Agricultural Economic Report No. 208

OPEN-COUNTRY POVERTY IN A RELATIVELY AFFLUENT AREA — THE EAST NORTH CENTRAL STATES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

ABSTRACT

Poverty among open-country households in the East North Central States--11 percent--was slightly above incidence found among U.S. whites in general. Incidence of poverty was greatest among the aged, disabled, and small farmers of all ages who made farming their major source of earnings. Eighty-seven percent of the respondent households in this 1967 survey had earnings. Most respondents were nonfarmers. Although 42 percent received some income from a farm, only 12 percent got the major portion of their earnings from this source. Seventy-two percent of poor households with heads under age 45, and 57 percent of those with heads aged 45-64 reported no income other than earnings, interest, or dividends. Even more received no welfare payments. In this area, where two-fifths of all houses were built before 1901, substandard housing was prevalent among the poor.

Key Words: Poverty, age, East North Central States, education, employment, farming, homegrown food, households, housing, human resources, rural areas, cross-sectional.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Office of Economic Opportunity provided the financial support for this study. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Washington, D.C. 20250 June 1971

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402

CONTENTS

	Page
Highlights	iii
Introduction	1
Poverty in the open country	1
Background of the study area	2
The survey and sample	4
Comparison with the three Southern typology studies	6
Poverty and household composition	8
Overall situation and plan of the report	8
Age, sex, and marital status of the household head	8
Number of persons in the household	11
Children and youth	13
Deprivation and family composition--A summary	14
Income and poverty	14
Earnings	15
Property income	16
Transfer payments	16
Poverty and the farm	17
Land utilization	17
Incidence of poverty	20
Family farm income as a proportion of total household income	21
Farm profitability	22
The household head as a worker	22
Employment	22
Extent of employment	23
Availability of head or family members for more work	24
Occupation of the head	25
Education of the head	26
Housing and poverty	27
Running water inside the house	27
Substandard housing	27
Age of house	27
Mobile homes	28
Tenure of residence	29
Homegrown food	30
Profiles of poverty	31
Deprived households--head aged 65 or over	31
Deprived households--head aged 45-64	32
Deprived households--head under 45	33
Deprived households with land--heads of all ages	34

CONTENTS--CONTINUED

Page

Literature cited..... 37

Appendix

A. Relative income deprivation criteria..... 39

B. Cross index of tables in this report with those in Rural Poverty in Three Southern Regions..... 40

C. Tables..... 41

HIGHLIGHTS

Eleven percent of the households and 9 percent of the people surveyed in the open-country area of the East North Central States were deprived in 1967. This is a much lower incidence of poverty than has been found in many other rural areas. However, poverty in the open-country areas of the relatively prosperous East North Central States was slightly higher than for U.S. whites in general.

The incidence of poverty was greatest among households headed by the aged, the disabled, and small farmers (those with sales under $10,000) who made farming their major source of earnings. For about half of the poor, the shortrun solution appears to lie in income supplement programs. However, the rest are potentially capable of earning an adequate living if they receive assistance in acquiring new skills and improved employment opportunities.

Thirteen percent of households headed by farm operators with sales of $10,000 or more were excluded from the study for procedural reasons. The remaining residents of the open-country essentially were not farmers. Although 42 percent of the respondent household heads received some income from ownership or rental of a farm, only 12 percent derived the major portion of their earnings from a farm. Another 14 percent farmed to supplement their nonfarm earnings, while 17 percent did not report farming as a 1966 activity. For the 31 percent of all households whose farm receipts exceeded expenses, income from a farm constituted, on the average, only a third of total household income. For 12 percent of all households, farm expenses exceeded receipts, and a quarter of these were poor.

Only 13 percent of all households had no earnings; of these, 87 percent had heads aged 65 or over. Among husbands under 65 and not disabled who headed poor families, two out of three worked the equivalent of a full year or more. They need not more work but more remunerative work. In only one out of eight poor households could one person be found who was not working but could reasonably be expected to be available for work. The aged, the disabled, those in school, and wives and female heads with young children or disabled dependents were not considered available for work. Most of those who could be expected to be available for a job were wives or those who had recently left school. In no household--poor or nonpoor--could as many as two persons be found who could be expected to be available for a new job.

Seventy-two percent of the poor households with a head under 45 and 57 percent of the poor households with a head aged 45-64 reported no income from relatives, unemployment compensation, or disability or other benefits. An even higher percentage received no welfare payments.

Substandard housing was prevalent among the poor, but it was also to be found among those who were not deprived. Although this may be explained partly by the age of the homes (two-fifths were built before 1901), substandard housing was also to be found among homes of more recent construction. Forty-seven percent of the deprived households lived in old houses and half of them were substandard. In all, 40 percent of the poor and 14 percent of the nonpoor lived in substandard housing.

Among families, ownership of the residence increased with the age of the head; 81 percent of all families owned homes. Among the poor, three out of four lived in homes they owned, one out of eight paid rent, and one out of seven lived rent-free or in a house provided by the farm or job.

Whether they were poor or nonpoor and regardless of age, 85 percent of farm households raised some food for home consumption. Similarly, about 53 percent of nonfarm households ate some homegrown food.

OPEN-COUNTRY POVERTY IN A RELATIVELY AFFLUENT AREA--
THE EAST NORTH CENTRAL STATES

by
Jeannette Fitzwilliams*

INTRODUCTION

Poverty in the Open Country

About 190,000 of the 1,680,000 households in the open country of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin were economically deprived. A survey made in the spring of 1967 showed another 205,000 households on the margin of poverty. Thus, almost one-quarter of the households outside towns and suburban developments had incomes that were low relative to the number of people in the household. In this relatively affluent area, open-country poverty was found to be slightly higher than among U.S. whites in general (11). 1/

For this study, deprivation is defined as the failure of total household income to equal or exceed the sum assumed to be necessary for the maintenance of a household of a given size (appendix table A-1). 2/ In all societies, there are some individuals whose physical or mental disabilities make it difficult for them to support themselves or maintain a family. Others are poor because their educational and skill levels are too low. Increases in longevity and decline in the popularity of the extended family have left many old people without adequate resources. In addition, shifts in employment opportunities have left others stranded, particularly in rural areas.

The postwar period has been one of particular stress for farmpeople. The technological revolution, with new machinery, seed, and farming techniques, has reduced or eliminated the need for farm labor while increasing the land and capital needed by the farm operator to support a family.

A few households have had the resources to farm in the modern manner. Many have adapted by going out of farming entirely; some have migrated, while others have turn to nonagricultural employment while continuing to live in the country. Some have continued farming because they had no alternative; many of them barely subsist. Others, mostly those with gross farm receipts of less than $10,000, have continued farming, but merely as a supplement to nonagricultural earnings or retirement income.

---

*Economist, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service.

1/ Underscored numbers in parentheses refer to items in the Literature Cited.

2/ The term "poverty" or "deprived" in this report refers to all persons in the first and second household size-income classes as shown in the table.

Nonfarm rural people have also faced a crisis in this same period. Accustomed to serving agriculture and the extractive industries, they have not only seen the demand for services decline, but they have been faced by competition for scarce jobs from those forced out of farming, mining, or logging. In some areas, the adjustment has been aided by penetration of housing developments into the open country, decentralization and regional shifts in industry, and growth of a network of high-speed roads coupled with an increase in automobile ownership. These developments have brought jobs and improved community services, such as better education, to the rural population and increased rural accessibility to the metropolitan areas. However, such developments have not come to all areas equally and not all individuals have been equally successful in adapting to changed conditions.

In the early 1960's, the plight of the disadvantaged and of those who had been unable to adjust became a matter of national concern. An antipoverty campaign was initiated, to provide an escape from poverty and to alleviate all types of poverty. For success in this undertaking, many different programs are needed: Some directed to the individual or household; others designed to improve facilities and opportunities provided by the community. For any given area, the program mix must be tailored to the characteristics of the area and its inhabitants. Profiles of areas are needed to determine the magnitude of the problem, potential for adaptation, and special economic and social features of the area. To obtain profiles of rural households, USDA's Economic Research Service undertook a series of "typology of poverty" studies. This study was designed to examine poverty problems in a relatively affluent area, the East North Central States.

Background of the Study Area

The East North Central States have commonly been regarded as highly prosperous, especially in agriculture. Yet a close examination of recent census data suggests that this impression is erroneous; actually, this area corresponds closely to national averages in agricultural earnings and is markedly higher in nonagricultural earnings. The 1966 per capita personal income in the East North Central States was 1.09 times the U.S. average (20). 3/ Though regional residents comprised only 19.8 percent of the U.S. population, they received 23.6 percent of private nonfarm earnings and 29.8 percent of earnings originating in manufacturing--an industry with high average earnings (table 1).

Although this region is considered a good farming area, agriculture is relatively unimportant in its economy. Agriculture is, in fact, slightly less important in this region than in the Nation as a whole. Proprietors' incomes, plus farm wages and salaries, are but 2.5 percent of personal income in the East North Central States, compared with 3.2 percent for the United States. The 1960 Census of Population showed that farmers and farm managers were only 3.4 percent of the employed labor force in this region, compared with 3.8 percent for the United States (1,9).

3/ Personal income is the total of cash and imputed incomes received by the personal sector composed of individuals and nonprofit institutions serving individuals.

Table 1.--Personal income and selected characteristics for residents of the East North Central States, 1966

Item	Amount	Percentage of U.S. total
	Number	Percent
Residents	38,735,000	19.8
Farms	583,000	18.0
	Million dollars	
Personal income	125,775	21.5
Total earnings	103,992	22.0
Private nonfarm earnings	89,191	23.6
Manufacturing earnings	42,225	29.8
Property income	17,481	20.7
Transfers	8,135	18.4
Farm proprietors' income	2,915	18.1
Farm wages and salaries	240	8.7

Source: Population (12); farms (21); income (20).

The characteristics of farms in this region are usually the same as those for farms in general. The value of land and buildings per farm was just below the 1964 U.S. average (5,6). With 18 percent of the farms, the region received 18 percent of proprietors' income (table 1) and 18 percent of the value of farm products, whether field crops or livestock (22,23). When farms were classified by size of farm receipts, the 1964 Census of Agriculture showed that the region had relatively few very small subsistence farms with receipts under $2,500 or very large farms with receipts of $40,000 or over--only 14 percent and 15 percent, respectively. Instead, 21 percent of all farms receiving $2,500-$9,999 were located in this region, and 24 percent of those with receipts of $10,000-$39,999. This meant that only one-third of the farms in the region received gross receipts of $10,000 or more in 1964. Below that amount, few operators can support themselves and their families by farming alone.

Farm labor is one characteristic in which East North Central farms deviate from the U.S. norm. Only 8.7 percent of total U.S. farm wages and salaries are received by residents of this area (table 1). 4/ Proprietors, aided by their equipment, perform most of the farm chores themselves, unaided by even unpaid family labor. This is due to the type of farming--it is not labor intensive--and to the size of operation. While the percentage of farms employing any labor at all is about the same as for the United States in general--48 percent --only 36 percent of farms with receipts under $10,000 employed any hired labor

4/ Farms of the East North Central States pay 10 percent of the farm wage bill. The difference arises because few migratory laborers are residents of this area.

at all in 1959 and then only for short periods (3,4). In two-thirds of the cases the wage bill was under $200 per farm. In general, the data suggest that these small farms do not keep even the proprietor fully employed. Only 3 percent employed a regular hired hand--the same as for the United States in general. On the other hand, less than a quarter of the larger farms reported reported regular hired labor, and the average was only 1.6 regular workers per farm. This compares with 29 percent of all larger U.S. farms which employed an average of 2.5 regular workers.

The East North Central States have shared in the general decline in employment throughout agriculture. In counties where the survey (described below) was taken, agriculture absorbed one-quarter of the total employment (urban and rural) in 1940. Twenty years later it absorbed less than a 10th. In these five States, the number of agricultural workers--propietors, employees, and unpaid family labor--fell 13 percent in the first 10 years and 34 percent in the next 10 years, or approximately at the national rate (table 2).

The decline in total number of farms in the East North Central States was very similar to the U.S. decline. However, by size of operation, the change recorded for large farms was entirely different from that experienced by small farms, and the East North Central region did not conform closely to the U.S. pattern of change. Large farms, with sales of $10,000 or more, declined further than the U.S. average in 1950-59, but increased faster in 1959-64. In contrast, small farms declined less than the U.S. average--17 percent, compared with 30 percent--in 1950-59, but declined slightly faster--25 percent, compared with 21 percent--in 1959-64.

Changes of the above magnitude have called for considerable adaptation. From 1950 to 1960, this adjustment was aided by the fact that employment opportunities increased faster than the increase in the population aged 21 and over --16 percent, compared with 8 percent (1,3).

Changes in personal income reflect not only changes in employment but also shifts in industrial mix. Over the postwar period, personal income in the region grew more slowly than in the Nation as a whole. However, much of this poor performance was due to the growth rate of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) counties. From 1950 to 1959, personal income of the primarily rural counties of the East North Central States, while growing more slowly than their SMSA counterparts, grew faster than for rural counties in general. In 1959-66, the growth rate for personal income in non-SMSA counties in the East North Central States surpassed the rate for their more urban regional counterparts (18). It also exceeded the U.S. growth rate for personal income in general and in both SMSA and non-SMSA areas, nationally. The rural counties benefit from the wide geographic distribution of the many large cities of the area, and from a generally good highway system that enables most people who live in the open country to commute to work relatively easily.

The Survey and Sample

The survey mentioned earlier was made in conjunction with a larger survey conducted by USDA's Statistical Reporting Service in 1967 on the use of pesticides and selected farm characteristics throughout the United States. The

Table 2.--Changes in employment in agriculture and in the number of farms, selected areas, 1940-64

Item	1959-64	1950-60 1/	1940-50	1940-60
	Percent			
Employment in agricultural industries--Census of Population				
United States	---	-37	-15	-45
East North Central States	---	-34	-13	-43
Mississippi	---	-53	-28	-66
Number of farms--Census of Agriculture				
United States				
Total	-15	-31	-12	-39
With receipts of:				
$10,000 and over	+9	-33	---	---
Under $10,000	-21	-30	---	---
East North Central States				
Total	-15	-24	-12	-33
With receipts of:				
$10,000 and over	+18	-41	---	---
Under $10,000	-25	-17	---	---
Mississippi				
Total	-21	-45	---	---
With receipts of:				
$10,000 and over	+26	+25	---	---
Under $10,000	-24	-47	---	---

1/ Census of Population data are for 1960; Census of Agriculture data are for 1959.

