." Electricity, kitchen sink with drain, and flush toilets proved to be "necessities" in the Northwest but "luxuries" in the Plains. Household operations and furnishings, housing, services, isolation-reducing agents, social participation, and several other classes of items are categorized for both areas, and variations shown.

#### 1946

117. COCHRANE, WILLARD W., and GRIGG, MARY D. The changing composition of family budgets for selected groups of Corn Belt farmers, 1940-42. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 107 pp.

The immediate objective of this study was to determine extent farm families allocate their income differently when incomes change and/or the actual size of family is modified. Data were collected in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois from two principal sources, FSA and the State colleges of agriculture. The two functional components of total outlay were: (1) Family expenditure and (2) capital expenditures plus debt repayment (apparently the flexible component).

118. GARNETT, WILLIAM E. The housing of Virginia rural folk. Va. Agr. Expt. Sta. Rur. Sociol. Reprint 31. Blacksburg. 48 pp.

This circular is a progress report on the first phase of a study entitled "Prevailing Conditions in Rural Housing and Home Conveniences." It is primarily an analysis and summary of the 1940 Housing Census. Materials from a 1934 Farm Housing Survey and from community studies are also used. Part I of the report gives Statewide summary with rural-urban and national comparisons. Part II gives findings on a county and minor-civil-division level.

119. HEISIG, CARL P. Sources of improved living on family farms. J. Home Econ. 33: 401-404.

Discusses some of the relationships between farm management problems and those of home management, particularly as they relate to ways of improving family living on farms. Considers the major factors involved in farm management and problems of operating a farm for maximum income. Emphasizes need for increased efficiency on the farm and full appreciation of the details of farm and home financial management by the homemaker.

120. KNUPFER, GENEVIEVE. Indices of socio-economic status: a study of some problems of measurement (Columbia Univ. diss.). New York. 193 pp.

This dissertation covers aspects of measurement of socio-economic status and the scales and indexes developed in this connection. For most part completed in 1943, in part revised in 1945.

121. SCOTT, V. E. and SWETT, P. Trends in farm-family available income and living standards. Nev. Agr. Expt. Sta. Farm Mgmt. Bul. 7 (3). Reno. 16 pp.

Points out that living standards are influenced by size of family, total income, net income, amounts of home-produced foods, size of debts, individual tastes, and other factors. Available cash family income was used as an indicator to show changes in standards. Families were divided into three groups according to cash family income available in 1940. Tabular data shown on (1) relation of size of family to income; (2) available family income; (3) living expenses; (4) farm produce used in the farm home; (5) effect of average number in the family on living costs; and (6) relation of available income to living expenses.

1945

122. CARTER, ROBERT M. The farm business and farm family living as related to land class in nine Vermont towns. Vt. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 526. Burlington. 36 pp.

Relationships between farm family living and four land classes are considered. Location factors were directly associated with land classification. Physical facilities for farms declined from class to class.

Farm homes were best located in relation to schools, especially secondary schools, in land class 1. Similarly, direct

relationship was indicated between land class and size and condition of the homes, frequency of running water, electricity and telephone service, baths and furnaces, and automobiles. Farm families in all land classes frequently sought out supplementary sources of income. Average amount of such income was greater in land class 4 than in others.

123. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Home management and family level of living on the small farm. J. Home Econ. 37: 13-18.

A discussion of family living on the small-scale farm which has minimum resources with which to meet farm and family needs. Cites cases from FSA experience to show how a farm family's level of living is affected by management ability of the wife, relationship of home management level to income, savings, diet, health, clothing, ability to set and reach goals, and women's work in the fields.

124. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Increase in prices of goods for farm family living greatest in the South. Miss. Farm Res. 8(5): 1-8.

Price information on 86 family-living items was obtained from retail merchants serving farm population; this information was used to determine a "parity ratio." National averages and index numbers were computed from these data. This article compares prices in the South with those in other sections of the United States.

125. GUNSELMAN, MYRTLE A. Farm incomes and living costs for certain Kansas families. Kans. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 327. Manhattan. 35 pp.

Data covering 1934-1940 from income and expense records from 346 Kansas farm families in 48 counties were basis of study. When the average annual disbursements by net farm income groups were compared, little variation was found in annual disbursement for families in the lower and middle income groups. There was an appreciable increase for each of the items of expenditures in the upper income group. The average value of farm-supplied goods was greatest in the upper income group and accounted for a third of the value of all consumption items. The cost of living for these families tended to move upwards from 1934 to 1937, decreased slightly in 1938 and 1939, and rose again in 1940.

126. HAGOOD, MARGARET J., and BOWLES, GLADYS K. Rural levels of living in Virginia. Univ. Va. News Letter 21 (Apr. 15): 1.



Level of living in Virginia compared with levels in other southern States rather than with those of the country as a whole. Virginia led the southeastern States. World War II and farm-to-nonfarm migration helped to create a better balance of population and resources.

127. HOFFER, CHARLES R. Adjustment of Michigan farm families to war conditions. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Special Bul. 333. East Lansing. 28 pp.

Survey of 275 farm families indicated that, even with evidence of an increase in income since the beginning of World War II, a large proportion of the families had not changed their level of living in any significant way.

128. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. Comparison of farm housing indexes for Oklahoma. Social Forces 24: 174-180.

Describes the construction of four indexes of rural-farm housing for the counties of Oklahoma on the basis of 19 items from the 1940 Census. Compares validity of indexes constructed by relatively simple methods with those obtained with more complicated techniques. Contains full description of methods and evaluation of results.

129. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. Social factors related to farm housing in southern Oklahoma. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Tech. Bul. T-22. Stillwater. 28 pp.

