

A STUDY OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS
OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES IN KANSAS

by

FREDBRICK WILLIAM HILL

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1934

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1935

Doc-
ment
LD
2668
T4
1935
H51
C.2

PREFACE

As Steiner (1) states, "One cannot proceed far in a study of communities without discovering vast differences in what might be called their psychic nature or personality. Each community has an individuality of its own, determined by such factors as its location, economic basis, past history, and types of people, together with their traditions, customs, and attitudes. Some places are characterized by a spirit of progressiveness where it is easy to secure support for forward-looking enterprises; others are conservative and too strongly dominated by the past to welcome social changes; still others are so torn by discord and divided interests, that cooperative effort becomes out of the question."

In a state where there is considerable homogeneity in population; and where economic activity of the rural people is largely agricultural, these differences in psychic nature and personality become vastly more important in contrast with their common setting.

Population groups have attitudes, interests and conflicting senses of value. Group reactions are determined by stimulating "drives" and cultural forces, which are largely end-products of a former social progress. Social controls both guard and direct the social processes and social products are the end-result.

If a group process produces poverty; if societary action sets up the necessity for "relief", or if a group action gives rise to pathological phenomena -- who then is to be deemed responsible? New studies must be made and new facts must be uncovered before man can accurately place censure.

This study is an attempt to get "behind the scenes" of a pathological group condition. For the author it is a first venture into a new field of social research. It begins with no - "isms" as pre-conceived conclusions. It attempts to formulate no hypothesis and neither does it try to prove any theorem. Stated concisely, its problem was simply to discover, "What are the facts in this case?" The uncoverings of causes, effects, or possibilities, were therefore merely incidental to its purpose.

This study represents a preliminary attempt to under-

stand why certain families have been unable to maintain their financial independence throughout the crisis period following 1929, while their neighbors located in similar situations in the same community, have been able to continue on their own resources through the long period of misfortune.

That the factual data accumulated in this study should throw some light upon this problem will become evident as the study proceeds. Ultimately, the discovery of fundamental differences, if such exist, between relief and non-relief families, should lead to the formulation of social policies designed to get at the root of the difficulties lying beneath the economic inadequacies of families who fail in an emergency.

The author believes in the need for social engineering, or an adequate social planning. He believes that social pathological conditions can some day be relieved by the use of the proper social forces. He feels that social forces arise from the impetus or impact of social stimuli set up largely as the result of environmental conditions. Some day he hopes to make further studies to discover what are the stimuli and what is the adequate "social diet", to produce the truly social being. He hopes, and believes, that this study is part of the ground work for that future enterprise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	11
INDEX	
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Method of the Survey	2
Period Covered	3
Sources of Data	3
GENERAL METHOD	5
Caution Necessary in Interpreting Results . . .	6
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE AREAS STUDIED	
Meade County	9
Gray County	14
Linn County	19
Norton County	20
CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES	
Prior Relief History	26
Period of Relief Duration	29
Location	29
Nativity and Race	32
Age of Head of Household	35
Sex of Head of Household	37
Combined and Not Combined Households	39
Size of the Households	41
Persons Other Than the Head	
Sex and Ages	45
Individuals Not in Household as of Jan. 1930	46
Relationships to Head	50
Education of Head and Homemaker	53
Young People in the Household	60
Occupational Experiences of the Homemaker	65
OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY, FARM TENURE, AND MOBILITY OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	
Occupational Factors	
Occupational Experience	67
Work Record	69
Job Duration	71
Unemployment Periods	71
Earnings	74
Distance to Job	78

	Page
Changes in Vocational and Residential Location	77
Mobility	78
Persons Seeking Employment	82
Farm Tenure	
Period Since Farming Began	83
Total Years of Farm Operation	85
Tenure Operation Status During Total Farming History	87
Tenure Operating Status at Time of Survey	89
Full versus Part-time Farming	93
Farm Mobility	94
ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HOUSEHOLD	
Land and Livestock as of January 1, 1934	97
Livestock	100
Poultry	100
Outstanding Indebtedness	101
Increase in Indebtedness	
January 1930 to January 1934	103
Decrease in Reserves	
January 1930 to January 1934	105
Losses January 1930 to January 1934	107
Medical Costs	109
Extraordinary Expenses	111
Summary of Economic Status	112
SUMMARY	114
CONCLUSIONS	118
RECOMMENDATIONS	120
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	122
LITERATURE CITED	123