Sources: (2,3,4,5,6,8,9)

Master Sample of Agriculture was used (14). Counties were grouped together, and a single county was selected from each group with a probability proportional to the number of qualifying farms in each county, i.e., those with total sales of $5,000 or more. Enough enumeration segments were chosen in each selected county to provide a 1-percent sample of the qualifying farms of the group. All households within the designated segments were then screened to determine whether there was a farm operator in the household and what was the size of farm sales. In all segments, the pesticide questionnaire was used for all farm operator households which reported farm sales of $10,000 or more. Since these large operators were given the pesticide questionnaire, the survey reported here excluded them. 5/ In three-quarters of the segments, the remaining households

5/ Estimates of poverty among excluded households were made after a study of income data obtained from the pesticide questionnaires.

were subsampled, with farm households being sampled twice as heavily as nonfarm households. To provide the proper relationship for percentages and averages, each nonfarm household was counted twice for tabulations at the sample level. 6/ To confine the sample to residents of the open country, no nonfarm households were interviewed in segments containing over 50 households. In obtaining estimates for the total population, farm operator households with sales of $5,000 or more were raised to a total based on the 1964 Census of Agriculture results. Other aggregates were made proportionate to the results obtained in the survey. Unless otherwise stated, findings in this study are based on the open-country population not included in the pesticide survey. Also, readers should keep in mind that this is a study of the open country, not the rural, population of the East North Central States.

Comparison with the Three Southern Typology Studies

This is one of a series of studies reporting on the extent and types of rural poverty found in different parts of the country. 7/ The Mississippi Delta study covered an area where 48 percent of the households were Negro, 25 percent of the heads were farm operators, and 47 percent had agriculture for their major occupation. Fifty-six percent of the households were poor, but of the poor only 10 percent were farm operators and only 42 percent were primarily in agriculture. The relative decline in agricultural employment and in the number of farms was far greater in Mississippi (one of the Delta study States) than in the East North Central States, -53 percent, compared with -34 percent in total employment, and -47 percent, compared with -17 among small farms from 1950 to 1960 (table 2). The magnitude of the adjustment needed as a result of the decline explains in part the high poverty levels found in the Delta survey.

In the Southeast Coastal Plain, again, almost half of the households were Negro and one-third were farm households. Again, just over a quarter of the heads were farm operators. Farm laborers increased the number in agriculture to 37 percent. Half of the households were poor, and poor farm operators were proportionate to total numbers. Incidence of poverty among farm laborers was very high.

The third study covered the Ozarks--a predominantly white area with farmwork as the major occupation for only 15 percent of household heads, almost all of them farm operators. One quarter of the households were poor and, as for the Southeast Coastal Plain, the percentage of poor farms was about the same as the percentage of farm operators among all households.

Open-country households of the East North Central States were entirely white, and one-quarter of household heads found their major occupation in agriculture, most of them farm operators with farm sales of $10,000 or more. Only 11 percent of all households were poor. While incidence of poverty was lower than average among households headed by farm operators with sales of

---

6/ Due to the oversampling and the clustering nature of the design, standard errors computed as for a random sample are somewhat understated.

7/ See appendix B, which cross-indexes the set of tables presented in this report with those in Rural Poverty in Three Southern Regions (15).

$10,000 or more, it was high among small farm operators who relied extensively upon farming for their income.

Incidence of poverty by age of the head of household and the percentage of poor households where the head is under 65 are presented in table 3 for the four areas. With only 7 percent of the households poor if the head is under 65, and only 29 percent poor if the head is 65 or over, it is obvious that poverty

Table 3.--Incidence of poverty by age of head and percentage of poor heads under 65 years of age, selected areas

Study area	Age of head	
	Under 65	65 and over
	Percent	
Incidence of poverty:		
East North Central States	7	29
Mississippi Delta	53	65
Ozarks	19	37
Southeast Coastal Plain	47	56
Proportion of poor heads in age group specified:		
East North Central States	46	54
Mississippi Delta	67	23
Ozarks	49	51
Southeast Coastal Plain	79	21

Source: East North Central States survey; others: (15)

in the East North Central States is a less pressing problem than in the Delta or the Southeast Coastal Plain, where the comparable figures are 53 and 65 percent or 47 and 56 percent. However, a poor person suffers just as acutely from poverty when he is one in 14 as when he is one in two. In fact, the frustration may be greater for the poor family living among nonpoor neighbors than for the poor family surrounded by other poor families. For individual programs designed to meet specific problems, standards are nationwide or statewide, and are related to need, not incidence of poverty. Poverty exists in many forms--widespread in the Delta, concentrated in the ghetto, and out-of-sight along a back road in the open country of the Midwest.

However, the program mix of the overall antipoverty effort will be different. In areas such as the Delta or the Southeast Coastal Plain, a larger proportion of the effort might be directed to remedial programs designed to enable heads of households to get back into the mainstream of economic life. This might be so because well over half of the poor heads in these regions are of working age, compared with just under half in the other two regions (table3). Furthermore, the type of remedial program suitable for the East North Central States, where even the poor families have had a long tradition of independence and economic self-sufficiency, may be quite different in emphasis from programs in the Delta, where poor families have long been accustomed to taking direction from their employers or the owners of the land they sharecropped.

In evaluating need for antipoverty efforts, it should be remembered that table 3 and the findings that follow are based upon adequacy of incomes. They may, therefore, not give a true picture of relative well-being in the broader sense. When incidence of poverty is widespread, the quality and quantity of education, health services, and all the amenities of life are likely to be lower or even lacking.

POVERTY AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Overall Situation and Plan of the Report

Although this study focuses on the open-country population of the East North Central States, only 36 percent of the approximately 1.7 million households of the area would qualify as farm households under the census of population residence-occupation definition which requires that the farm household live on a farm and, in addition, have at least one member who works on the farm (table 4 and appendix table C-1). Even though less than a quarter of all households relied on agriculture for the major portion of their earnings, half the households in the survey area had some connection with agricultural production (appendix table C-7).

Thirteen percent of all households had farm sales of $10,000 or more. For procedural reasons, they could not be included in the survey reported herein. While this exclusion reduced the proportion receiving income from the farm to 42 percent of all households, it did not materially affect the incidence of deprivation observed in the survey, which rose only 1 point--from 11 percent to 12 percent.

The poverty level of 12 percent indicates the overall magnitude of the need for antipoverty efforts among the survey population of the area. To identify the nature and extent of need and the overall human resource potential of this population, this report first considers the personal characteristics of household heads and the size of their households, examining the distribution and incidence of deprivation among various subcategories. Since deprivation is defined in terms of income, sources of income are reported, giving particular attention to the farm and its contribution to household economic well-being. Since the major source of income is earnings, heads were investigated with regard to their work experience and to their potential for work. Housing and the home production of food are reviewed because they can materially affect the household's overall standard of living. Finally, the above data are drawn together to provide a series of profiles of deprived households.

Age, Sex, and Marital Status of the Household Head

The age, sex, and marital status of the household head can impose serious constraints upon the head's ability to provide for dependents and to escape from poverty. Eighty-three percent of all survey households were headed by a male with wife present, but this was true of only 64 percent of poor households (appendix table C-2). Thirteen percent of the poor households were headed by males with no wife present and 23 percent by females with no husband present. The absence of a spouse is disproportionately associated with poverty.

Table 4.--Amount of deprivation in the open-country area of the East North Central States and for the survey population, 1967

Item	Household size-income classes 1/			
	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total
	Households 2/			
Total open country	188,700	205,900	1,285,400	1,680,000
Farm	77,000	70,800	450,200	598,000
Nonfarm	111,700	135,100	835,200	1,082,000
Farmers with sales of $10,000 or more:				
Farm only	13,100	10,600	198,100	221,800
Survey population	175,600	195,300	1,087,300	1,458,200
Farm	63,900	60,200	252,100	376,200
Nonfarm	111,700	135,100	835,200	1,082,000
	Percent down 2/			
Total open country	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Farm	40.8	34.4	35.0	35.6
Nonfarm	59.2	65.6	65.0	64.4
Farmers with sales of $10,000 or more:				
Farm only	6.9	5.1	15.4	13.2
Survey population	93.1	94.9	84.6	86.8
Farm	33.9	29.2	19.6	22.4
Nonfarm	59.2	65.6	65.0	64.4
	Percent across 2/ 3/			
Total open country	11.2	12.3	76.5	100.0
Farm	12.9	11.8	75.3	100.0
Nonfarm	10.3	12.5	77.2	100.0
Farmers with sales of $10,000 or more:				
Farm only	5.9	4.8	89.3	100.0
Survey population	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0
Farm	17.0	16.0	67.0	100.0
Nonfarm	10.4	12.5	77.2	100.0

1/ Deprivation codes are based on 1966 income and 1967 household composition. See appendix A for derivation of income deprivation categories.

2/ Parts may not add to totals due to rounding.

3/ Incidence of poverty was obtained from unrounded data.

In part, this finding is due to age, for the average age of men and women heading a household where a spouse is not present is higher than where a spouse is present, regardless of whether the household is poor. Poor heads without wives are 8 years older than poor husbands, who average 60 years of age, and 4 years older than poor female heads. When the family is well above the poverty line, the difference is even greater. With an average age of 46, heads with a spouse are 14 years younger than heads without a wife and 17 years younger than those without a husband. Within each type of household, the age of the male head was substantially higher for poor than nonpoor households. For husbands, the age differential between deprived heads and those well above the margin of poverty was 15 years; for other men it was 8 years, but for women heads it was only 2 years.

As a result of the many constraints closely connected with age, the age distribution of poor heads was entirely different from that of all heads. Thus, 40 percent of all household heads were under 45 years of age, but only 19.2 percent of deprived heads; and we find only 22.6 percent of all household heads 65 years of age and over, but 54.0 percent of all deprived heads. The incidence of poverty increased sharply with age, from 5.8 percent for heads under 45, to 8.6 percent for those aged 45-64, to 28.8 percent for heads 65 years and older.

This trend held primarily for households headed by men, with or without a spouse present; for households headed by females, the greatest incidence of deprivation was for heads under 45. At this age, the absence of a spouse leaves a woman with children particularly vulnerable to poverty because of her limited availability for work and the low probability of adequate support or survivor payments.

Because the response of the various age groups in relation to selected background variables differed greatly, each group was studied separately. Furthermore, the choice of programs to ameliorate or provide an escape from poverty will depend to a large extent upon the age and health of the head of the household.

Since age and serious disability are likely to preclude a return to the economic mainstream by way of employment, the main shortrun solution to poverty for these groups is probably some form of transfer payment to supplement their income. It will be recalled that over half of deprived household heads were aged and disabled in the study area.

Not only does a younger man have a greater opportunity to work, but in husband-wife households, there are also more frequently two wage earners. Further, since there are two adults to share the responsibility for dependents and one is likely to be younger than the other, there is more opportunity for at least one person to work. Last, in such households there is also a greater chance of nonwage income being received. Thus, only 9.3 percent of the households with both spouses present were deprived. This contrasts with a poverty rate of 22.6 percent for households headed by a male with no spouse present, and with a rate of 27.9 percent for households headed by a female with no spouse present.

The heads who were under 65 but disabled were almost all aged 45 to 64, and this fact should be borne in mind in evaluating this group--about one-sixth of the poor in the age group had a serious disability.

In addition, approximately one-seventh of all heads and one-fifth of deprived heads aged 45-64 had a minor chronic ailment which may have impaired their earning ability by forcing them to cut down on their activities or to move into another type of work. But a man who has to quit his regular occupation often does not know what other opportunities are open to him or what kind of training he should take to be able to support his family. Many of this group need expert employment advice in reordering their lives.

In addition to those below the poverty line, 13 percent of all heads were on the margin of deprivation, with 55 percent under age 65, approximately equally divided between those under 45 and those aged 45-64. Households with spouse of the head present had an 11-percent chance of being just above the poverty line, with about one-third of the marginally deprived husbands in each of the three age groups. A quarter of all male heads without a spouse present were marginally poor, but 80 percent of these heads were 65 or over. A female head without spouse present had a 23-percent chance of being on the margin of deprivation. Sixty-eight percent of these marginally deprived female heads were 65 or over and 29 percent were aged 45-64.

All together, one-quarter of all survey households were classified as living in or on the margin of deprivation. If poor and marginally poor households headed by those who were disabled or who were close to or over 65 were excluded, then one-tenth of all households--two-fifths of households in or near poverty--would have fallen into the category of those who not only needed help, but were potentially capable of improving their position. All might not be able to escape from poverty but, with assistance, those near the borderline should be able to rejoin the mainstream.

Number of Persons in the Household

To a large extent, the degree of deprivation depends upon the relationship between income and the number of people which it must support. This consideration is embodied in the poverty-determining criteria employed in this report (appendix table A-1). Over the life cycle, there is a complicated series of interactions at work. In the first place, at the earlier ages, households are formed; later, one- and two-person households again occur as children leave home or a spouse dies. The incidence of poverty is high among such small households (appendix table C-3).

When the household was formed or the spouse died in the period January 1966 to April 1967, the poverty status may have been temporary as career earnings replaced student income or adequate survivor payments were received. The relative income deprivation classification may not even represent the household members' true standard of living in the income year if, in fact, the income of parents or deceased spouse's earnings (not included as income to the survivor) had provided a higher standard of living than the 1966 income of the current household members would indicate. However, for most heads, particularly young female heads with children, and for those approaching or over 65, a poverty level of income is likely to be chronic. Although only 40 percent of all households contained but one or two persons, two-thirds of deprived households were

of this type. The proportion of such households increased rapidly as the head aged, and it was particularly high among households with heads 65 or over. By age of head, the proportion of one- and two-person households was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All households	8.9	45.2	87.3	40.2
Deprived households	9.2	54.3	93.1	66.6

Second, while size of income and number of persons in a family rise and fall, they do not do so simultaneously. In the early years, as children come and the wife's employment ceases or is interrupted, the increase in the number of dependents tends to outstrip the increase in household income. As children become more able to look out for themselves, wives may participate more fully in the labor force, and children begin to earn small sums of money. In addition, the average earnings of heads under 45 are relatively high. As a result, when the head was under 45, incidence of poverty was generally low, but it did tend to rise somewhat unevenly with an increase in the number of persons in the family (appendix table C-3).

Few children contribute greatly to a household's economic well-being, since they tend to leave home when they become self-sufficient. As the head approaches and passes age 45, most families shrink in size and, on the average, the combined income of head, wife, and remaining children becomes more adequate in terms of household size, so that the average level of economic well-being is higher. However, three adverse factors are present: (1) Departing children may be replaced by aged relatives, some of whom may contribute little to the household income; (2) heads who have been unable to adapt to changed economic conditions, and hence have low income, are now more prevalent; and (3) there are more heads without earnings or with only low earnings due to ill health or widowhood.