Analyzes the relationship of selected social and economic conditions to housing among families living in two open-country areas of southern Oklahoma. A simple possession index of housing and facilities was constructed with a total of 32 items. Relations are explored between this index and age-distribution, age of farm dwelling, illness rate, community participation, productive man work hours, size and cultivation of farm, type of farm, tenancy, possession of a tractor, and other factors.

130. PARVIN, D. W. Prewar living standards on farms of Mississippi lower than United States Average. Miss. Farm Res. 8(2): 1-2.

This article quotes prewar percentages and indexes of possession or consumption of items related to level of living for the rural population of Mississippi. Points out variety in county indexes, and makes comparisons with indexes in northern States. Suggests comparatively high percentages of owner-operators, white operators, and urban population as possible factors contributing toward comparative prosperity in the North.



131. RIEMER, SVEND. Farm housing behavior. Rur. Sociol. 10: 157-168.

Uses Census of Housing data to show the relation between equipment and other features of the farmhouse, its total value, and the competition between these items for the growing purchasing power of the farm family. Compares the percentages of farmhouses valued at less than \$500 with those of farmhouses valued at \$10,000 and over, having each of ten features, and calculates rate of increase between the two groups, for New York, North Carolina, Iowa, and California.

1944

132. EDWARDS, ALLEN D. Farm family income and patterns of living. An analysis of original census schedules and land classification of Henry County, Virginia, 1940. Joint study of the Va. Agr. Expt. Sta., Va. Polytech. Inst. and Population Study, Va. State Planning Bd. Population Study Rpt. 3. Richmond. 83 pp.

Census data were used for an intensive analysis of a limited area and in conjunction with information from research studies. Population, agriculture, and housing census schedules for individual farm families in Henry County, Virginia, were matched. Relations studied included (1) economic status of farm families by sources of income; (2) relation of income level to such factors as fertility, possession of specified conveniences and facilities, and economic dependence upon agriculture; (3) characteristics of farm families living on various classes of land; and (4) characteristics of farm families using and not using electricity, with a further breakdown of those families which did not use electric power even when available.

Total value of products sold was the only published census data on farm-family income and was found to be an unsatisfactory measure of total or net income of individual farm families. Estimates based on data from agriculture and population schedules were used for family-living analyses.

133. GUTTMAN, LOUIS A. A basis for scaling qualitative data. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 9: 139-150.

A new approach to the problem of ordering persons, which appeared to afford an adequate basis for quantifying qualitative data. The account of scale making is of general interest, even though the technique described may be applicable to data related to economic status.

134. HAGOOD, MARGARET J., and DUCOFF, LOUIS J. What level-of-living indexes measure. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 9: 78-84.

Three points are underscored regarding the county level-of-living indexes: (1) An index is not a direct measure of the actual level of living, but only an indicant of it; (2) such an indicant for a county is not one of the absolute degree of attainment of some external standard, but is expressed in relation to the average for a defined group; (3) the description of level of living relates only to the average level attained by the specified residence class of the county, and not to variations among individual families or persons (see items 7, 42, 110, 150).

135. HOFFER, CHARLES R. Rural levels of living in Michigan. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Quart. Bul. 27: 1-7.

Michigan counties displayed a wide range of rural level-of-living indexes as did groups of neighboring counties. This suggested that soil productivity and other geographical factors that affect income are important determinants of rural level of living. The relation of county indexes to land class and to type of farming was explored. The relation to land class was clearly evident, but the relation to type of farming was not except insofar as it may affect income.

136. HOLMES, EMMA G., and ANGLE, GRACE M. The need for rural housing. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Human Nutr. and Home Econ. Washington. 10 pp.

This study covers value and size of homes, sanitary facilities and equipment, state of repair, causes of poor rural housing, tenancy and rural housing, and economic adequacy of the farm and housing.

137. INGERSOLL, HAZEL, and STOTT, LELAND H. A group scale for the measurement of social, cultural, and economic status of farm families of the Middle West. Rur. Sociol. 9: 349-363.

This scale was developed in conjunction with a project in which environmental factors were correlated with personality-development data in a study of rural family life. The group scale developed had satisfactory reliability and validity in the measurement of social and economic status in farm families of the middle west. The "synonymization" technique was used in the selection and validation of the items. The complete revised scale is presented.

138. KOZLIK, ADOLF. Concepts of plane, standard, level and satisfaction of consumption and of living. J. Mktg. 9: 55-57.

Attempts to mitigate terminological difficulties resulting from a lack of standardization by suggesting definitions.

139. LINDQUIST, RUTH. Family living in war and postwar years. Kans. State Bd. Agr., Bienn. Rpt. 34: 57-63. Topeka.

Discusses effects of the war years on both urban and rural families in Kansas. Devotes attention to manpower shortage, augmented role of wife and mother, development and expansion of munitions plants, inflation, separation of family members, democracy in family living, and attitudes toward family spending and saving.

140. LINDSTROM, DAVID E., and ESHLEMAN, ROBERT F. Indices of human welfare with special reference to rural areas in Illinois. Ill. Agr. Expt. Sta. Rur. Sociol. Mimeog. 13. Urbana. 13 pp.

To show the wide variations in rural social and economic conditions, 35 indexes of human welfare in rural areas are given.

141. McMILLAN, ROBERT T. Farm ownership status of parents as a determinant of the socio-economic status of farmers. Rur. Sociol. 9: 151-160.

Analyzes relationship of the socio-economic status of farmers to the farm-ownership status of their parents. Subjects were 618 married couples whose parents lived on farms at the time of the couple's marriage.

142. SNYDER, L. B., and ANDERSON, ANTON H. Determinants of levels of living for farmers of Lancaster County, Nebraska. Nebr. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 368. Lincoln. 27 pp.