INTRODUCTION

The rural relief situation in Kansas is due primarily to crop shortages caused by drouth and indirectly to price declines caused by the nation wide depression. Rainfall has been far below normal and drouth has naturally lessened crop production. In Linn, Gray, and Meade Counties, the lack of proper soil moisture and rainfall has been the chief cause of the relief situation. In Norton County, price declines during the past four years have been the chief cause for the necessity of relief. In general, one can safely conclude that the two factors of crop shortage and price decline are the primary causes for the relief situation as it exists in these four counties.

For this study of characteristics of rural relief families, an attempt was made to select, in so far as possible, counties that represented typical farming areas in the state. Meade County was selected as representative of the short grass winter wheat area; Gray County as representative of the diversified farming and mining area suffering from drouth conditions of the southwest; Norton County as representative of a wheat and corn area; and Linn County as representative of the group of counties which are marginal producers, having but little subsoil, in the eastern part of the state.

PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of this study was to secure a composite picture of socio-economic background factors of 520 rural households receiving relief in these counties in Kansas in October, 1933.

First, it was designed to show the composition of the household; the occupational history, farm tenure, and mobility of the head of the household, the employment status of members of the household other than the head; and a general resume of the economic conditions of the household at the time of the survey.

Second, it was intended to discover the educational backgrounds and occupational experiences of the homemakers; to show the amount of education being secured by children whose families were on the relief rolls, and to indicate the proportion of young people under twenty-five who constitute the unoccupied out-of-school population.

Third, on the basis of this study, giving a statistical appraisal of the backgrounds and resources of the families involved, to make tentative suggestions, or to formulate some general principles which would be of basic value in the establishment of possible future rehabilitation programs.

PERIOD COVERED

The data on family characteristics cover intensively the period of January 1, 1930 to January 1, 1934, however, some of the sections deal with longer periods, and others with shorter periods.

SOURCES OF DATA

The data for this study were gathered through personal interviews with 520 Kansas rural families receiving relief in October, 1933. There were 155 of these selected families residing in Meade County; 116 were in Gray County; 131 in Linn County; and 118 in Horton County.

The interviews were held during the period of January, 1934 to April, 1934. The families were interviewed in their own homes, and the data were recorded on a schedule designed for this purpose. Each family was interviewed by a field worker, and the schedule was completed in their presence and with their help.

The schedules used were a standard form prepared by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in cooperation with which the study was conducted. The schedule used was DRS - 3C - "A Survey of Rural Families Receiving Relief in October, 1933". The schedules were collected by a staff of field workers, all of whom had college degrees or equivalent train-

ing, and were mailed from the field daily and edited in the office at Manhattan. Where inconsistencies appeared, schedules were returned immediately to the field, in order that errors might be corrected.

Basic Definitions. "A relief family was one falling within the bounds of the following definition: Relief is to be taken to mean relief chargeable to public funds (Federal, State, or Local) and covers only those cases of residents within the state which are eligible to be reported to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration each month on a standard form (number 10-A). Relief includes both direct relief and work relief, and covers orders for food, shelter, clothing fuel, light, household necessities (such as soap, matches, lamps, etc.), medical care given in the client's home or in a doctor's office (but not medical care given in a clinic or a hospital), transportation, moving expenses, car tokens, and cash whenever cash is given in lieu of the above-mentioned commodities or services or as wage for work relief."^{*}

Because of the dire feed situation, families who had received only livestock feed, were not considered relief families and were therefore not eligible for this study.

* Definition issued in special instructions to local research supervisors by Dr. E. D. Tetreau, Rural Research Analyst - Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

The United States census definition of rural and urban was accepted; that is a municipality of 2500 or more population constitutes an urban district. Only rural areas were studied. The terms "family" and "household" are used synonymously except as otherwise indicated.