The net result is that where the head of a survey household was aged 45-64, incidence of poverty by size of household was higher than when the head was under 45. Furthermore, the proportion that was poor showed no consistent tendency to increase with size of household. When the head is 65 or over, family members are more likely to have income and their earnings have a more important role. Addition of a third or fourth person to the household reduced the likelihood of poverty. For all age groups combined, incidence of poverty among persons was 10 percent. 8/

Thus, for the three age groups used in this study, there was considerable difference in size of average household and in relation of size of household to economic well-being. In general, except at the extremes of household size where the likelihood of poverty was great, when the head was under 45, incidence of poverty was low and increased with size of household; when the head was aged 45-64, the poverty rate was high, but showed no consistent trend in relation to size; and when the head was aged 65 or over, the rate declined, but

8/ If the households of farmers with sales of $10,000 or more had been included, the rate would have been about 9 percent.

there were so few households of three or more persons that there was little difference in the size of all households and deprived households. By age of head, the size of households was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Persons			
All households	4.8	3.2	1.9	3.6
Deprived households	5.8	3.2	1.8	3.0

Heads under 45 had the largest households, accounting for 54 percent of all persons. Though incidence of poverty was low in such households, the many persons in this group meant that a high proportion of deprived persons lived with a head under 45. This distribution could have important policy implications when need for remedial assistance for heads is considered. Though only 19.2 percent of deprived heads were under 45, assistance to such heads would benefit a far higher proportion of deprived persons, since the distribution of deprived households and persons was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
Deprived households	19.2	26.8	54.0	100.0
Deprived persons	38.0	29.4	32.6	100.0

Children and Youth

About two-fifths of the persons living in the sample households were children under 18. A slightly higher proportion of persons living in poor households were children. Seven out of eight of these poor children lived in families with heads who were potentially capable of earning an adequate living, i.e., the heads were young and had no serious disability. In general, very few children lived in households headed by the aged, but over half the families with young, disabled heads had children. About 28 percent of such families were poor.

In the study area, apparently many grown children not only left home, but also left the open-country area and were not replaced by others who moved in. Young men and women aged 16-24, were underrepresented in the working age population of the study area, compared with the Nation as a whole, excluding members of the armed forces. For the United States, just under a quarter of the white civilian population aged 16 to 64 was under 24; for the survey area, the proportion was only one-fifth.

Briefly, young men aged 16-24 can be categorized as follows. Forty-two percent of the young men were in school and 8 percent were in college. Sixteen percent did not finish high school. One-third of these dropouts were married and had their own households, constituting a quarter of the young married heads of families. Dropout husbands were less well off than young husbands in general. About 6 percent of all young men aged 16-24 lived in deprived families. Two percent of all young men aged 16-24 had a serious chronic handicap.

One-third of the young women aged 16-24 lived with a spouse, compared with less than a fifth of the young men. Thirty-eight percent of the young women were in school, 6 percent in college, and 12.5 percent were high-school dropouts. The proportion of dropouts who were married was twice as high as for the men. About 7 percent of the young women were deprived and 2 percent had a serious chronic handicap.

Thus, poverty was a relatively minor problem for young people aged 16-24 in the sample. However, since the group numbers some 39,000 persons, it is too large to be ignored.

Deprivation and Family Composition--A Summary

To summarize, 12 percent of survey households were deprived. Fifty-four percent of these poor households had a head aged 65 or over. Twenty-three percent of poor households were headed by a woman, but only 8.7 percent of deprived heads were women under 65. While a woman under 65 who was left as a head of a household had a 24 percent chance of being poor, a male head under 65 had only a 5.5 percent chance of being deprived if his spouse was present, and a 20.7 percent chance if he had no spouse present. Male heads under 65 accounted for 37.3 percent of all deprived heads.

Two-thirds of the deprived households contained only one or two persons, with an average for all deprived households of 3.0 persons per household. If the head was 45 or over, the average number of persons in a household was the same for deprived households and for all households--3.2 persons if the head was aged 45-64, and about 1.8 persons if the head was 65 or over. However, when the head was under 45, deprived households consisting of 5.8 persons averaged one more person per household than all households with heads under 45. The 19.2 percent of deprived households with heads under 45 contained 38.0 percent of all deprived persons.

A little over two-fifths of deprived persons were children under 18. However, only 6 percent of all young men aged 16-24 and 7 percent of all young women aged 16-24 were deprived.

INCOME AND POVERTY

The average income of survey households in 1966 was $6,734 (appendix table C-4). 9/ The distribution for all households was bimodal with peaks in the $1,000-$1,999 and $6,000-$6,999 classes. This corresponds closely with the distribution for the same year for all white U.S. families and unrelated individuals which was also bimodal with peaks in the same classes (10). In contrast, the mode for the typology studies in the Mississippi Delta, the Ozarks, and the Southeast Coastal Plain was the $1,000-$1,999 class (15).

No household was considered poor if it had an income over $5,000, but the average received by poor households was far below that amount. By age of head, average income ranged thus:

9/ If farmers with sales of $10,000 or more had been included in the study, the average would have been about $7,000.

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
All households	$8,066	$7,308	$3,426	$6,734
Deprived households	1,723	1,207	1,007	1,198

Earnings

Household earnings represent the total earnings of all household members. However, in all but 12 percent of the families with earnings, the head was the principal earner. Since nearly all male heads under age 65 worked, nearly all households with heads under 65 had some earnings, whether the household was poor or nonpoor. Within age groups for the head, the percentage of households with earnings was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All households with earnings	99.6	95.9	48.6	86.7
Deprived households with earnings	96.3	83.4	31.9	58.1

A household that contained no person who reported wages, salary, or self-employed income from a farm or nonfarm activity was a household without earnings. Such a household had about a 38 percent chance of being poor, as shown below. This was true whether the head was under 65 or 65 and over. Furthermore, when earnings were received and heads were under 65, the household that contained a self-employed farmer was more likely to be poor than one that did not. The incidence of poverty by class of household earnings was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
No earnings	36.7		38.2	38.0
Farm self-employment only or farm plus nonfarm earnings	10.7	11.0	19.8	12.7
Nonfarm earnings only	3.6	4.2	17.2	4.8

After middle age, ill health, voluntary retirement, and company rules increasingly took the head out of the labor force. In many cases when the head could not or did not work, some other household member did, but there were no workers at all in 13 percent of all households. Forty-two percent of deprived households contained no workers. Households without earnings were distributed by age of the head as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All households without earnings	1.1	11.6	87.3	100.0
Deprived households without earnings	1.7	10.6	87.7	100.0

Property Income

Two-fifths of all households received income from property, ranging from a fourth of those with heads under age 45 to two-thirds of those with heads aged 65 or older (appendix table C-5). Property income as used here is defined as interest, dividends, and income from estates, private pensions, or annuities. The percentage of households with income from property rose steadily as age increased. Over age 65, even among the deprived, almost half had some such income, but the average amount was small and did little to make up for the insufficiency of transfer income. Among the young, average property income was also small, but this was unimportant as long as wages were adequate.

Transfer Payments

Income received from pensions, Social Security (Old Age, Survivor, or Disability Insurance), unemployment compensation, insurance companies, friends, relatives, or welfare (both private and public) is treated as transfer income. Two-fifths of all households--94 percent where the head was 65 or over 10/--had such income (appendix table C-5). Transfers received by households with younger heads usually were for young children, but sometimes included Social Security benefits paid to elderly relatives. Within age groups, the percentage of households receiving transfer payments was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All households	22.9	29.7	93.6	41.4
Deprived households	27.8	43.0	93.1	67.1

Many of those now 65 or over spent their most remunerative years not covered by Social Security. For instance, self-employed farmers were not covered until 1955. Today, with practically all heads covered, and with husbands averaging about $7,000 from nonfarm jobs if under age 45, or about $6,000 if 45-65, it is expected that Social Security payments alone will be more nearly adequate for households whose heads retire in the future. In 1966, transfer payments received by households with such payments were low, averaging the following amounts according to age of head:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
All households	$698	$1,166	$1,492	$1,229
Deprived households	998	1,142	1,056	1,066

Half the households receiving transfer payments in 1966 had heads under age 65. By their nature, transfer payments indicate situations conducive to low income--death, injury, unemployment, and old age. Therefore, it is not surprising that recipient families showed a higher incidence of poverty. The

10/ A few commented specifically that they did not believe in Social Security and did not claim it.

greater the reliance on transfer payments, the greater the likelihood of deprivation when the head was under 65 (appendix table C-6).

Advocates of legislation to improve the lot of the poor find that one of the greatest obstacles they have to overcome is the generally accepted belief that the poor are living on welfare. Poverty status is based on total income including welfare payments. But 72 percent of poor households with heads under 45, and 57 percent of those with heads aged 45-64, reported no transfer payments at all--not even those based on insurance-type provision for the future such as unemployment, survivor, or disability payments. 11/

POVERTY AND THE FARM

Land Utilization

Households located in the open country are popularly supposed to consist mostly of farmers. But it has already been pointed out that 64 percent of the heads of survey households lived in nonfarm households. However, since 42 percent of all study households derived some income from the family farm, and 53 percent of deprived households had such income (appendix table C-9), it is important to see what role the farm had in the economic life of these open-country residents.

To determine this role, a land use classification was devised. On the assumption that self-employed farming could not occur without use of some land, all persons who merely owned or rented the homesite allotted to the residence were considered to have no land available, and hence no farming potential. Two-fifths of all survey household heads fell into this class (appendix table C-8). 12/ The proportion of households with no farming potential is shown below:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	52.3	31.6	24.0	38.2
Deprived heads	33.3	27.8	30.9	30.6

An additional fifth of the household heads, regardless of age, owned or rented more than 1 acre, but did no farming on it. The proportion was not significantly different for deprived heads under 45 or over 65. However, only 7.3 percent of deprived heads aged 45-64 had land from which they did not derive income. In some cases, the land owned or rented by this "no utilization group" was only a large homesite or was land not suitable for farming. Over one-half of these heads reported 9 acres or less. In a few instances, the owner was unable to either rent his land or farm it himself, and in a very few

11/ Some may have received welfare aid in the form of free medical care or food and fuel. Income for this study covered only cash income.

12/ Remember, this proportion excludes the larger farmers with sales of $10,000 or more. The proportions for all open-country households will be found in appendix table C-7.

cases, the owner permitted another to use the land rent-free, thereby deriving no benefit from it himself.

However, 42 percent of all households and 52 percent of deprived households owned or rented land which they utilized in anticipation of deriving some income. Among age groups, these household heads were distributed as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	26.0	43.1	30.9	100.0
Deprived heads	18.6	33.2	48.1	100.0

The relationship of land utilization to economic well-being is the net result of a complicated set of factors. Some of the more important are acquisition of land through savings or inheritance, alternative opportunities for employment, personal predilection for faming, and, ultimately, the degree of success in farming. The set of factors is different for each age group and, within each age group, for poor and nonpoor.

Savings and the likelihood of inheritance increase with age, but job opportunities decline. The percentage of all heads in each age group who reported land utilization increased with age, but among deprived heads the percentage, while generally large, was greatest for heads aged 45-64, thus:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All household heads	27.3	48.4	57.5	42.0
Nonpoor heads	26.8	46.8	61.9	40.6
Deprived heads	50.9	64.9	46.7	52.4

If a head reported no farm self-employment during 1966, the income from the farm was not considered earnings as far as he was concerned. This was particularly true of those over 65, many of whom were no longer able to work. Seventeen percent of all heads (40 percent of those with land utilization) may be said to have treated their farms as investments rather than a way of life. Within age groups, the proportions with utilization but reporting no self-employment on their farms were as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	7.8	15.3	35.5	16.8
Deprived heads	8.3	9.3	26.0	18.1

One quarter of all household heads reported self-employed farming as a 1966 activity. These may be divided into two groups: those whose farming was a minor source of earnings and those for whom self-employed farming was the major or sole source of employment.

For some whose regular job was nonfarm, the farm was essentially a one-man operation. In other cases, part or all of the farm was operated on shares with another, under an arrangement whereby the owner furnished part or all of the land, paid part of the expenses, and contributed some of his own labor. In many cases, working capital no doubt was provided out of nonfarm earnings. By age, the proportion of heads whose major earnings were nonfarm and who may, therefore, be said to have "moonlighted" as farmers was as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	15.5	18.4	2.6	13.6
Deprived heads	25.9	11.3	2.3	9.2

The two groups--investors and "moonlighters"--may be said to have used their farms to supplement their regular income, whether it be from earnings or pensions. Except in the case of deprived heads aged 45-64, these two groups combined, who treated the farm as a supplement to income, constituted well over half of those who utilized their farms, thus:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads with utilization	85.3	69.5	66.2	72.6
Deprived heads with utilization	67.3	31.6	60.6	52.2

Among all heads who used the farm to supplement their income, the greatest proportion were aged 45-64; among deprived heads, over half were elderly:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads with utilization	30.6	41.3	28.1	100.0
Deprived heads with utilization	24.0	20.1	55.8	100.0

Since most of those over 65 were really out of the labor force, those aged heads whose sole or major earnings came from the farm could be added to the group that used their farms to supplement their other earnings; however, they are included here with their younger counterparts. This remaining group of heads, who reported farm self-employment as their sole or major source of earnings, constituted only 11.5 percent of all heads (27.4 percent of those with land utilization). However, 44.4 percent of deprived heads aged 45-64 (68.4 percent of those using their land) fell into this category. Within age groups, the following are the proportions relying extensively on the farm for earnings:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	4.0	14.8	19.4	11.5
Deprived heads	16.7	44.4	18.4	25.0
Nonpoor heads	3.2	12.0	19.9	9.7

Comparatively few of those deriving the major portion of their earnings from the farm were under 45. The distribution of heads by age group was approximately the same for deprived heads as for all heads in this category:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All heads	13.9	48.0	38.1	100.0
Deprived heads	12.8	47.5	39.7	100.0

There was considerable diversity among those whose major or sole occupation was farming. Some of the more successful were "junior partners" in a large-scale operation where the operator (frequently a father or father-in-law) lived in one of the households excluded from the sample. Some were able to support their families from the farm because they had small families and a particularly advantageous farm situation. For others, it was the nonfarm wages of other family members that made the difference between being above or below the poverty line. Frequently, given the head's age, health, lack of alternative skills, and the condition of the labor market in his area, farming may have been the best use of family resources, particularly if the wife or other household member worked. In fact, for some, farming was the only alternative to unemployment.

Incidence of Poverty

Table 5 clearly demonstrates the importance of a nonfarm job to the economic well-being of the household. In almost every instance, at least a quarter of the heads were deprived if the farm was their major or sole source of earnings, or if they were essentially out of the labor force due to age.

Table 5.--Incidence of poverty by land utilization and by age of heads in survey, open country, East North Central States, 1967

Land utilization	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
Heads without land or with land not utilized	3.9	5.9	36.2	9.9
Heads where farm is a supplement to income	8.5	5.3	21.4	10.8
Heads where farm is the sole or major source of earnings	24.0	26.0	27.3	26.2

The relation of the farm to incidence of poverty is different within each age group, and the role of the determining influences cannot be definitively stated without a more intensive study. However, some probably underlying reasons for the differences can be suggested.

1. Regardless of age, the farm operation of survey heads is likely to be so small, and the rate of return so low, that farm net income compares unfavorably with annual wages from other types of employment.