An attempt to show some of the farm-management factors that influence the way farm families in Lancaster County live, and to find certain indicators that might be used to show the relative well-being of these families. The study was based on five items chosen as significant indicators of level of living: (1) Total living values; (2) cash expenditures for living; (3) selected material possessions; (4) social participation of all members of household; and (5) cultural possessions.

143. WELLS, ORIS V. Parity prices versus standards of living. Rur. Sociol. 9: 115-122.

States that parity and parity prices have proved beneficial so far as commercial farmers are concerned, but that the real need of perhaps more than half of the farm families is to find ways to insure a higher level of living, with more varied food, adequate education for children, and better medical care. Suggests that a series of minimum standards of living be worked out for farm families against which actual conditions can be measured and standardized. Such standards would be stated in terms of minimum allowances for commodities, average values or expenditures for goods and services needed by the standard farm family, allowances for adjusting this budget to fit types of



families most often found, and some measure of community services such as schools, roads, medical facilities, agricultural electric power, and churches which should accompany or supplement the family budget.

1943

144. CAWL, FRANKLIN R. Recent changes in farm economic levels. J. Mktg. 7: 360-366.

States several reasons why the income and living levels of the farm population are more difficult to ascertain than those of the nonfarm population.

Discusses the first attempt to devise an income-measuring scale in Cortland County, New York, where white urban, farm and rural-nonfarm families were studied together under similar conditions. These families were studied for a period of 2 years; changes in economic status, as derived from ownership of various items, were noted.

145. COTTAM, HOWARD R. Housing scales for rural Pennsylvania. J. Amer. Statis. Assoc. 38: 406-416.

A methodological article explaining the construction of three rural-housing scales of 10, 20, and 30 items.

146. COX, REX W., WAITE, WARREN C., and GARVER, WALTER B. Income and expenditures of Minnesota agriculture. Minn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 366. St. Paul. 43 pp.

Primarily concerned with distribution and fluctuation of farm income and expenses; includes level-of-living measurement items as "miscellaneous" under "current operating expenses." Presents charts dividing the State into nine income-and-expense areas.

147. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Effects of good household management on family living. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 380. State College. 30 pp.

This study is concerned with how the level of living of a farm family varies with the management skill of the wife. Data from Farm Security Administration families in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, referred to low-income farm families in which the contribution that could be made by efficient home managers was relatively great.



148. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Development of a 1940 rural-farm level-of-living index for counties. Rur. Sociol. 8: 171-180.

A 1940 rural-farm level-of-living index based on five items was developed (see item 150). The items were selected from a preliminary list of 14 suggested components. One basis of selection was the weights each component received on four preliminary indexes constructed by component techniques for counties in North Carolina and Iowa, these two States combined, and a sample of 200 counties of the United States. High positive weights on all four indexes constitute basis of component selection. Another basis of selection is degree of intercorrelation of components. Only one from any group of highly intercorrelated components was selected. Correlations between the preliminary and final indexes indicated that no great loss in differentiating capacity was incurred by reducing the number of components and by using weights derived from the national sample of counties.

149. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Rural level-of-living indexes. Rur. Sociol. 8: 292-293.

Brief note on the 1940 level-of-living indexes (see item 150).

150. HAGOOD, MARGARET J. Rural level-of-living indexes for counties of the United States, 1940. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 43 pp.

These indexes indicate in a simple form the relative level of living in each county of the United States for rural families, both farm and nonfarm. The five items selected for the rural-farm index measured crowding, gross farm income, education, and possession of radios or late-model automobiles. The rural-nonfarm index substituted measures of possession of running water and mechanical refrigeration for those of farm income and automobiles.

Data on the items were weighted and combined to form an index of the composite characteristics which can most satisfactorily discriminate between low and high counties. The scales for the rural-farm and rural-nonfarm indexes were comparable--for each county the two values could be weighted together, according to the proportions rural-farm and rural-nonfarm persons comprised of the total rural population of the county, to form a composite index.

151. JETER, HELEN R. How farm income is being used for family living. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Human Nutr. and Home Econ. Washington. 3 pp.

An address given at Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, Washington, D. C., 1943. Discusses the farm family after 2 years of wartime living and two basic problems it has encountered: (1) How to use increased incomes to help win the war and keep living costs down, and (2) how to plan ahead for post-war living.

152. LUNDBERG, GEORGE A., and FRIEDMAN, PEARL. A comparison of three measures of socio-economic status. *Rur. Sociol.* 8:227-242.

A sample of 232 families in rural townships in Vermont was scored for socio-economic status according to the Chapin scale, the Guttman-Chapin scale, and the Sewell scale. The authors analyze characteristics of the three scales by use of a detailed analysis of the ten cases showing the greatest discrepancies in scores. The scores of the Guttman revision of the Chapin scale agree quite closely with those of the Chapin, but showed a tendency to register the low scores as still lower. The correlation between the Chapin and Sewell scores was 0.76; between the Guttman revision and the Sewell, 0.73. Scale scores were also compared with self-ratings of the families studied.

153. McVOY, EDGAR C., and NELSON, LOWRY. Satisfactions in living: farm versus village. *Minn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 370. St. Paul. 16 pp.

Describes a study in which rural farm and village people were approached directly for statements concerning their satisfactions with various aspects of living. The questions for each item representing a "field of desire" were designed to indicate how well satisfied the individual was with respect to that item. In addition, families were measured by the Chapin Social Status Scale (to village families only), the Sewell Socio-Economic Status Scale, the Rundquist-Sletto General Adjustment Scale, and the Chapin Social Participation Scale.