2. If heads under 45 have no farm, it is less likely that they will have suffered any business loss that offsets their nonfarm earnings. Furthermore, among those who moonlight, nonfarm secondary employment probably brings in more cash than work on their farm. Hence, those without land or with unutilized land will tend to have a lower incidence of poverty than those who exploit their land in anticipation of increasing their income.

3. While the same forces work on heads aged 45-64, not only is the spread probably less between farm and nonfarm earnings but, in addition, some of those without land may also be out of the labor market due to ill health. This tends to make incidence of poverty more nearly alike for the first two groups.

4. For those over 65, the difference in incidence of poverty between the two groups with land utilization may be partly due to more remunerative nonfarm employment and partly to the possibility that there is less likelihood of loss by renting than where the head farms alone, especially if he farms primarily for personal satisfaction.

Family Farm Income as a Proportion of Total Household Income

In general, for 31 percent of the survey households, family farm income made a positive contribution to the unit's economic well-being. When the head was 65 or over, alternative sources of income usually brought in only small sums of money, and the greater the proportion received from the farm, the lower the incidence of poverty (appendix table C-9). However, under 65, exactly the reverse was true.

In discussing the background of the study area, it was pointed out that income originating in agriculture was a relatively small component of the personal income of the region--only 2.5 percent. Among survey households making a profit from operating a farm, farm income averaged only 33 percent of total income. This average rose to 67 percent when the head was deprived and aged 45-64.

For the sample as a whole, family farm income (profit or loss plus family farm wages paid to family members) amounted to only 5.6 percent of total cash income. When wages paid for employment on other farms and the net income derived from using farm equipment to do custom work for others were added, total income originating in agriculture rose to only 7.0 percent of total income.

Farm Profitability

While farming is usually undertaken in anticipation of profit, approximately 12 percent of survey households, regardless of age, reported a loss, and a quarter of these were poor (appendix table C-9). Among households with heads under 65, incidence of poverty was 17 percent, but if the head was 65 or over, it was 54 percent. Among those who utilized their farms, the proportion reporting a loss was highest for households with heads under 65 and lowest among those with aged heads:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All households with utilization	40.7	25.7	18.0	27.3
Deprived households with utilization	61.8	38.8	41.3	44.3

Losses may have arisen for various reasons. In addition to the losses due to bad management or the vagaries of nature, bookkeeping losses occurred when receipts were deferred to the next year while expenses were paid in 1966. It is probable that among the survey households few such bookkeeping losses were tax inspired, since only 1 percent had household income of $20,000 or more (appendix table C-4). Probably more frequent were the losses that were incurred because the farm was really used for recreation. Such a form of entertainment expenditure had the added attraction that it brought in some income to offset costs, but many in this group were perfectly willing to accept a loss to have personal satisfactions. The size of this group is unknown, but almost 2 percent of all heads frankly commented that "farming" was for their own enjoyment. Over half of these reported losses.

However, not all losses were detrimental. Taxes and insurance must be met whether the farm is operated or not. An operation that covered variable operating costs and contributed something toward these expenses might be advantageous when all factors were considered, particularly if the farm provided relatively inexpensive shelter to the household. When subjected to this test, about one-fifth of the loss operations were found to be advantageous.

Detailed farm data for all men showed that for a man who had no occupation other than farming, average gross receipts were $4,440, with a profit ratio of 33.4 percent, while for those who moonlighted as farmers, gross receipts averaged $2,990, with a profit ratio of 19.2 percent. When farming represented a year-round job, the gross was $5,270, for a profit ratio of 31.4 percent. Among farmers with a full-time equivalent of 21 to 47 weeks of farmwork, the gross was $3,060, and for those who farmed for less than 21 weeks, about $275 could be earned from a gross of $1,910. In all cases, profit ratios were pulled down by those with losses.

THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD AS A WORKER

Employment

Under the philosophy which guided the old Poor Laws, it was believed that a man was poor because he would not work and that, therefore, his poverty was

his own fault. During the great depression of the 1930's, it was realized that unemployment was not always the fault of the individual. Unemployment compensation, Social Security, and the Full Employment Act of 1946 have all demonstrated a change in attitude. However, we still hear a great deal about those on welfare who will not work and about the need to provide work incentives. There are unemployables, and some of them are unemployable because they do not want to work. On the other hand, many of the poor are working poor, and those who do not work are frequently handicapped by age, disability, or the demands of young children so that even if they had the skills and jobs were available, they still would be unable to work.

This is very much the situation in the open-country area of the survey. Although 20 percent of all household heads were without jobs when interviewed (appendix table C-10), and nearly half of the deprived heads were not working, many were aged or disabled. Only 15 percent of all nonworking heads, and 13 percent of deprived nonworking heads, were under 65 and not disabled. A few of these had taken early retirement and most of the others were widows. The proportion not working in each group at the date of the interview was as follows:

	Under 65, not disabled	Aged or disabled	Total
	Percent		
All heads	3.9	65.4	19.7
Deprived heads	15.8	71.6	49.0

The implicit unemployment rate for heads is 3.5 percent for all households, and 11.1 percent for poor households when membership in the labor force for heads is defined to include those with jobs plus those under 65 without a serious disability who do not have jobs.

Even among the nondisabled aged, and those under 65 but reporting a serious disability, two out of five had some sort of job, attesting to their desire to be independent. This was true of both the poor and nonpoor. The disabled under 65 who did not work were less prone to poverty than their able-bodied counterparts, probably due to workmen's compensation and other payments they received; but otherwise, working or not, the disabled had a higher incidence of poverty than those of their age group who were not disabled.

Among the working poor, some were poor because their effort was possibly ill-advised and resulted in a loss. Others were poor because wages were not sufficient to raise the household income above the poverty level.

Extent of Employment

Since poverty is defined in terms of income, the extent of employment in the income year is more meaningful than the possession of a job at the date of the interview. Four-fifths of all husbands under 65 who were not seriously disabled (two-thirds of those who were also deprived) worked the equivalent

of a full year or more. 13/ It is not more work but more remunerative work that is needed.

The employment of the head usually provides the basic support of the family, but the difference between being poor or not poor frequently depends upon the total employment effort of the family. Three-quarters of the multi-person families reported the total of a full year's equivalent or more of work for the whole family; 30 percent reported the equivalent of a year and a half (79 weeks) or more.

In all but 12 percent of the families with workers, the head was the principal earner. Rarely was the wife or other relative the principal earner if the head was young and not disabled; but the older the head and the more the disability, the likelier it was that either there would be no earner in the family, or that someone other than the head would be the only or main breadwinner. In 14 percent of the families where the head reported farm self-employment, the wife or other relative was the principal earner.

The question of who is the principal earner is important to the solution of the poverty problem in two ways. First, it may necessitate changing the rules for eligibility or the definition of who is the head of a family, so that families supported by someone other than the head are not inadvertently excluded from a program.

Second, when a healthy head is not the principal earner, careful consideration should be given to the question of whether he is making the best use of the family's resources. It may well be that given his age, health, education, personality, and the state of the labor market, having the husband farm and his wife work elsewhere may be the best solution. However, a farmer may have considerable mechanical skill, and a better understanding of where this skill was in demand might enable him to make use of opportunities as they arise.

Availability of Head or Family Members for More Work

In view of the above, is it realistic to expect the poor to significantly increase their earnings? The answer may be found by evaluating presumed availability for work. Regardless of deprivation status, no family had as many as two not employed or partially employed persons who could be expected in the

---

13/ Weeks actually worked were converted into full-time equivalent weeks by counting a week of full-time work as 1 and a week of less than full-time work as 1/2. Weeks worked on all jobs were added together to give the total for an individual. The totals for all family members were added together to give the total for the family.

face of financial stress, to report for a job. 14/ In about one-eighth of the deprived households, one person could be expected to be available for more work. A few of these were heads of one-person households or female heads of families. Most were wives or young persons under 25 living at home with their parents.

Occupation of the Head

To avoid income maintenance problems, it is not sufficient that a man work an adequate number of full-time equivalent weeks. He must, in addition, be using a skill for which someone is going to pay a reasonable wage. In general, occupations requiring greater skills pay higher wages. Though major occupational classifications are universal in character, lumping together, for instance, the $12,000-a-year salesman with the dime-store clerk, they do provide a crude first approximation of earning potential. For this study, the major occupational classifications were condensed into five skill categories--low, limited, medium, craft, and technical, professional, or managerial (appendix table C-11). 15/ Each individual was rated at the highest skill reported for any job. 16/

Even among those well above the poverty line, relatively few survey heads were technicians or professional men, compared with the Nation as a whole.

14/ Presumed availability for a job in the face of financial stress was determined on the basis of replies to many questions. Persons 16 and over were expected to be available if they were under 60, not disabled, worked less than 40 full-time equivalent weeks in 1966, were not currently employed, not in school or college if under 25, and, if wives, did not have children under 14 or a disabled person in the family. In other words, they were presumed to be available if young and healthy enough, free of family or educational demands, and without steady employment. The inclusion of those excluded above on the basis of education, children 6-14, a disabled person in the family, or a current job added few to the number of husbands or other males over 25 expected to be available, but materially increased the number of women available.

15/ Service workers, laborers (farm and nonfarm), members of the armed forces (thought to be mostly draftees) were arbitrarily rated as having low skills. Clerical and salesworkers were considered to have limited skills. Operatives and nontechnical self-employed were put in the medium category. The skill required for farming was evaluated as limited if the farmer had sales under $8,000 or medium if sales were $8,000-$9,999.

16/ If the results shown in appendix table C-11 are compared with those for other study areas, two points should be remembered: (1) In setting up the classification, it was assumed that the major job would be the one requiring the greatest skill. Where this assumption was not valid, the occupational distribution implied in the table may be different from that shown in tables for other areas. (Occupation for the other three typology studies (15) was defined as the occupation or the job providing the most cash income in the past 2 years.) (2) The 13 percent of total open-country heads who have been excluded because farm sales amounted to $10,000 or more should be added to one of the occupational categories and the percentage distribution recomputed. At the sample level, these number 42 deprived, 34 marginal, and 635 not deprived, for a total of 711 households.

Craftsmen were relatively rare among deprived and marginally deprived heads. However, at just over 40 percent, the proportion of heads who were operatives was very high among those whose economic well-being was marginal or better. Almost half of the poor heads were rated as possessing only limited skills.

In the limited-skill group, about four-fifths of the heads were self-employed farmers--three-fifths had no other occupation. It was this preponderance of farmers, many of them with losses, that is probably the reason for the high incidence of poverty among this group. If those with losses were excluded, it is believed that the decline in incidence of poverty with increase in skill would be uninterrupted.

Nearly half the self-employed farmers were classed in the limited-skill group. About a quarter of these had nonfarm jobs rated as requiring only low or limited skill. About one-third of the farmers had a medium-skill rating--only about 12 percent of them solely on the basis of the farm operation. A craft occupation was reported by 12 percent of the self-employed farmers, and 7 percent held jobs as technicians, professionals, or executives. To put it another way, by definition, none of those rated as having only low skills were farmers, four-fifths of those with limited skills were farmers, and so were a little over a fifth of those in each of the other skill classes.

Education of the Head

Skill is closely associated with education, partly because higher skills frequently require higher education, and partly because education is frequently used as a screening device to determine employability.

Educational attainment in the open-country area of the East North Central States was very much higher than in the other poverty study areas. Even without the farmers who had sales of $10,000 or more, only 14 percent for heads with less than an 8th grade education compared favorably with 31 percent for the Ozarks and 50 percent or more in the Delta and Southeast Coastal Plain (15 and appendix table C-12). At the other end of the scale, 40 percent of survey heads in the East North Central Region finished high school, compared with 14 percent in the Delta, 20 percent in the Southeast Coastal Plain, and 26 percent in the Ozarks. True, grades completed are largely a function of age, and East North Central heads had a younger average age than those in the Delta or Ozarks. But this difference was not enough to account for the difference in overall educational attainment. Part of the difference is related to regional differences in educational opportunity and motivation, both as they relate to quality of education and to employment opportunities that will effectively result from greater educational attainment.

In the East North Central States, younger survey heads had more education than older ones. Furthermore, while a college education provided no guarantee against poverty, it was noticeable that the more education a head had, the less likely it was that he would be poor (appendix table C-12). These two trends are reflected in the averages for the highest grade of schooling completed by heads of households, which were as follows:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Grades			
All heads	11.0	9.6	8.1	9.8
Deprived heads	10.1	7.9	7.2	7.9

HOUSING AND POVERTY

Not only are poor households worse off in the sense that they have less to spend relative to their needs, but they are frequently even worse off than their relative income deprivation status indicates, since their household facilities are less adequate than those enjoyed by the more affluent.

Running Water Inside the House

Deprived households were more likely to be without running water than those which were nonpoor (appendix table C-13). In this respect, survey households in the East North Central Region were better off than those in the other three regions. The percentage without running water inside the house is shown in table 6 for all four areas.

Table 6.--Percent of households without inside running water

Study area	Poor households	Nonpoor households	All households
Mississippi Delta.....	70	16	46
Southeast Coastal Plain...	65	14	39
Ozarks.....	31	11	16
East North Central survey	24	6	8

Source: East North Central States: Survey; others (15).

Substandard Housing

A commonly used measure of housing quality is the standard-substandard classification. To be considered standard, a house must have inside hot running water, a flush toilet, a bathtub or shower, and must not be dilapidated (13, p.2). Eighteen percent of survey houses, classified by plumbing alone, were found to be substandard (appendix table C-14). Forty percent of houses lived in by deprived households were substandard, while only 14 percent of the nonpoor lived in substandard housing. If information on dilapidation had been available in this survey, these proportions would not have been materially increased because 96 percent of substandard housing outside Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the North Central Region were found by the Bureau of the Census in 1960 to be deficient in plumbing (13, appendix table B-1).

Age of House

Two-fifths of the houses in the survey were built before 1901; another fifth before 1930. The average age of houses occupied by nonfarm households

was about 45 years, while houses occupied by farm residents were about 15 years older. While two-fifths of all heads were under 45, these younger heads lived in 63 percent of the new houses built in 1960 or later. They occupied only 32 percent of the older houses built before 1929. The slightly fewer heads aged 45-64 occupied 39 percent of the older houses, but only 28 percent of the newest homes. Aged heads occupied less than half their proportionate share of the houses built since 1959. Half of the houses in which deprived heads lived were built before 1901. Three percent of deprived families lived in mobile homes (appendix table C-14).

The age of a house is often thought to indicate the quality of housing. Among houses built before 1901, one was rated substandard for every three that were standard (table 7). This ratio improved steadily as the date of construction became more recent, and if the head was under age 65. The aged and disabled, through habit, inertia, or lack of resources, more frequently lived in the older houses. Furthermore, the houses in which they lived--old or new--were more likely to be substandard than those of the younger heads. If a house built before 1901 was occupied by a poor family, there was an even chance that it would be substandard.

Table 7.--Ratio of standard to substandard housing by age of house, by age and disability of head of household, open country, East North Central States, 1967

Date built	Household heads		
	Under 65 not disabled	65 and over or disabled	Total
Before 1900	3.6:1	2.2:1	3.0:1
1901-1929	4.6:1	2.8:1	3.9:1
1930-1959	12.9:1	3.7:1	9.1:1
1960-Spring 1967	17.2:1	6.9:1	14.8:1

Some of the substandard housing was of recent construction and was inhabited by families of ample means. This indicates that some people were willing to build and live in a new home that failed to meet minimum standards with regard to toilet and washing facilities, and suggests that in some places the accepted standard of living was low indeed. These families and their poorer neighbors may lack motivation to take advantage of programs designed for their benefit. Special efforts may be required to secure their participation.

Mobile Homes

With high building costs and interest rates, one of the fastest growing forms of housing is mobile homes. In 1967, almost 3 percent of the survey householders lived in mobile homes. For 59 percent of this group, the head was under age 45 (appendix table C-14). 17/

17/ A more detailed report of the characteristics of households living in trailers is in U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 203, "Characteristics of Open Country Mobile Home Residents--East North Central States. 11 pp. Apr. 1971

Because of their restricted living space, mobile homes are most suitable for one- or two-person households or for households with small children. The five most frequent types of householders living in mobile homes, by age of head and size of household were:

Age of head	Number of persons in household	Percent
25-34	4 or more	16.0
65 and over	1	12.2
25-34	3	9.9
Under 25	4 or more	9.2
65 and over	2	7.6
All other types of household		45.1
		100.0

Tenure of Residence

Four-fifths of the survey heads who lived in a house owned their homes; 13 percent paid cash rent and 6 percent lived rent-free. This latter group was composed of 1 percent who got their house as part of their job, 2 percent whose farm rental arrangement included the use of a house, and another 3 percent composed of older persons who had sold their real estate subject to a life tenancy, young people starting out in life in a house belonging to relatives, and poor people permitted to live rent-free in a house that otherwise would have been vacant. 18/

Table 8.--Housing tenure, exclusive of mobile homes, by selected characteristics of head of household, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Characteristics of head	Fully paid for	Partly paid for	Cash rent	Rent free	Total: Percentage	Total: Owned
	Percent					
All heads	44.9	36.1	12.6	6.4	100.0	81.0
Husbands	39.7	40.9	13.6	5.8	100.0	80.7
Other male heads	69.6	10.3	9.0	11.2	100.0	79.8
Female heads	71.9	12.8	6.6	8.7	100.0	84.7
Not disabled:						
Under 45	16.3	54.8	21.7	7.1	100.0	71.2
45-64	52.6	34.3	7.5	5.6	100.0	86.9
Aged or disabled	77.6	10.2	5.7	6.5	100.0	87.8
Deprived heads 1/	60	16	12	13	100	75

1/ Percentages for deprived heads are approximations.

18/ Excluding summer cottages and development housing, 11 percent of the houses identified by the enumerators were vacant.

The percentage of heads who fully owned their homes increased rapidly with age. Among those under 25, only 37 percent fully owned or were buying their homes; this proportion increased with age, so that for the group aged 45-64, as well as for the aged, over four-fifths owned their houses (table 8).

On the average, the proportion (four-fifths) for those owning their homes applied to heads irrespective of marital status. However, only a little over 10 percent of other male heads and female heads (average age about 64) were buying their homes, whereas two-fifths of husbands (average age 48) still had mortgages on their homes (table 8).

Among deprived heads, 13 percent lived rent-free, 12 percent paid a cash rent, and 75 percent owned their houses (16 percent still had a mortgage).

HOMEGROWN FOOD

Farmers often have homegrown food, but to a large extent such production is independent of the availability of farmland. A productive vegetable garden can be maintained on a homesite, even in an urban area. On the other hand, farm families do not eat feed grains or soybeans, which are the most frequently grown crops in the region. Thus, food production for home use involves a special effort aside from normal farming operations. However, farm households do have an advantage when it comes to raising food because of availability of equipment, feedstuff, and space.

In the survey areas, 85 percent of farm households raised some food, compared with only a little over 50 percent of the nonfarm households (appendix table C-16). For all households, age made no difference in the percentage raising food for home consumption:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
All farm households	88.2	84.1	83.7	85.3
All nonfarm households	52.7	50.1	57.7	53.0

Within age groups, it appeared that under age 65, the propensity of all households to raise food for home consumption increased as households became more deprived. However, this was largely the effect of the different weighting of farm-nonfarm households in each group. In fact, the percentage of deprived farm households raising food was practically the same as for all households, thus:

	Under 45	45-64	65 and over	Total
	Percent			
Deprived farm households	88.2	86.8	85.7	86.8
Deprived nonfarm households	59.6	66.7	58.5	60.1

Among the nonfarm group with heads under 45, the slightly higher percentage of deprived than nonpoor households with homegrown food could well be due to chance.

PROFILES OF POVERTY

Twelve percent of survey households were poor. This may be a small proportion, compared with the poverty rate in the Mississippi Delta or some larger cities. However, this represents over half a million people, some 175,600 households averaging 3 persons each--far too large a group to be ignored just because they are spread over a wide area and are not highly visible. Their very dispersion presents problems to the policymaker since they are hard to find, and difficulties with communication and transportation will increase the cost of remedial and ameliorative programs.

Most programs for the urban poor are also appropriate to the open-country poor because their problems are essentially the same, and the urban and open-country poor work side by side on the production line or in trade or service establishments. In fact, most programs for the rural poor would probably have to be located in towns or cities. Such programs can be differentiated in part on the basis of the age and health of the household head. Other types of programs are relevant only to those having land with income-producing potential. The following profiles summarize the characteristics or needs of these major groups.

Deprived Households--Head Aged 65 or Over

Deprived households with heads aged 65 and over constituted 54 percent of all deprived households. In the short run, the major solution to their poverty problem will be ameliorative, consisting of some form of income supplement to their retirement income. The large size of this group was due in part to the fact that during their most remunerative years they were not covered by Social Security. Much of the problem of inadequate retirement funds can be expected to disappear as the systems--both public and private--mature.

The average number of persons in deprived households with heads aged 65 or over was 1.8; 30 percent lived alone (C-3). 19/ In 15 percent of the households, the head was a single male and in 26 percent, a single female (C-2). About 46 percent of deprived aged heads were 75 or over. After age 64, a head has a 21-percent chance of being seriously deprived and a 29 percent chance of being below the poverty line (C-2). In addition to the restraints imposed by age, 35 percent of deprived heads 65 or over reported a serious chronic disability (C-10).

19/ (C-3) identifies the appendix table where this information will be found.

For this group, household income averaged $1,007 (C-4). The largest source of income was public or private transfer payments--93 percent reported an average of $1,056 (C-5). An average of $160 per year from interest, dividends, or private pensions was reported by 49 percent (C-5). Income from their farms was received by 47 percent of the households (C-8) and 19 percent reported a farm loss (C-9), but without income from the farm, the number of deprived households would have been much greater. Much of this farm income was rent rather than earnings--only 21 percent of the heads reported farm self-employment as a 1966 activity (C-8). At the date of the interview, 27 percent said they still had a job (C-10), mostly on their own farms (C-8).

Half the households lived in a house built before 1901 (C-15) and 4 percent lived in mobile homes (C-14). Two-fifths of the houses in which they lived were substandard (C-14).

Deprived Households--Head 45-64

Households with heads 45-64 comprised 27 percent of all poor households and contained 29 percent of all poor persons (C-3). The income maintenance problem for this group is particularly intractable for two reasons: (1) the barriers erected by business and industry to the employment of those over 45 and without a high school education, and (2) the limited employment potential of the heads themselves (also frequently coupled with a high commitment to small-scale farming).

One-fifth of the heads were women, mostly widows (C-2). About one-sixth were seriously disabled and another one-fifth had minor chronic handicaps. 20/ For some in these three groups, ameliorative assistance in the form of transfers in cash or in kind may be the only shortrun solution. However, counseling from specialists in employment, and placement for those with chronic ailments, might have enabled many of the 23 percent of deprived heads aged 45-64 who did not work in 1966 (C-11) to find work and might have directed others to higher paying jobs.

Whether able-bodied or not, most of these heads would benefit from counseling and training. It is not more work but more remunerative work that they need. In many cases it should be possible to adapt a farmer's knowledge of machinery and his ability to talk to farmers to new uses. Many may need to take courses in basic education because 69 percent completed only 8 grades or less (C-12). Others will need to upgrade their occupational skills because 57 percent were working at jobs requiring low or limited skill (C-11).

On the average, household income amounting to only $1,207 (C-4) had to support 3.2 persons (C-3). Though classified as deprived, 57 percent reported no transfer payments in cash, and thus no welfare payments (C-6). Average transfers of $1,142 were received by 43 percent of the deprived households (C-5), but in many cases these represented survivorship payments to mothers or children or the disability payments or retirement incomes of in-laws. Thirty percent of these households had small savings which produced an average income of $314 (C-5).

20/ Estimated from unpublished tabulations and from appendix table C-10.

While 77 percent of the heads worked in 1966 (C-11), 44 percent reported self-employed farming as their major or sole source of earnings (C-8). Sixty-five percent reported some income from the farm (C-9). For 25 percent of poor households, their farm income was a loss; this may have been the main reason for classification as a poor household (C-9). For those with positive income from a farm, farm income averaged 67 percent of all income (C-9). The number of poor households would have been much greater had not many heads in the 45-64 age group used their farm income to supplement their regular earnings.

All lived in houses and none in mobile homes (C-14), but 51 percent of those houses with a known date of construction were built before 1901 (C-15), and 47 percent were substandard (C-14).

Deprived Households--Head Under 45

To a certain extent, poverty problems of households with heads under 45 are self-solving. For a few, losses in getting started will turn to profits, and advancement on the job will result in higher wages. As children get older, wives and widows can join the labor force. However, without assistance, many may not rejoin the mainstream. In addition to counseling and retraining, the major needs for assistance to this group lie in the following areas:

(1) Special programs so that the children of such families may more fully benefit from the basic education program provided by schools.

(2) Assistance in the fields of health and housing. These, also, will be of particular benefit to the young.

(3) The coordination of transportation and day-care facilities with job opportunities so that female heads, wives, and older youth can contribute to the family income.

Though this group is comparatively small, the payoff from assistance, whether remedial or ameliorative, might well be higher than for any other group. Assistance to only 19 percent of all deprived heads will benefit 38 percent of all poor persons (C-3), many of them children whose lifetime potential may be seriously reduced by early deprivation. The youthfulness of this group of heads means not only that they may be more responsive to remedial assistance, but that, if this is successful, the long-term savings in ameliorative assistance will be great indeed.

Seventy-eight percent of the heads under 45 were husbands, and 18 percent were women without a husband (C-2). On the average, a household income of $1,723 (C-4) supported 5.8 persons (C-3). While 93 percent of heads had a job in 1966 (C-11), 96 percent of the households had average earnings of $1,458 (C-5). Twenty-three percent received $160 in interest, dividends, etc. (C-5), some of which may have belonged to parents who had come to live with their children because of ill health or lack of income. Only 28 percent reported any transfer payments, and these averaged $998 (C-5).

Possibly, ill-advised farming operations contributed to the income maintenance problems of many of these deprived households. Farm losses were reported by 31 percent of the households (C-9). However, though 51 percent of

the heads reported utilizing their farmland, only 17 percent reported obtaining their major or sole earnings from the farm (C-8).

While 39 percent of the heads were classified as employed at jobs requiring only low or limited skills in 1966 (C-11), 56 percent of the heads failed to complete high school; 32 percent did not get beyond the 8th grade (C-12).

Nearly 4 percent lived in mobile homes (C-14). One-third of the houses in which they lived were substandard and two-fifths were built before 1901.

Deprived Households with Land--Heads of All Ages

The case of the poor family with land presents the policymaker with a conflict of interests. An economist looking at the problems of agriculture would clearly recommend that the forces of the marketplace should be permitted to drive the submarginal farmer out of production and therefore possibly off the land. The same economist looking at the problem of income for the individual might recommend that the submarginal farmer continue to utilize his farmland even though the return to his labor is below the minimum wage. Or he might recommend a move to the city. Which course represents the best use by the individual of his labor, land, and shelter would depend on the individual's potential and the state of the labor market where he lived and elsewhere.

Economists looking at high unemployment and mounting relief rolls in the city and shrinking demand for goods and services in the countryside might well conclude that everything possible should be done to keep the submarginal farmer in the country. The humanitarian may feel that the nonmarket satisfactions of being employed at a socially accepted task, of contributing to family income, of living among familiar scenes and faces, and of a country life for both parents and children should outweigh the disadvantages of a low return to labor for the individual and the depressing effect on agricultural prices and profits of inefficiently produced crops and livestock. These conflicts underlie all decisions taken with regard to those with usable but limited amounts of land, capital, and, particularly, labor. Explicitly or implicitly, they will be resolved in the decisions taken as to what rules will be made for those with land assets, as to their eligibility for food stamps, the Family Assistance Program, or any of the other remedial or ameliorative programs.

Among the poor households, 52 percent utilized land for agricultural purposes and therefore will be affected by the resolution of these conflicts (C-8). Though the group aged 45-64 had the greatest proportion of deprived heads reporting land utilization, nearly half of the heads with land utilization were 65 years old or over and only a third were aged 45-64.

Only a half of the heads utilizing land derived a profit. (In other words, 23 percent of all deprived heads sustained a loss.) Heads aged 45-64 were the most successful, while the group under 45 had the highest proportion with a loss.

Over 60 percent of heads under 45, or 65 and over, who utilized their land did so to supplement their regular earnings or other sources of income. In contrast, 68 percent of heads aged 45-64 with utilization (44 percent of

all deprived heads in this age group) relied on the farm as the major or sole source of their earnings. This age group constituted nearly half of the deprived heads in this category; a further two-fifths were 65 or over.

Forty-two percent of all survey households had land which they utilized, and for three quarters of these, profit from the farm enabled them to improve their economic well-being, whether below or above the poverty line. Essentially, these open-country heads were no longer farmers. Where skills and accessibility to the labor market enabled them to obtain jobs to cover their basic needs, farm income provided the extras as long as bad luck or bad management did not result in a loss. Even among those with a loss, when all factors were taken into consideration, some were better off than they would have been if they had abandoned the farm or not operated it. In view of this, the question arises: How best could the farm or farming experience be made to contribute to the economic well-being of households owning or renting land that could be used for agricultural production, and particularly to the income maintenance of the 52 percent of deprived households in this category?

Because of the prevalence of losses--44 percent of deprived households utilizing their farms reported losses--many should ask themselves whether they should continue to farm the land, either themselves or under a rental arrangement. The frequency of losses also suggests that simple tests need to be developed whereby losses resulting in (1) "technical" poverty can be distinguished from either (2) temporary need due to crop failure beyond the control of the farmer or (3) losses resulting from operations ill-advisedly undertaken in the belief that farming would be advantageous. Simple rules of thumb will be needed to determine eligibility for programs designed to aid the rural poor.