154. MANGUS, ARTHUR R., and McNAMARA, ROBERT L. Levels of living and population movements in rural areas of Ohio, 1930-1940. *Ohio Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 639. Wooster. 62 pp.

In this study, facts were collected on growth and redistribution of rural population among different social and economic areas and among different age-groups in Ohio between 1930 and 1940, a period of tremendous social change. Information regarding the process and results of rural population redistribution among contrasting areas of level of living and various age periods of the adult population of both sexes was assembled and analyzed.

155. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. The restandardization of a sociometric scale. *Social Forces* 21: 302-311.

The term "sociometric scale" in this study is used to refer to scales developed for the measurement of complex social phenomena. Cultural variability makes it necessary to restandardize a basic scale to make it applicable to new or different groups. Restandardization involves three major considerations: (1) Testing its validity for new groups, (2) determining the reliability of the scale for the new population, and (3) developing norms for the new group. Principal data for this study were scores

on the Farm Family Socio-economic Status Scale (see item 193) and related information for three sample groups. Author believes that restandardization of such a scale is not an impossible task. He demonstrates some of the major difficulties involved, and presents partial solutions.

156. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. A short form of the Farm Family Socio-economic status scale. *Rur. Sociol.* 8: 161-170.

Author constructed a scale of 14 of the most easily obtainable items from his original 123-item scale (see item 193). Item analysis in samples taken from Oklahoma, Kansas, and Louisiana farm populations proved that these items possess sharp diagnostic capacity and show close agreement to measurements produced by the original scale. Reliability tests also proved satisfactory. Brevity, simplicity, and ease of enumeration claimed for the short scale, although it may fail to measure extremes of socio-economic status. Conclusion reached is that the short form of the Farm Family Socio-economic Status Scale will produce an easily obtainable, objective, valid, and sufficiently reliable measurement of socio-economic status.

157. SMITH, FERNAL V. Farm and family income and expenses of low income farm families in Indiana. *Ind. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 485. Lafayette. 38 pp.

Two objectives of the study were: "...To ascertain the value of the family living obtained from low income farms and to determine the amount spent for family living by the low income farm families."

Food, fuel, and shelter were the most important items of family living obtained from the farms. In 1939, sample farms averaged \$346 per family value of home-produced food, fuel, and rental value of home. Forty percent of the cash spent for family living went for food, 14 percent for clothing, 19 percent for household operation and equipment, and the remainder for medical and personal care, automobile, education, recreation, and insurance.

158. U. S. DEPT. AGR. Rural family spending and saving in wartime. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 520. Washington. 163 pp.

Reports on a national survey of expenditures and savings of rural families and single consumers at different income levels during 1941 and the first quarter of 1942. (A parallel study of urban consumers was made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.) Data are comparable in many respects to those of the Consumer Purchases Study of 1935-36.

159. WAKELEY, RAY E. Living is tops on Iowa farms. *Iowa Farm Econ.* 9: 8-10.

In 1940, Iowa farm families had the highest average level-of-living index in the U. S. The author points to wide variations in level of farm family living throughout the country.



Reasons given for the favored position of Iowa include abundance of good land and a favorable combination of crop and livestock enterprises, which tend to increase and stabilize incomes. The level of living in villages and small towns in the State was not so high as on farms. Reasons for this are lack of local industries to support population, little suburban living by city workers, and declining importance of small towns as trade centers.

1942

160. COTTAM, HOWARD R. Housing and attitudes toward housing in rural Pennsylvania. Pa. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 436. State College. 63 pp.

This bulletin reports the results of interviews with 517 families and questionnaires from 1941 school children covering 57 characteristics of houses, facilities, and equipment. From these data, separate indexes were calculated for sanitation, safety, labor-saving devices, electrical conveniences, and space. Attitudes toward housing were found to be comparable to housing conditions.

161. COTTAM, HOWARD R. Measurement of housing and attitudes toward housing in rural Pennsylvania. Pa. Agr. Expt. Sta. J. Series Paper 1149. Methodol. Sup. to Bul. 436. State College. 25 pp.

A supplement on technical aspects of the study reported in Bulletin 436 (see item 160).

162. COTTAM, HOWARD R., and MANGUS, ARTHUR R. Standard of living: an empirical test of a definition. Rur. Sociol. 7: 395-403.

The article describes an empirical test of the hypothesis that level of living, social participation, and social adjustment are components of a broader concept, standard of living. Degree of interrelatedness was tested while successively holding constant various interfering factors such as occupation, age, family composition, size of household, educational attainment, and religious affiliation.

163. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Improving levels of living of tenant families. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 365. State College. 18 pp.

This study included 100 owner families, 111 share-renter families, and 93 sharecropper families, all residing in poor agricultural areas of the State. Families ranked downwards in the order listed for income, returns from farming, value of housing, and value of products furnished by the farm. Various suggestions for improving levels of living of tenant families are made.



164. GUTTMAN, LOUIS A. Revision of Chapin's social status scale. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 7: 362-369.

From a sample of 67 Minneapolis Negro homes a single common factor pattern was found to give a rather good fit to the intercorrelations of the five variates of occupation, social participation, education, and Chapin's 1933 social status scale. Social status being defined as the centroid (in the common factor space) of the first four of these variates, the items of Chapin's scale were reweighted to yield scores that correlate 0.95 with the status factor in the sample.

165. MONROE, DAY, and others. Family spending and saving as related to age of wife and age and number of children. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 489. Washington. 126 pp.

Points out that family spending patterns vary with the age of the family owing to changes in a person's scale of values. The overall aim of the study was to learn how families adjust their use of income to varying circumstances. Records of family income and consumption were obtained from the Study of Consumer Purchases, made in 1935-36. Tables giving farm spending data are presented by regions, and include such items as size of living quarters, furnishings and equipment, clothing expenditures, personal care service, and recreation.