Many farms are no doubt being run efficiently and are using the latest techniques. However, it is also probably true that many heads need advice not only as to whether to farm but also how to farm. Furthermore, before the needed advice can be given, it is quite probable that at least some farm production research should focus on the question of how small amounts of land, labor, and capital can most efficiently be utilized to supplement regular sources of income. It is the answer to this question which is pertinent to two-thirds of the operators in the East North Central States. Few survey heads have the resources to become large farmers.

Such research may need to be directed not only toward determining for small operations what to produce and how, but also toward the organization whereby production is facilitated. Possibly, many of those with acreage--some of it not utilized--would benefit most from some sort of a clearinghouse that would bring together those looking for land or a partner and those with land to rent, possibly with some labor to go with it. Some households with land were poor because they could find no one to rent their land or with whom they could team up to ensure profitable production. That a head's share of sales is less than $10,000 does not mean that the total size of the operation utilizing the land must necessarily be uneconomic.

For many heads engaged solely in self-employed farming, such an activity may represent the best or only activity possible, given individual potential and local opportunities. There are undoubtedly some, however, who could move into nonfarm employment, thereby improving not only their current position but

also their long-range prospects. This is a particularly important consideration for heads under 45, since their propensity to loss is high and since they are of an age when they can and should be developing alternative skills and establishing themselves in occupations that have a future for persons of their potential. Though less easy to retrain, some effort toward nonfarm employment might well be stimulated even among heads 45-64 because many have 10 to 20 years of working life remaining. What is needed is imaginative counseling that will not regard these men as merely potential farmworkers but will seek to utilize their skills and knowledge in businesses servicing large commercial farms or employing machinery like that with which they are familiar.

LITERATURE CITED

(1) Ashby, Lowell D.
1965. Growth Patterns in Employment by County 1940-50 and 1950-1960, Col. 3 Great Lakes, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, D.C.

(2) Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, D.C.
1952. Census of Agriculture, 1950. Vol. II General Report, Statistics by Subjects.

(3) _____
1961. Census of Agriculture, 1959. Vol. 1. Counties.

(4) _____
1962. Census of Agriculture, 1959. General Report--Vol. II--Statistics by Subjects.

(5) _____
1966. Census of Agriculture, 1964. Statistics by Subject--Vol. II.

(6) _____
1966. Census of Agriculture, 1964. Statistics for the States and Counties--Vol. I.

(7) _____
1953. Census of Population, 1950. Vol. II--Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, United States Summary.

(8) _____
1961. Census of Population, 1960. General Population Characteristics. United States Summary, Final Report PC(1)-1B.

(9) _____
1963. Census of Population, 1960. Detailed Characteristics. United States Summary, Final Report PC(1)-1D.

(10) _____
1967. Current Population Reports, Consumer Income Series. Income in 1966 of Families and Persons in the United States, P60, No. 53.

(11) _____
1969. Current Population Reports, Consumer Income Series. Poverty in the United States, 1959-68, P60, No. 68.

(12) _____
1967. Current Population Reports, Population Estimates. Estimates of the Population of States, July 1, 1966 and 1967, P25, No. 373.

(13) _____
1969. Working Paper Series. Measuring the Quality of Housing, An Appraisal of Census Statistics and Methods, No. 25.

(14) King, A.J. and Jassen, R.J.
1945. Master Sample of Agriculture, Jour. Amer. Statis. Assoc. 40:38-56, Mar.

(15) McCoy, John L.
1970. Rural Poverty in Three Southern Regions. U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. 176, Mar.

(16) Office of Business Economics, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, D.C.
1968. Survey of Current Business. Metropolitan Area Incomes, 1929-66, Aug.

(17) _____
1968. Survey of Current Business. Personal Income and Disposable Income, 1929-68, by States and Regions. Aug.

(18) _____
1968. Survey of Current Business. Personal Income by States and Regions in 1967. Aug.

(19) _____
1969. Survey of Current Business. Personal Income, 1968, and Disposable Income, 1929-68, by States and Regions. Apr.

(20) _____
1969. Survey of Current Business. Total and Per Capita Personal Income by Regions and States, 1968. Aug.

(21) Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C.
1968. Number of Farms and Land in Farms, 1959-68. Sp.Sy.3(1-68).

(22) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
1967. Farm Income Situation. Farm Income State Estimates, 1949-66. U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. 207, Aug.

(23) _____
1969. Farm Income Situation. Farm Income State Estimates, 1949-68. U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. 214, Aug.

APPENDIX A.--RELATIVE INCOME DEPRIVATION CRITERIA

Appendix table A-1.--Relative income deprivation based on the relationship of income to household size, 1966

Household income ranges	1 Seriously deprived	2 Deprived	3 Marginal	4 Probably not deprived	5 Definitely not deprived
	Household size-income class				
$0-$999	2 or more persons	1 person	---	---	---
$1,000-$1,999	5 or more persons	2, 3, or 4 persons	1 person	---	---
$2,000-$2,999	9 or more persons	4-8 persons	2-3 persons	1 person	---
$3,000-$4,999	---	8 or more persons	4-7 persons	2-3 persons	1 person
$5,000-$7,499	---	---	9 or more persons	4-8 persons	1-3 persons
$7,500-$9,999	---	---	---	6 or more persons	1-5 persons
$10,000 or more	---	---	---	9 or more persons	1-8 persons

Source: Developed jointly by agricultural economists and rural sociologists working on related studies in the following regions: Coastal Plain, South Carolina; Delta, Mississippi and Louisiana; Ozarks, Arkansas and Missouri. These categories grew out of the need to define income deprivation more precisely than that provided by income alone and for uniformity in making comparisons of data by regions.

APPENDIX B. CROSS INDEX OF TABLES IN THIS REPORT WITH THOSE IN RURAL POVERTY IN THREE SOUTHERN REGIONS (15)

Appendix table numbers in this report	Subject	Table numbers in other study
C-1	Farm-nonfarm residence	13, 14, 15, 16, 18
C-2	Age and sex of head	6, 10, 11, 12
C-3	Number of persons in household	7, 8, 12
C-4	Size of household income	3
C-5	Sources of income	17
C-6	Transfer income as a proportion of total income	---
C-7,8	Land utilization	---
C-9	Family farm income as a proportion of total income	1/, 19
C-10	Head with job at date of interview	34, 35
C-11	Head by occupational group 1966	15, 16
C-12	Head by highest grade completed	21, 22
C-13	Running water inside house	9
C-14	Quality of housing	---
C-15	Age of house	---
C-16	Homegrown food	5

1/ These two tables may not be comparable, as table 19 is for gross farm income but C-9 is a total of net farm profit or rent before allowance for depreciation plus any wages to family members included in farm expenses.

Appendix Table C-1.--Farm-nonfarm distribution of households at survey level, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967 1/

Part A. All households

Type of residence	Distribution down				Distribution across			
	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total
	Percent				Percent			Nos.
Total: Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---:4,674
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0: ---
Farm households	36.4	30.8	23.2	25.8	17.0	16.0	67.0	100.0:1,207
Nonfarm households	63.6	69.2	76.8	74.2	10.3	12.5	77.2	100.0:3,467

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45				45-64				65 and over			
	Total		Deprived		Total		Deprived		Total		Deprived	
	No.	% down	% of total	% down	Nos.	% down	% of total	% down	Nos.	% down	% of total	% down
Total: Number	1,872	---	108		1,748		151		1,054	---	304	
Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Farm households	382	20.4	13.4	47.2	592	33.9	15.4	60.3	233	22.1	27.0	20.7
Nonfarm households	1,490	79.6	3.8	52.8	1,156	66.1	5.2	39.7	821	77.9	29.4	79.3

1/ This classification conforms to the definition used by the Bureau of the Census for the Decennial Census and the Current Population Surveys.

Appendix Table C-2.--Age, sex, and marital status of heads by relative income deprivation, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All heads

Age, sex, and marital status	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Men	77.4	83.5	93.5	90.3	10.3	12.4	77.3	100.0	4,219
Husbands	64.3	70.4	88.6	83.3	9.3	11.3	79.4	100.0	3,892
Other men	13.1	13.1	4.9	7.0	22.6	25.1	52.3	100.0	327
Women	22.5	16.5	6.5	9.7	27.9	22.6	49.5	100.0	455
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Men:									
Under 25	1.4	3.1	4.3	3.8	3.7	9.9	86.4	100.0	162
25-34	6.2	11.3	19.3	16.9	3.8	8.3	88.0	100.0	715
35-44	12.8	17.0	24.8	22.6	5.0	9.3	84.8	100.0	952
45-54	11.0	14.7	22.0	20.8	5.9	8.8	85.3	100.0	877
55-64	15.8	13.4	17.5	16.9	9.7	9.8	80.4	100.0	711
65-74	26.6	25.0	7.9	12.0	23.0	25.9	51.1	100.0	505
75 and over	25.2	15.5	3.3	7.0	37.0	27.3	35.7	100.0	297
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	10.3	12.4	77.3	100.0	---
Number	436	523	3,260	4,219	---	---	---	---	4,219
Women:									
Under 25	1.6	---	---	.4	100.0	---	---	100.0	2
25-34	4.7	---	0	1.8	75.0	---	25.0	100.0	8
35-44	8.7	2.9	8.4	7.3	33.3	9.1	57.6	100.0	33
45-54	7.1	6.8	16.0	11.4	17.3	13.5	69.2	100.0	52
55-64	16.5	22.3	28.4	23.7	19.4	21.3	59.3	100.0	108
65-74	37.0	34.0	25.3	30.5	33.8	25.2	41.0	100.0	139
75 and over	24.4	34.0	20.9	24.8	27.4	31.0	41.6	100.0	113
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	27.9	22.6	49.5	100.0	---
Number	127	103	225	455	---	---	---	---	455
Average ages 1/									
Men: Mean	61.6	55.4	46.3	49.0	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error	(.8)	(.8)	(.3)	(.2)	---	---	---	---	---
Husbands: Mean	60.3	52.9	45.6	47.8	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error	(.9)	(.8)	(.2)	(.2)	---	---	---	---	---
Other men: Mean	68.1	68.4	59.9	63.9	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error	(1.8)	(1.3)	(1.2)	(.8)	---	---	---	---	---
Women: Mean	64.4	69.6	62.4	64.6	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error	(1.4)	(1.1)	(.9)	(.6)	---	---	---	---	---
Total: Mean	62.3	57.7	47.4	50.6	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error	(.7)	(.7)	(.3)	(.2)	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Men	1,829	97.7	4.9	82.4	1,588	90.8	7.6	80.1	802	76.1	28.2	74.3
Husbands	1,790	95.6	4.7	77.8	1,487	85.1	6.5	64.2	615	58.3	29.4	59.5
Other men	39	2.1	12.8	4.6	101	5.8	23.8	15.9	187	17.7	24.1	14.8
Women	43	2.3	44.2	17.6	160	9.2	18.8	19.9	252	23.9	31.0	25.7
Total: Percent		100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	

1/ Standard errors computed as for a pure random sample are understated due to sample design.

Appendix Table C-3.--Size of household by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All households

Size of household	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
1 Person	18.6	22.7	5.4	9.3	24.2	32.7	43.1	100.0	434
2 Persons	48.0	33.1	27.7	30.9	18.7	14.3	67.0	100.0	1,444
3 Persons	7.3	5.1	19.1	15.8	5.5	4.3	90.1	100.0	739
4 Persons	8.0	13.9	17.0	15.5	6.2	12.0	81.8	100.0	724
5 Persons	5.5	10.1	13.8	12.3	5.4	10.9	83.7	100.0	576
6 Persons	3.0	4.6	8.4	7.2	5.0	8.6	86.4	100.0	337
7 Persons	2.3	4.8	4.4	4.2	6.6	15.2	78.2	100.0	197
8 Persons or more	7.3	5.8	4.2	4.8	18.4	16.1	65.5	100.0	223
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Numbers	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Average number of persons	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.6	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error of average 1/	.1	.1	2/	2/	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
1 Person	11	0.6	18.2	1.8	121	6.9	10.7	8.6	302	28.7	29.8	29.6
2 Persons	156	8.3	5.1	7.4	670	38.3	10.3	45.7	618	58.6	31.2	63.5
3 Persons	287	15.3	2.4	6.5	355	20.3	4.2	9.9	97	9.2	19.6	6.3
4 Persons	448	23.9	4.9	20.4	261	14.9	8.4	14.6	15	1.4	6.7	.3
5 Persons	412	22.0	3.9	14.8	150	8.6	9.3	9.3	14	1.3	7.1	.3
6 Persons	248	13.2	4.4	10.2	88	5.0	6.8	4.0	1	.1	---	---
7 Persons	151	8.1	6.0	8.3	41	2.3	9.8	2.6	5	.5	---	---
8 Persons or more	159	8.5	20.8	30.6	62	3.6	12.9	5.3	2	.2	---	---
Total: Percent		100.0	5.8	100.0		100.0	8.6	100.0		100.0	28.8	100.0
Numbers	1,872		108		1,748		151		1,054		304	
Average number of persons	4.8		5.8		3.2		3.2		1.9		1.8	
Standard error of average 1/	2/		.2		2/		.2		2/		2/	

1/ Standard error was computed as for a pure random sample and is therefore understated

2/ Less than 0.05.

Appendix Table C-4.--Households by size of household income, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1966

Part A. All households

Size of household income	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Loss	8.2	---	---	1.0	100.0	---	---	100.0	46
$1- $999	33.9	---	---	4.1	100.0	---	---	100.0	191
1,000-1,999	44.0	22.7	---	8.3	63.6	36.4	---	100.0	390
2,000-2,999	9.8	38.2	2.3	8.0	14.7	63.9	21.4	100.0	374
3,000-3,999	.9	13.6	8.5	8.2	1.3	22.1	76.6	100.0	385
4,000-4,999	3.2	19.8	5.9	7.4	5.2	35.8	59.0	100.0	346
5,000-5,999	---	2.4	12.3	9.5	---	3.4	96.6	100.0	444
6,000-6,999	---	2.1	13.3	10.2	---	2.7	97.3	100.0	476
7,000-7,999	---	1.3	12.8	9.7	---	1.8	98.2	100.0	455
8,000-8,999	---	---	10.8	8.0	---	---	100.0	100.0	375
9,000-9,999	---	---	8.2	6.1	---	---	100.0	100.0	287
10,000-14,999	---	---	19.9	14.8	---	---	100.0	100.0	693
15,000-19,999	---	---	4.7	3.5	---	---	100.0	100.0	163
20,000-24,999	---	---	.8	.6	---	---	100.0	100.0	27
25,000-49,999	---	---	.5	.4	---	---	100.0	100.0	19
50,000 and over	---	---	.1	.1	---	---	100.0	100.0	3
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Average income: dollars	1,198	2,960	8,308	6,734	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error: dollars 1/	(54)	(54)	(74)	(69)	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Loss	15	.8	100.0	13.9	19	1.1	100.0	12.6	12	1.1	100.0	3.9
$1- $999	13	.7	100.0	12.0	37	2.1	100.0	24.5	141	13.4	100.0	46.4
1,000-1,999	30	1.6	100.0	27.8	96	5.5	70.8	45.0	264	25.0	56.8	49.3
2,000-2,999	51	2.7	66.7	31.5	114	6.5	17.5	13.2	209	19.8	.5	.3
3,000-3,999	78	4.2	5.1	3.7	149	8.5	.7	.7	158	15.0	---	---
4,000-4,999	125	6.7	9.6	11.1	160	9.2	3.8	4.0	61	5.8	---	---
5,000-5,999	219	11.7	---	---	172	9.8	---	---	53	5.0	---	---
6,000-6,999	274	14.6	---	---	165	9.4	---	---	37	3.5	---	---
7,000-7,999	274	14.6	---	---	151	8.6	---	---	30	2.9	---	---
8,000-8,999	202	10.8	---	---	143	8.2	---	---	30	2.9	---	---
9,000-9,999	151	8.1	---	---	121	6.9	---	---	15	1.4	---	---
10,000-14,999	351	18.8	---	---	308	17.6	---	---	34	3.2	---	---
15,000-19,999	62	3.3	---	---	95	5.4	---	---	6	.6	---	---
20,000-24,999	12	.6	---	---	15	.9	---	---	---	---	---	---
25,000-49,999	14	.7	---	---	3	.2	---	---	2	.2	---	---
50,000 and over	1	.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	.2	---	---
Total: Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
Average income: dollars	8,066	---	1,723		7,308	---	1,207		3,426	---	1,007	
Standard error: dollars 1/	107	---	175		106	---	114		115	---	52	

1/ Standard errors computed as for a pure random sample are understated due to sample design.

Appendix Table C-5.--Specified types of income by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1966 1/

Part A. All households

Specified type of income	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Earnings in relation to family farm:									
No earnings at all	41.9	32.7	5.2	13.3	38.0	33.0	29.0	100.0	621
And no income from family farm	27.4	19.0	1.6	7.0	46.8	36.2	17.0	100.0	329
But income from family farm	14.6	13.7	3.6	6.2	28.1	29.5	42.5	100.0	292
With earnings	58.1	67.3	94.8	86.7	8.1	10.4	81.5	100.0	4,053
But not from family farm	20.1	33.4	58.7	50.7	4.8	8.8	86.4	100.0	2,368
Some or all from family farm	38.0	33.9	36.1	36.0	12.7	12.6	74.7	100.0	1,685
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
With income from property	38.7	42.8	41.9	41.6	11.2	13.8	75.0	100.0	1,945
With income from transfers	67.1	62.8	33.4	41.4	10.5	20.3	69.2	100.0	1,935
Specified averages for those with:									
Earnings: dollars	777	2,485	7,885	7,689	---	---	---	---	---
Property income: dollars	192	648	1,118	950	---	---	---	---	---
Transfers: dollars	1,066	1,347	1,241	1,229	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Earnings in relation to family farm:												
No earnings at all	7	.4	57.1	3.7	72	4.1	34.7	16.6	542	51.4	38.2	68.1
And no income from family farm	6	.3	66.7	3.7	42	2.4	40.5	11.3	281	26.7	47.3	43.8
But income from family farm	1	.1	0	0	30	1.7	26.7	5.3	261	24.7	28.4	24.3
With earnings	1,865	99.6	5.6	96.3	1,676	95.9	7.5	83.4	512	48.6	18.9	31.9
But not from family farm	1,350	72.1	3.6	45.4	855	48.9	4.2	23.8	163	15.5	17.2	9.2
Some or all from family farm	515	27.5	10.7	50.9	821	47.0	11.0	59.6	349	33.1	19.8	22.7
Total: Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
With income from property	484	25.9	5.2	23.1	756	43.2	6.0	29.8	705	66.9	21.0	48.7
With income from transfers	428	22.9	7.0	27.8	520	29.7	12.5	43.0	987	93.6	28.7	93.1
Specified averages for those with:												
Earnings: dollars	7,817	---	1,458		6,924	---	777	---	2,602	---	45	---
Property income: dollars	450	---	160		801	---	314	---	1,452	---	160	---
Transfers: dollars	698	---	298		1,166	---	1,142	---	1,422	---	1,056	---

1/ Frequencies and averages pertain to the specified income of the consumer unit to which the head of the household belonged.

Appendix Table C-6.--Households with transfers and by ratio of transfer income to total income, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country **survey area, East North Central States, 1966** 1/

Part **A.** All households

Transfer status and size of ratio	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Total: Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
No transfers	32.9	37.2	66.6	58.6	6.8	8.5	84.7	100.0	2,739
With transfers	67.1	62.8	33.4	41.4	19.5	20.3	60.2	100.0	1,935
Total income is negative	2.1	---	---	.3	100.0	---	---	100.0	12
Total income is positive	65.0	62.8	33.4	41.1	19.0	20.4	60.5	100.0	1,923
Under 0.10	2.5	4.5	13.9	11.3	2.7	5.3	92.0	100.0	527
0.10-.24	1.4	5.0	8.3	7.0	2.5	9.5	88.1	100.0	327
0.25-.49	7.1	11.2	6.1	6.9	12.3	21.6	66.0	100.0	324
0.50-.74	7.6	16.0	2.7	5.0	18.2	42.4	39.4	100.0	236
0.75-.99	14.4	10.1	1.7	4.4	39.7	30.9	29.4	100.0	204
1.00	23.4	14.5	.6	5.2	54.1	37.3	8.6	100.0	244
1.01 and over	8.5	1.6	.1	1.3	78.7	16.4	4.9	100.0	61

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Total: Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
Percent		100.0	5.8	100.0		100.0	8.6	100.0		100.0	28.8	100.0
No transfers	1,444	77.1	5.4	72.2	1,228	70.3	7.0	57.0	67	6.4	31.3	6.9
With transfers	428	22.9	7.0	27.8	520	29.7	12.5	43.0	987	93.6	28.7	93.1
Total income is negative	4	.2	100.0	3.7	1	.1	100.0	.7	7	.7	100.0	2.3
Total income is positive	424	22.6	6.1	24.1	519	29.7	12.3	42.4	980	93.0	28.2	90.8
Under 0.10	298	15.9	3.0	8.3	196	11.2	2.6	3.3	33	3.1	0	0
0.10-.24	78	4.2	3.8	2.8	125	7.2	0	0	124	11.8	4.0	1.6
0.25-.49	22	1.2	13.6	2.8	82	4.7	23.2	12.6	220	20.9	8.2	5.9
0.50-.74	11	.6	18.2	1.9	49	2.8	18.4	6.0	176	16.7	18.2	10.5
0.75-.99	9	.5	55.6	4.6	20	1.1	35.0	4.6	175	16.6	39.4	22.7
1.00	4	.2	50.0	1.9	40	2.3	47.5	12.6	200	19.0	55.5	36.5
1.01 and over	2	.1	100.0	1.9	7	.4	71.4	3.3	52	4.9	78.8	13.5

1/ The transfers and total income are those of the consumer unit whose head is also a household head.

Appendix Table C-7.--Land utilization of the head by relative income deprivation and size of farm sales in the open-country at population level, East North Central States, 1967

Land utilization	Distribution down				Distribution across				
	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total	
	Percent				Percent				Nos.
Total open country									
Total: Number	188,700	205,900	1,285,400	1,680,000	---	---	---	---	1,680,000
Percent 1/	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	11.2	12.3	76.5	100.0	---
Without land	28.5	35.2	33.5	33.1	9.6	13.0	77.3	100.0	556,600
With land	71.6	64.8	66.5	66.9	12.0	11.9	76.1	100.0	1,123,400
Not utilized	15.9	14.9	17.8	17.2	10.4	10.6	79.1	100.0	289,200
Utilized	55.7	50.0	48.7	49.7	12.6	12.3	75.1	100.0	834,200
Income is not earnings	16.9	17.4	13.8	14.6	13.0	14.6	72.4	100.0	245,500
Income is earnings	38.8	32.6	34.9	35.0	12.5	11.4	76.2	100.0	588,700
Heads with farm sales of $10,000 or more whose farm income is earnings	6.9	5.1	15.4	13.2	---	---	---	100.0	221,800
Survey heads:									
Total	93.1	94.9	84.6	86.8	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	1,458,200
Without land	28.5	35.2	33.5	33.1	9.6	13.0	77.4	100.0	556,600
With land	64.7	59.7	51.1	53.7	13.5	13.6	72.8	100.0	901,600
Not utilized	15.9	14.9	17.8	17.2	10.4	10.6	79.1	100.0	289,200
Utilized	48.8	44.8	33.3	36.5	15.0	15.1	69.9	100.0	612,400
Income is not earnings	16.9	17.4	13.8	14.6	13.0	14.6	72.4	100.0	245,500
Income is earnings	31.9	27.4	19.5	21.8	16.4	15.4	68.2	100.0	366,900
Minor source of earnings	8.6	10.0	12.6	11.8	8.2	10.3	81.5	100.0	199,000
Major or sole source of earnings	23.3	17.4	6.8	10.0	26.2	21.4	52.4	100.0	167,900

1/ **Percentages were taken from unrounded data.**

Appendix Table C-8.--Land utilization of the head by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All heads

Land utilization	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Total: Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Without land	30.6	37.1	39.6	38.2	9.6	13.0	77.4	100.0	1,784
With land	69.4	62.9	60.4	61.8	13.5	13.6	72.8	100.0	2,890
Not utilized	17.1	15.7	21.0	19.8	10.4	10.6	79.1	100.0	927
Utilized	52.4	47.3	39.4	42.0	15.0	15.1	69.9	100.0	1,963
Income is not earnings	18.1	18.4	16.4	16.8	13.0	14.6	72.4	100.0	787
Income is earnings	34.3	28.9	23.0	25.2	16.4	15.4	68.2	100.0	1,176
Minor source of earnings	9.2	10.5	14.9	13.6	8.2	10.3	81.5	100.0	638
Major or sole source of earnings	25.0	18.4	8.1	11.5	26.2	21.4	52.4	100.0	538

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Total: Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Without land	979	52.3	3.7	33.3	552	31.6	7.6	27.8	253	24.0	37.2	30.9
With land	893	47.7	8.1	66.7	1,196	68.4	9.1	72.2	801	76.0	26.2	69.1
Not utilized	382	20.4	4.5	15.7	350	20.0	3.1	7.3	195	18.5	34.9	22.4
Utilized	511	27.3	10.8	50.9	846	48.4	11.6	64.9	606	57.5	23.4	46.7
Income is not earnings	146	7.8	6.2	8.3	267	15.3	5.2	9.3	374	35.5	21.1	26.0
Income is earnings	365	19.5	12.6	42.6	579	33.1	14.5	55.6	232	22.0	27.2	20.7
Minor source of earnings	290	15.5	9.7	25.9	321	18.4	5.3	11.3	27	2.6	25.9	2.3
Major or sole source of earnings	75	4.0	24.0	16.7	258	14.8	26.0	44.4	205	19.4	27.3	18.4

Appendix Table C-9.--Households by ratio of family farm income to total income, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1966 1/

Part A. All households

Family farm and total income status and size of ratio	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Total: Numbers	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Family farm income: none	47.4	52.4	60.3	57.7	9.9	12.2	77.9	100.0	2,697
loss	23.3	10.1	9.9	11.5	24.3	11.7	64.0	100.0	539
profit	29.3	37.5	29.8	30.8	11.5	16.3	72.2	100.0	1,438
Total income: negative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
positive	29.3	37.5	29.8	30.8	11.5	16.3	72.2	100.0	1,438
Ratio: Under 0.10	6.7	7.0	10.0	9.2	8.8	10.2	81.0	100.0	431
0.10-.24	5.7	7.2	7.1	7.0	9.8	13.8	76.4	100.0	326
0.25-.49	6.2	10.5	5.9	6.5	11.5	21.6	66.9	100.0	305
0.50-.74	2.3	5.8	3.8	3.9	7.2	20.0	72.8	100.0	180
0.75-.99	2.8	3.5	2.2	2.5	13.9	19.1	67.0	100.0	115
1.00	5.5	3.5	.8	1.7	38.2	27.2	34.6	100.0	81
1.01 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratio for those with family farm profit:									
Mean	.37	.41	.28	.33	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error 2/	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Total: Numbers	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
Percent		100.0	5.8	100.0		100.0	8.6	100.0		100.0	28.8	100.0
Family farm income: none	1,356	72.4	3.9	49.1	897	51.3	5.9	35.1	444	42.1	36.3	53.0
loss	210	11.2	16.2	31.5	219	12.5	17.4	25.2	110	10.4	53.6	19.4
profit	306	16.3	6.9	19.4	632	36.2	9.5	39.7	500	47.4	16.8	27.6
Total income: negative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
positive	306	16.3	6.9	19.4	632	36.2	9.5	39.7	500	47.4	16.8	27.6
Ratio: Under 0.10	138	7.4	4.3	5.6	201	11.5	2.5	3.3	92	8.7	29.3	8.9
0.10-.24	71	3.8	2.8	1.9	141	8.1	2.8	2.6	114	10.8	22.8	8.6
0.25-.49	38	2.0	7.9	2.8	119	6.8	9.2	7.3	148	14.0	14.2	6.9
0.50-.74	19	1.0	5.3	.9	57	3.3	15.8	6.0	104	9.9	2.9	1.0
0.75-.99	24	1.3	8.3	1.9	57	3.3	22.8	8.6	34	3.2	2.9	.3
1.00	16	.9	43.8	6.5	57	3.3	31.6	11.9	8	.8	75.0	2.9
1.01 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratio for those with family farm profit:												
Mean	.26	---	.54		.34	---	.67		.35	---	.25	
Standard error 2/	.02	---	.09		.01	---	.04		.01	---	.03	

1/ Family farm income and total income is that of the consumer unit to which the head of household belonged.
2/ Standard errors computed as for a pure random sample are understated due to sample design.