166. MOSER, ADA M. Food habits of South Carolina farm families. S. C. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 343. Clemson. 38 pp.

Dietary study based on food records kept by several groups of South Carolina farm families which derived the greater part of their income from farming. Graphic summaries present the findings.

167. NELSON, LOWRY, and McVOY, EDGAR C. How satisfying is rural life? Rur. Sociol. 7: 261-267.

An attempt to measure objectively the reactions of rural people themselves to the kind of life they lead. The random sample included both farm and village women in Isanti county, Minnesota. The results indicate that degree of satisfaction with items in family living is related to economic status, place of residence (village or farm), nativity, age, education, family composition, social participation, and general social adjustments. Farm women showed higher dissatisfaction than village women on all categories of family living. The item of greatest dissatisfaction among village women was security; among farm women, clothing. Social participation yielded the lowest dissatisfaction scores for both farm and village women.

168. NELSON, LOWRY, MITCHELL, DONALD, and JACOBSON, ERNST. Some problems of Minnesota rural youth. Minn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 358. St. Paul. 32 pp.

A report on a study begun in 1933 to provide information toward solving the problem of mass unemployment and dissatisfaction among rural youth. The authors express concern about a possible permanent surplus labor force on farms, lack of desire for education, inadequacy of social organization in rural areas, and the problems young people faced in getting jobs and setting up homes.

169. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. The development of a sociometric scale. Sociometry 5: 279-297.

A less detailed account of the construction and standardization of the scale described in item 193.

1941

170. AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. Rural public library service. Chicago. 10 pp.

Discusses the poor library facilities then available to rural people. Recommends regional libraries as the best means of serving rural areas. Tells how to start and operate a regional library.

171. BRITTON, VIRGINIA. Housing of 538 Vermont farm families. Vt. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 470. Burlington. 39 pp.

This study of the housing of farm families living in Chittenden and Franklin Counties shows the relation of housing facilities, equipment, tenure, housing, household operation, and total home expense to the important variables of income, family type, education, and tenure.

172. COTTAM, HOWARD R. Methods of measuring level of living, social participation and adjustment of farm people. Ohio Agr. Expt. Sta., Dept. of Rur. Econ. and Rur. Sociol. Mimeog. Bul. 139. Columbus. 27 pp.

This report is a technical supplement to Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 624 entitled Level of Living, Social Participation and Adjustment of Ohio Farm People, by Mangus and Cottam (see item 180), presenting a detailed statement of the methods used in the study.

173. DAVIS, JOSEPH S. Consumption level; consumption standard; plane of living; standard of living. J. Mktg. 6: 164-166.

An attempt to clarify and differentiate between the various concepts frequently referred to as the "standard of living."

174. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Owner farm families in poor agricultural areas and cropper farm families in rich agricultural areas. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 359. State College. 19 pp.

Studies possibility of centering attention on improving sharecropping in rich areas as opposed to farm ownership in poorer areas. Data covering 1938-1939 were obtained from white families in the two classifications. Findings are compared for family income (sources and income level), significance of tenure in consumption patterns, and various factors in value of family living. Author concludes that farm ownership appears to be preferable because of differences in the form of income, not mere differences in income only.

175. DICKINS, DOROTHY. Some contrasts in the levels of living of women engaged in farm, textile mill, and garment plant work. Miss. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 364. State College. 53 pp.

The purpose of the study was to learn whether industrial employment or farm life provided better living for farm-reared women.

176. DUNCAN, OTIS D. Contemporary sociological research in farm family living. Rur. Sociol. 6: 300-310.

Includes studies which have made more or less original and distinctive contributions. Deals mainly with the work of LePlay, Engel, Wright, Atwater, Warren, Kirkpatrick, Zimmerman, and Sewell.

177. FORSYTH, F. HOWARD. Measuring attitude toward rural and urban life. Rur. Sociol. 6: 234-241.

Reports some preliminary findings from use of a scale designed to measure pro-rural or pro-urban sentiment. Central groups were farmers of advanced age, teachers in training before and after rural practice teaching, delinquents and high school students in a high-delinquency urban area, Negro city delinquents and Negro college students of rural southern origin, city students attending a "rural" college, and sociology students of rural and urban origin.

178. GARNETT, WILLIAM E., and EDWARDS, ALLEN D. Virginia's marginal population--a study in rural poverty. Va. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 335. Blacksburg. 166 pp.

Studies factors related to poverty in rural Virginia and associated population trends. The term "marginal" is defined as "...families on a bare-subsistence plane of living, both economically and culturally, with a gross income of less than \$600 exclusive of rent." Nonfarm families with less than \$750 annual income were classed as marginal also. This report is also of interest for methodological procedure.



179. JEHLIK, PAUL J. Level of living on the Ropesville Project, Hockley County, Texas. U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Washington. 31 pp.

Describes the level of living of families in the Ropesville Resettlement Project. All 76 families were low-income farm families who formerly lived in submarginal areas that were being taken out of cultivation. The report is based on 47 complete farm-family record books kept for the entire 12-month period of 1939. Data on family size, age of operator, schooling, income, and expenditures are presented.

180. MANGUS, ARTHUR R., and COTTAM, HOWARD R. Level of living, social participation and adjustment of Ohio farm people. Ohio Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 624. Wooster. 58 pp.

This study was concerned with the interrelation in the life of Ohio farm people, of levels of living, participation in group activities, and social adjustment. Data were collected from adult representatives of 299 farm families. Measurement of the level of living was in terms of possession of various items which seemed to distinguish between the most and the least well-to-do families; of social participation, in terms of the amount and kind of organized group activities engaged in by farmers and their wives. Social adjustment was measured in terms of attitudes toward social environment registered on a 5-point satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale.