Appendix Table C-10.--Heads reporting job at time of interview by age and disability status, by relative income deprivation, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Job, age and disability status	Distribution down				Distribution across				
	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total	Deprived	Marginal	Not deprived	Total	
	Percent				Percent				Nos.
With job 1/	51.0	62.0	88.3	80.3	7.6	10.3	82.0	100.0	3,753
Not disabled:									
Under 45	16.3	25.4	45.1	39.0	5.1	8.7	86.2	100.0	1,821
45-64	17.8	22.2	36.7	32.5	6.6	9.2	84.2	100.0	1,517
65 and over	12.1	11.0	4.9	6.6	22.1	22.5	55.4	100.0	307
Disabled:									
Under 65	2.3	1.4	1.3	1.4	19.7	13.6	66.7	100.0	66
65 and over	2.5	1.9	.5	.9	33.3	28.6	38.1	100.0	42
Without job	49.0	38.0	11.7	19.7	30.0	25.8	44.2	100.0	921
Not disabled:									
Under 45	1.2	.3	.6	.6	24.1	6.9	69.0	100.0	29
45-64	5.2	2.4	1.8	2.3	27.4	14.2	58.5	100.0	106
65 and over	23.3	22.4	6.2	10.4	26.8	28.7	44.5	100.0	488
Disabled:									
Under 65	3.2	3.2	1.2	1.7	22.2	24.7	53.1	100.0	81
65 and over	16.2	9.7	1.9	4.6	41.9	28.1	30.0	100.0	217
Total: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

1/ Some persons who had seasonal jobs or were on layoff said they still had the job though they were not working at the time of the interview.

Appendix Table C-11.--1966 occupational skill index of heads, by relative income deprivation, by age, open-country survey area, East North Central States 1/

Part A. All heads

Occupational skill index	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Low skill	16.8	17.3	9.1	10.5	12.5	17.2	70.3	100.0	407
Limited skill	48.5	27.5	13.7	17.9	21.2	16.0	62.7	100.0	692
Medium skill	27.7	43.1	43.0	41.8	5.2	10.8	84.1	100.0	1,618
Craftsmen	5.9	8.7	23.1	20.2	2.3	4.5	93.2	100.0	783
Technicians, professional employees or self-employed, **managers, or officials**	1.0	3.5	11.1	9.5	.8	3.8	95.4	100.0	368
Total with skill known: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	7.8	10.4	81.7	100.0	---
Numbers	303	404	3,161	3,868	---	---	---	---	3,868
Others 2/	---	---	---	---	32.3	27.5	40.2	100.0	806
Total all heads: Percent	---	---	---	---	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Numbers	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

Part B. By age group

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Low skill	165	8.8	10.3	17.0	180	11.1	13.3	20.7	62	15.9	16.1	11.5
Limited skill	171	9.2	14.6	25.0	316	19.5	19.6	53.4	205	52.4	29.3	69.0
Medium skill	840	45.3	5.1	43.0	711	43.9	4.1	25.0	67	17.1	17.9	13.8
Craftsmen	484	26.1	2.7	13.0	277	17.1	.4	.9	22	5.6	18.2	4.6
Technicians, professional employees or self-employed, **managers, or officials**	196	10.6	1.0	2.0	137	8.5	---	---	35	9.0	2.9	1.1
Total with skill known: Percent	---	100.0	5.4	100.0	---	100.0	7.2	100.0	---	100.0	22.3	100.0
Numbers	1,856	---	100		1,621	---	116		391	---	87	
Others 2/	16	---	50.0	---	127	---	27.6	---	663	---	32.7	---
Total all heads: Percent	---	---	5.8	---	---	---	8.6	---	---	---	28.8	---
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	

1/ **Each of the jobs described, up to four, was given an occupational code. The highest code reported constituted the Occupational** Skill Index. Low=service workers, laborers, armed forces; Limited=clerical and sales workers; Medium=operatives, nonfarm nontechnical self-employed. Self-employed farmers were rated as limited if sales were under $8,000 or medium if sales were $8,000-$9,999.

2/ Others consist mostly of those without a job in 1966, particularly female heads. In a very few cases, occupation was unknown.

Appendix Table C-12.--Highest grade of schooling completed by head, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, Spring 1967

Part A. All Heads

Highest grade completed	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Total: Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
0 grades 1/	1.1	1.6	.3	.5	24.0	40.0	36.0	100.0	25
1-7 grades	29.1	24.1	8.8	13.3	26.4	24.3	49.4	100.0	622
8 grades	41.7	37.7	23.3	27.5	18.3	18.4	63.3	100.0	1,284
9-11 grades	12.3	13.6	20.7	18.8	7.9	9.7	82.4	100.0	877
12 grades: High school graduate	12.8	18.7	35.2	30.3	5.1	8.3	86.7	100.0	1,417
13-15: College, did not graduate	2.1	3.7	6.9	5.9	4.3	8.3	87.4	100.0	277
16: College graduate	.9	.3	2.9	2.3	4.7	1.9	93.5	100.0	107
17: Some postgraduate work	0.0	.3	1.8	1.4	---	3.1	96.9	100.0	65
Highest grade completed									
Mean	7.9	8.4	10.4	9.8	---	---	---	---	---
Standard error 2/	(.1)	(.1)	3/	3/	---	---	---	---	---

Part B. By age group

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Total: Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	
Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
0 grades 1/	4	.2	---	---	7	.4	14.3	.7	14	1.3	35.7	1.6
1-7 grades	80	4.3	18.8	13.8	242	13.8	18.6	29.8	300	28.5	34.7	34.2
8 grades	234	12.5	8.5	18.5	570	32.6	10.2	38.4	480	45.5	32.7	51.6
9-11 grades	445	23.8	5.6	23.1	338	19.3	8.6	19.2	94	8.9	16.0	4.9
12 grades: High school graduate	896	47.9	4.5	37.0	445	25.5	3.6	10.6	76	7.2	21.1	5.3
13-15: College, did not graduate	127	6.8	4.7	5.6	100	5.7	1.0	.7	50	4.7	10.0	1.6
16: College graduate	61	3.3	3.3	1.9	20	1.1	5.0	.7	26	2.5	7.7	.7
17: Some postgraduate work	25	1.3	---	---	26	1.5	---	---	14	1.3	---	---
Highest grade completed												
Mean	11.0	---	10.1		9.6	---	7.9		8.1	---	7.2	
Standard error 2/	(.1)		(.3)		(.1)		(.2)		(.1)		(.2)	

1/ Mostly defective replies, including uncoded foreign schooling. Very few had no education.
2/ Standard errors computed as for a pure random sample are understated due to sample design.
3/ Less than 0.05.

Appendix Table C-13.--Availability of water, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All households

Availability of water	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Inside piped hot and cold water.....	66.5	76.4	91.9	86.8	9.2	11.7	79.1	100.0	3,896
Inside piped cold water only.....	10.1	8.0	3.9	5.2	23.1	20.5	56.4	100.0	234
Outside pumped cold water only.....	11.7	9.0	2.6	4.5	31.0	26.6	42.4	100.0	203
No pumped water.....	11.7	6.5	1.6	3.5	40.6	25.2	34.2	100.0	155
Known water availability: Percent...	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.3	74.7	100.0	---
Number....	537	598	3,353	4,488	---	---	---	---	4,488
Unknown water availability.....	---	---	---	---	22.0	17.1	61.0	100.0	41
Unknown: Other 1/.....	---	---	---	---	11.7	14.5	73.8	100.0	145
All households: Percent.....	---	---	---	---	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number.....	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

Part B. By age of head

Availability of water	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Inside piped hot and cold water.....	1,629	91.7	4.7	73.8	1,485	87.3	6.1	60.4	782	77.5	24.4	67.0
Inside piped cold water only.....	77	4.3	10.4	7.8	77	4.5	16.9	8.7	80	7.9	41.2	11.6
Outside pumped cold water only.....	39	2.2	23.1	8.7	78	4.6	26.9	14.1	86	8.5	38.4	11.6
No pumped water.....	32	1.8	31.2	9.7	62	3.6	40.3	16.8	61	6.0	45.9	9.8
Known water availability: Percent...	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.8	100.0	---	100.0	28.2	100.0
Number....	1,777	---	103		1,702	---	149		1,009	---	285	
Unknown water availability.....	14	---	7.1	---	13	---	15.4	---	14	---	42.9	---
Unknown: Other 1/	81	---	4.9	---	33	---	---	---	31	---	41.9	---
Total: Percent.....	---	---	5.8	---	----	---	8.6	---	---	---	28.8	---
Number.....	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	

1/ Defective replies to housing section (14). Availability of water not obtained when respondent lived in a mobile home (131).

Appendix Table C-14.--Quality of house and type of residence by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All households

Quality of house and type of residence	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Standard quality	59.7	67.6	88.7	82.4	8.7	11.0	80.3	100.0	3,721
Substandard quality	40.3	32.4	11.3	17.6	27.6	24.7	47.7	100.0	794
Total known quality: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	543	605	3,367	4,515	---	---	---	---	4,515
Unknown quality	---	---	---	---	21.4	---	78.6	100.0	14
Unknown whether house or mobile home	---	---	---	---	14.3	---	85.7	100.0	14
Lived in mobile home	---	---	---	---	11.5	16.0	72.5	100.0	131
All households: Percent	---	---	---	---	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Standard quality	1,569	87.8	4.3	65.4	1,412	82.6	5.7	53.0	740	72.6	23.8	61.1
Substandard quality	217	12.2	16.6	34.6	298	17.4	23.8	47.0	279	27.4	40.1	38.9
Total known quality: Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.8	100.0	---	100.0	28.3	100.0
Number	1,786	---	104		1,710	---	151		1,019	---	288	
Unknown quality	5	---	---	---	5	---	---	---	4	---	75.0	---
Unknown whether house or mobile home	4	---	---	---	7	---	---	---	3	---	66.7	---
Lived in mobile home	77	---	5.2	---	26	---	---	---	28	---	39.3	---
All households: Percent	---	---	5.8	---	---	---	8.6	---	---	---	28.8	---
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	

Appendix Table C-15.--Age of house by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1967

Part A. All households

Year house was built	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
1900 or before	50.2	49.2	33.0	37.2	16.0	17.5	66.5	100.0	1,655
1901 - 1929	26.8	24.9	19.4	21.0	15.1	15.6	69.3	100.0	934
1930 - 1939	4.3	5.6	6.0	5.8	9.0	12.9	78.1	100.0	256
1940 - 1949	5.3	5.5	8.2	7.5	8.4	9.6	82.0	100.0	334
1950 - 1959	8.7	9.2	18.4	16.1	6.4	7.6	86.0	100.0	715
1960 - Spring, 1967	4.6	5.6	15.0	12.5	4.3	5.9	89.7	100.0	556
Total with known date: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	11.8	13.2	75.0	100.0	---
Number 1/	527	587	3,336	4,450	---	---	---	---	4,450
Unknown: Date	---	---	---	---	24.1	22.8	53.2	100.0	79
Unknown: Other 2/	---	---	---	---	11.7	14.5	73.8	100.0	145
All residences: Percent	---	---	---	---	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

Part B. By age of head

	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
1900 or before	489	27.8	8.4	41.8	666	39.5	11.0	51.0	500	49.5	30.2	52.8
1901 - 1929	335	19.1	10.1	34.7	353	21.0	11.9	29.4	246	24.4	26.4	22.7
1930 - 1939	111	6.3	2.7	3.1	82	4.9	4.9	2.8	63	6.2	25.4	5.6
1940 - 1949	116	6.6	5.2	6.1	166	9.8	5.4	6.3	52	5.1	25.0	4.5
1950 - 1959	352	20.0	2.0	7.1	261	15.5	4.2	7.7	102	10.1	27.5	9.8
1960 - Spring, 1967	353	20.1	2.0	7.1	156	9.3	2.6	2.8	47	4.7	27.7	4.5
Total with known date: Percent	---	100.0	5.6	100.0	---	100.0	8.5	100.0	---	100.0	28.3	100.0
Number	1,756	---	98		1,684	---	143		1,010	---	286	
Unknown: Date	35	---	17.1	---	31	---	25.8	---	13	---	38.5	---
Unknown: Other 2/	81	---	4.9	---	33	---	---	---	31	---	41.9	---
All residences: Percent	---	---	5.8	---	---	---	8.6	---	---	---	28.8	---
Number	1,872	---	108		1,748	---	151		1,054	---	304	

1/ Total effective answers about age of house from those reporting they lived in a house or place of business.
2/ Mobile homes (131), defective replies to housing section (14).

Appendix Table C-16.--Production of home grown food by farm and nonfarm status, by relative income deprivation, by age of head, open-country survey area, East North Central States, 1966

Part A. All households

Production and type of household status	Distribution down: Deprived	Distribution down: Marginal	Distribution down: Not deprived	Distribution down: Total	Distribution across: Deprived	Distribution across: Marginal	Distribution across: Not deprived	Distribution across: Total	Nos.
	Percent				Percent				
Farm households:									
No homegrown food	13.2	11.9	15.7	14.7	15.3	13.0	71.8	100.0	177
Some homegrown food	86.8	88.1	84.3	85.3	17.3	16.5	66.2	100.0	1,030
All farm households: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	17.0	16.0	67.0	100.0	---
Number	205	193	809	1,207	---	---	---	---	1,207
Nonfarm households:									
No homegrown food	39.9	44.3	48.4	47.0	8.8	11.8	79.4	100.0	1,629
Some homegrown food	60.1	55.7	51.6	53.0	11.7	13.1	75.2	100.0	1,838
All nonfarm households: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	10.3	12.5	77.2	100.0	---
Number	358	433	2,676	3,467	---	---	---	---	3,467
All households:									
No homegrown food	30.2	34.3	40.8	38.6	9.4	11.9	78.7	100.0	1,806
Some homegrown food	69.8	65.7	59.2	61.4	13.7	14.3	72.0	100.0	2,868
All farm households: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.0	13.4	74.6	100.0	---
Number	563	626	3,485	4,674	---	---	---	---	4,674

Part B. By age of head

Production and type of household status	Under 45: Total Nos.	Under 45: Total % down	Under 45: Deprived % of total	Under 45: Deprived % down	45-64: Total Nos.	45-64: Total % down	45-64: Deprived % of total	45-64: Deprived % down	65 and over: Total Nos.	65 and over: Total % down	65 and over: Deprived % of total	65 and over: Deprived % down
Farm households:												
No homegrown food	45	11.8	13.3	11.8	94	15.9	12.8	13.2	38	16.3	23.7	14.3
Some homegrown food	337	88.2	13.4	88.2	498	84.1	15.9	86.8	195	83.7	27.7	85.7
All farm households: Percent	---	100.0	13.4	100.0	---	100.0	15.4	100.0	---	100.0	27.0	100.0
Number	382		51		592		91		233		63	
Nonfarm households:												
No homegrown food	705	47.3	3.3	40.4	577	49.9	3.5	33.3	347	42.3	28.8	41.5
Some homegrown food	785	52.7	4.3	59.6	579	50.1	6.9	66.7	474	57.7	29.7	58.5
All farm households: Percent	---	100.0	3.8	100.0	---	100.0	5.2	100.0	---	100.0	29.4	100.0
Number	1,490		57		1,156		60		821		241	
All households:												
No homegrown food	750	40.1	3.9	26.9	671	38.4	4.8	21.2	385	36.5	28.3	35.9
Some homegrown food	1,122	59.9	7.0	73.1	1,077	61.6	11.0	78.8	669	63.5	29.1	64.1
All farm households: Percent	---	100.0	5.8	100.0	---	100.0	8.6	100.0	---	100.0	28.8	100.0
Number	1,872		108		1,748		151		1,054		304	