181. MILLER, FRANK. Income levels of contract beet workers in Nebraska. Nebr. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 335. Lincoln. 23 pp.

Findings of a survey of two counties. Information was obtained from 135 families and covered a 12-month period (1939-1940). Discusses housing, income, progress of family in acquiring property, education of parents and children, and ownership of automobiles. The income data were divided into three parts to determine accurate income levels for amount from beet work, amount from other types of employment, and perquisites from the beet-grower.

182. U. S. DEPT. AGR., BUR. HOME ECON. (in cooperation with Work Projects Admin.). Consumer purchases study. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. Washington.

Farm Series:

No. 462. Family income and expenditures. Southeast Region. Part 1: Family income. By Dorothy S. Brady, Day Monroe, Margaret Perry, and Mary R. Pratt. 208 pp.

No. 465. Family income and expenditures. Five Regions. Part 2: Family expenditures. By Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, Margaret Perry, Kathryn Cronister, and Edith D. Rainboth. 366 pp.

Urban, Village, and Farm (Five Regions):

No. 415. Family expenditures for automobile and other transportation. By Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, June F. Constantine, and Karl L. Benson. 272 pp.

No. 436. Family expenditures for furnishings and equipment. By Day Monroe, Helen Hollingsworth, Margaret Perry, and Maryland Y. Pennell. 212 pp.

No. 455. Family expenditures for personal care, gifts, selected taxes, and miscellaneous items. By Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, Edith D. Rainboth, and Ellen D. Riley. 113 pp.

No. 456. Family expenditures for education, reading, recreation, and tobacco. By Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, Maryland Y. Pennell, and Miriam H. Coffin. 208 pp.

No. 457. Family expenditures for housing and household operation. By Hazel Kyrk, Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, Collette Rosenstiel, and Edith D. Rainboth. 201 pp.

No. 464. Changes in assets and liabilities of families. By Dorothy S. Brady, Day Monroe, Janet Murray, Yetta A. Carmel, and Marjorie W. Ellsworth. 226 pp.

Results of a large survey prepared in 1935-36 by the Bureau of Home Economics in USDA were published between 1939 and 1941. Only bulletins published since 1940, which give data on rural consumer expenditures, are considered here.

The study of consumer purchases was undertaken to provide comprehensive data on the consumption of American families at different income levels. Analysis of income is in terms of income levels by family type, occupation, race (for the southeastern region only), and degree of urbanization of the community, and according to source of income. The analysis of expenditures is in terms of income levels according to the same variables and is broken down into 15 major consumption categories. The study was made for six broad geographic regions.

Number 464 in this series contains a thorough explanation of the organization and methodology of the survey, and a glossary of terms.

See also item 194 for one of this series published in 1940.

1940

183. BRITTON, VIRGINIA. Housing of 299 Vermont village families. Vt. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 469. Burlington. 52 pp.

This study was made with special reference to the relation of type of living quarters, facilities, equipment, owner or renter status, household operation, and equipment to variables such as income, family type, occupation, education, age, and tenure.

184. DAVIDSON, DWIGHT M., JR. and HUMMEL, BENTON L. Standards of living in six Virginia counties. Farm Security Admin. Social Res. Rpt. XV. U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington. 116 pp.

Last of a series of six reports on level-of-living studies performed in 1935. Others in the series were published in 1938. This is an exhaustive study of farm family living in counties representative of the geographic areas of Virginia. It was performed in collaboration with the WPA and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

185. DRAPER, CHARLES R. Levels of living in Maine. Maine Agr. Ext. Serv. and U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. Orono. 29 pp.

The bulk of this report is devoted to obtaining some standardized measure of rural levels of living in Maine. Items used to determine levels of living included corrected mortality rates, ratio of students in high school to total number of persons aged 14-18, presence of various household conveniences, possession of a truck or automobile, a housing-condition index, and an index of rooms per person. Various analyses are presented on the basis of the indexes derived from these items.

186. FOOTE, CONIE C., and HAY, DONALD G. Rural housing facilities of selected Farm Security Administration borrowers in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. U. S. Dept. Agr., Farm Security Admin. and Bur. Agr. Econ. Lincoln, Nebr. 34 pp.

Gives data from a cooperative study by FSA and BAE, including tables and household conveniences.

187. HAMILTON, C. HORACE. The standard of living of farm laborers (a paper presented to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor). Washington. 14 pp.

A report prepared by Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Principally a review of statistics showing low levels of living, joined with low age-distribution and high fertility, among farm laborers. Stresses difficulty in self betterment by even ambitious and energetic farm laborers.

188. LUNDBERG, GEORGE A. The measurement of socio-economic status. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 5: 29-39.

Presents results of an experiment in which a banker and a janitor made informal ratings of the socio-economic status of other members of their common community. Differences between the two sets of ratings were studied, and the informal ratings compared with ratings according to the Chapin scale. There is also a discussion of the problem of definition of the factor to be measured, and of means of securing an accurate measurement.



189. MONROE, DAY. Patterns of living of farm families. U. S. Dept. Agr. Yearbook, 1940: 848-869. Washington.

Points out that consumption patterns of farm families have changed more than those of urban families since 1900. Uses data from Consumer Purchases Survey in presenting this point.

190. SCHULER, EDGAR A. Social and economic status in a Louisiana hills community. Rur. Sociol. 5: 69-87.

This study considers two problems: (1) The degree of agreement among members of a small rural community regarding the social status of families in the community, and (2) how this status is related to certain variables. It does not attempt to measure social status in terms of externally-imposed and rigidly-defined criteria. The data employed consist of formal family schedules, stenographic records of interviews, and ratings of families. Social-status scores were derived from the ratings of the least divergent rates and these were related to various social factors, opinions, and economic status.

191. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. A memorandum on research in income and levels of living in the South. Okla. Agr. and Mech. Col. Bul. 37 (16). Stillwater. 30 pp.

Covers the general types of pertinent research in this field. Contains a bibliography of selected studies dealing with the South which were published prior to 1940. Finally, it suggests certain research needs in this field and possible techniques for them.

192. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. A scale for the measurement of farm family socio-economic status. Southwest Social Sci. Quart. 21: 125-137.

Points out the need for a sociometric scale for the measurement of farm-family socio-economic status (see item 193). This study discusses the factors involved in such an undertaking. The concept of socio-economic status is defined by the author and the preliminary schedule, sample, and procedures used for item analysis are discussed, as are the validity, reliability, and usefulness of the scale.

193. SEWELL, WILLIAM H. The construction and standardization of a scale for the measurement of the socio-economic status of Oklahoma farm families. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Tech. Bul. 9. Stillwater. 88 pp.

One hundred twenty-three material and non-material cultural traits were selected for analysis--37 items represent cultural possessions, one "effective income"; 34, material possessions; and 51, activities. These together with closely-related items were formulated into an experimental schedule which was used to obtain the data for construction of the scale.

The sample areas gave a representative spread as to type of farming, percent of tenancy, and geography. Eight hundred schedules were taken from unbroken white families residing in the open country.

Internal consistency was chosen as the best system of item analysis for these data. A total of 41 items met the standard set for retention but 5 were dropped. The remaining 36 items were combined into a preliminary farm-family socio-economic status scale--15 representing material possessions; 13, cultural possessions; and 8, social participation. Sigma scoring was adopted for scoring the scale items.

The validity of the scale was determined by several tests. Since the scale seemed to meet every test in a satisfactory manner, it was concluded that it measured the socio-economic status of Oklahoma farm families. The items of the scale were rearranged to facilitate its application and the resulting form was named the Farm Family Socio-Economic Status Scale.

194. U. S. DEPT. AGR., BUR. HOME ECON. (In cooperation with Work Projects Admin.) Consumer Purchases Study, Farm Series. Family income and expenditures, Middle Atlantic, North Central, and New England Regions. Part I: Family income. By Dorothy S. Martin, Day Monroe, Dorothy S. Brady, and Elizabeth Phelps. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 383. Washington. 258 pp.

One of the earlier publications presenting data from the Consumer Purchases Study of 1935-36 (see item 182).

195. U. S. FED. SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, HOME ECON. EDUC. SERV. Attainable levels of living, their relation to price levels and family income. Misc. Publ. 2230-3. Washington. 67 pp.

The purpose of this report is to present information useful to supervisors, teacher-trainers, and teachers of home economics in helping families attain the best possible level of living under their existing circumstances. Part I discusses the problem of the adequacy of family incomes. Part II gives information on family incomes, expenditures, and production of goods for family use among rural families (including village families), and comments on estimated costs of attainable levels of living in rural communities. Part III contains similar factual information and discussions concerning urban families.

The section on rural incomes and levels of living gives data on the incomes of three types of rural families and presents a number of factors affecting their levels of living.

AUTHORSHIP INDEX

ANNOTATED REFERENCES

		<u>Item</u>						<u>Item</u>
American Library Association		170			Cushing, Hazel M.	104	105	
Amstutz, Keith		81			Davidson, Dwight M., Jr.		184	
Anderson, Anton H.	36 97	142			Davies, Vernon	57	103	
Anderson, C. Arnold		10			Davis, Joseph F.	56	70	
Anderson, W. A.		37			Davis, Joseph S.		173	
Angle, Grace M.		136			Dickins, Dorothy	40 58	66	
Aurbach, Herbert A.		1				67 84 123	124	
						147 163	174 175	
Ballou, Stephen V.		108			Dickson, Margaret W.		102	
Barton, Samuel G.		98			Douglas, Edna		71	
Belcher, John C.	38	54			Draper, Charles R.		185	
Benson, Karl L.		182			Ducoff, Louis J.		134	
Bertrand, Alvin L.	2 3	11			Duncan, Otis D.	4 14	176	
	55	83						
Beyer, Glenn H.	39	69			Edwards, Allen D.	132	178	
Blizzard, Samuel W., Jr.		99			Ellsworth, Marjorie W.		182	
Bonser, Howard J.		56			Eshleman, Robert F.		140	
Bottum, J. Carroll		30						
Bowles, Gladys K.		126			Ferriss, Abbott L.		85	
Brady, Dorothy S.	182	194			Fessler, Donald R.		28	
Brew, Margaret L.		19			Fisher, Lloyd H.		116	
Britton, Virginia	171	183			Flagg, Grace L.	41 72 76	90	
Brunner, Edmund deS.		46			Foote, Conie C.		186	
Burchfield, Laverne		100			Forster, Garnet W.		64	
					Forsyth, F. Howard		177	
Carmel, Yetta A.		182			Friedman, Pearl		152	
Carter, Robert M.		122			Fryer, Leland N.		106	
Cawl, Franklin R.		144						
Chapman, Paul W.		26			Galloway, Robert E.	74	107	
Charlton, Jesse L.	12	101			Garnett, William E.	118	178	
Coates, Charles H.		3			Garver, Walter B.		146	
Cochrane, Willard W.		117			Gee, Wilson		15	
Coffin, Miriam H.		182			Gordon, Pauline E.		64	
Constantine, June F.		182			Grady, Ethyl R.		29	
Correll, Myrtle G.		13			Green, James W.		16	
Cottam, Howard R.	145 160	161			Grieder, Calvin		108	
	162 172	180			Grigg, Mary D.		117	
Cowles, May L.	27	102			Grossman, Evelyn		63	
Cox, Rex W.		146			Gunselman, Myrtle A.	73	125	
Cronister, Kathryn		182			Guttman, Louis A.	133	164	



|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

<u>Item</u>				<u>Item</u>			
Sharp, Emmitt F.			38	U. S. Dept. Agr., Farmers			
Smith, Fernal V.			157	Home Admin.			114
Smith, Grace H.			29	U. S. Dept. Agr., Fed.			
Smith, T. Lynn			34	Extension Serv.			96
Snyder, L. B.			142	U. S. Dept. Agr., Rur.			
Speer, Elisabeth L.			80	Electrification Admin.			115
Staab, Josephine	6		59	U. S. Dept. Commerce,			
Stanton, Janet R.	7		8	Bur. Census			52
Stevenson, Ailsie			62	U. S. Dept. Interior,			
Stiebeling, Hazel K.			35	Bur. Reclamation			116
Stott, Leland H.			137	U. S. Fed. Security			
Swett, P.			121	Agency, Office of Educa-			
Swiger, Rachel R.	113		116	tion, Home Econ. Educ.			
				Serv.			195
Taves, Marvin J.			50				
Taylor, Carl C.			60	Van Landingham, Eugenia			64
Thompson, Warren S.			93				
Tillinghast, Rose C.			19	Waite, Warren C.			146
Trotter, Virginia Y.			23	Wakeley, Ray E.	45		159
Turner, W. L.			64	Wasmuth, Gladys			68
Twichell, Allan A.			94	Watson, Elizabeth S.			53
				Weiss, Gertrude S.			82
U. S. Dept. Agr.	9	52	158	Wells, Oris V.			143
U. S. Dept. Agr.,				Wilkening, Eugene A.			24
Bur. Home Econ.		182	194	Wills, John E.			25
U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur.				Wood, Anna L.			57
Human Nutr. and				Wood, Louise E.			102
Home Econ.	51	65	95	Woolrich, Avis			44

Related Bibliographies

Pioneer bibliography in the levels-of-living field. An early collection of references in this field is:

WILLIAMS, FAITH M. and ZIMMERMAN, CARLE C. Studies of family living in the United States and other countries: An analysis of material and method. U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. 223. Washington. 1935. 617 pp.

Bibliographies on related subjects. Publications dealing principally with subjects closely related to farm family level of living, upon which separate bibliographies have been prepared, have generally been omitted from this list. Following is a list of bibliographies on such subjects.

Agricultural Labor: Misc. Publ. 729. Washington. 1956. 124 pp.

FOLSOM, JOSIAH C. Agricultural labor in the United States, 1943-1952. A selected list of annotated references. U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 61. Washington. 1954. 170 pp.

Education:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. Selected bibliography on rural education. Washington. 1954. 33 pp.

FOLSOM, JOSIAH C. Migratory agricultural labor in the United States. An annotated bibliography of selected references. U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 59. Washington. 1953. 64 pp.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION Yearbook, 1955. pp. 417-441.

Health:

U. S. DEPT. OF LABOR, WAGE AND HOUR and PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS. Selected references on employment of children in agriculture. Washington. 1948. 9 pp.

JOHNSTON, HELEN L. and MANNY, ELSIE S. Rural health. Annotated list of selected references (U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Agr. Econ. in cooperation with Pub. Health Serv.). U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 60. Washington. 1953. 83 pp.

Community Organization:

MANNY, ELSIE S. Rural community organization. Selected annotated references. U. S. Dept. Agr.

MANNY, ELSIE S. Voluntary health insurance. Selected annotated references. U. S. Dept. Agr. Biblio. Bul. 25. Washington. 1954. 62 pp.



Housing:

McCULLOUGH, HELEN M. Housing and household equipment research in home economics, 1925-1950. Univ. Ill. Agr. Expt. Sta. Cir. 712. Urbana. 1953. 56 pp.

U. S. DEPT. AGR. LIBR. Preliminary bibliography on rural housing and farm service buildings. U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 51. Washington. 1949. 159 pp.

U. S. HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR. Current reading list of publications of the agency. Washington. 1953. 13 pp.

Low-Income Families:

DAVIS, ELIZABETH G. Low-income farm people. A selected list of references. U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 62. Washington. 1955. 46 pp.

Nutrition:

ADELSON, SADYE F. Adult nutrition. Nutrition Committee News for winter, 1955-56. U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington. 1955. 8 pp.

CEDERQUIST, DENA, HUNSCHER, HELEN A., and LEVERTON, RUTH M. The life cycle and its diet. A symposium on recent findings in human nutrition. Journal of Home Economics. 49: 101-115. Feb. 1957. Contains 113 references.

Social Security:

FOLSOM, JOSIAH C. Social security and related insurance for farm people. An annotated bibliography of selected references. U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. List 50. Washington. 1949. 25 pp.

## RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

### INDEX

	Page
Adelson, Sadye F. ....	52
Cederquist, Dena ....	52
Davis, Elizabeth G. ....	52
Folsom, Josiah C. ....	51, 52
Hunscher, Helen A. ....	52
Johnston, Helen L. ....	51
Leverton, Ruth M. ....	52
Manny, Elsie S. ....	51
McCullough, Helen M. ....	52
National Education Association ....	51
U. S. Dept. Agr. Libr. ....	52
U. S. Dept. of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions ....	51
U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator ....	52
Williams, Faith M. ....	51
Zimmerman, Carle C. ....	51