Sampling Procedure. Relief cases selected for this study were those found on the relief rolls of the respective counties in October, 1933. In Meade and Gray counties the entire October relief lists were studied as there were less than 200 cases; in Linn County where there were 262 families on relief, and in Norton County where there were 236 families on relief, a "sample" was taken by selecting every second card from a complete list of those on the relief rolls.

GENERAL METHOD

The schedules were collected by counties, and the data recorded on tally sheets. The four "county summaries" of each item were then united to form a composite picture for the total group of 520 families. Items of similar character were grouped, one section, for example, containing items pertaining to occupational history; economic factors; educational backgrounds; etc.. Inter-county comparisons were made where significant. From a study and evaluation of the

group tables thus evolved, final conclusions were derived.

While the sub-classifications for the individual counties are interesting, the cases are too few to make comparisons significant. Where variations occur in the individual counties that seem large enough to influence strongly the total for the four counties combined, the reader is appraised of this fact.

CAUTION NECESSARY IN INTERPRETING RESULTS

As was stated in the South Dakota study (2) "Caution is necessary in interpreting the data presented. A minute and close analysis taking into account all factors that cause a family to need relief was not possible, for numbers are too few to lead to trustworthy results when smaller group divisions are made. For this reason there are undoubtedly places where the most valid interpretation of the results obtained may not have been discovered.

It should also be stated that comparatively few of the cases studied are chronic relief cases, as these have been charges of the board of county commissioners and probably in most instances were not taken over by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Cases for study were taken from the

October lists of the county relief administration (Federal); consequently chronic cases were for the most part omitted. Had the entire list of the county commissioners been included in the study, some characteristics of relief families might have been different. However, the results would have been less typical of the normal family which is compelled to accept public aid during the depression had the "county poor" lists made up a greater proportion of the cases studied."

Caution must also be exercised in accepting "average" cost-per-family figures in the section pertaining to economic status of the household. While every effort was made to secure data that was reliable, it is necessary to recognize that the answers to an objective questionnaire frequently contain data which are principally "guess work", personal opinion, or inaccurate estimates, on the part of the person involved. Obviously, also, estimated losses could not be checked except by comparison with similar instances. In the case of items such as "decreases in reserves", or "crop losses" there could be no distinct criteria except that of the judgement of the field workers. Admittedly, the data are open to the criticisms inherent in the use of the ques-

tionnaire, interview, or case-history methods of procedure, but it will of course be recognized that any form of social research involving contact with human beings is necessarily exposed to such limitations. Care has been exercised, however, to reduce such errors to a minimum.

9

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE AREAS STUDIED*

Meade County

Meade County, Kansas is in the southwestern part of the state bordering on Oklahoma. As it has passed through a considerable number of phases in the relatively short period since it was originally settled, its population history is complex. For example, in 1888 the population figure was 4,561 while in 1900 it had dropped to 1,521; twelve years later it had reached a total of 5,196; and barring a rise above 6,000, in 1917 the progress was fairly steady up to 1930 when there were 6,127 people in the county. The 1934 figure was 6,012.

There are three centers of population in this county: Meade has a population of 1,200; Plains 650; and Fowler 700. There were 155 October 1933 relief families in Meade County, 56 per cent of which were in these three centers. There was no center of 2,500 population or more. According to the 1930 census bulletin for Kansas, Meade County had 1624 families, whose median size was 3.49 persons per family.

*The material in this section is an abstract of individual county summaries prepared by Field Work Supervisors at the time of the conclusion of the survey in each county. Copies of these reports are on file in the office of Dr. R. C. Hill, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

Economic Basis of Meade County. Meade County has gone through several phases in the last three-quarters of a century. In the early days it was one of those counties whose lands were utilized by the cattle growers both for grazing head-quarters and as part of the overlanding route from Texas to the north. When the farmers began to come in, the customary struggle for supremacy between the cattle men and the agriculturists took place. A considerable land boom occurred between 1884 and 1888, the total effect being to increase the acreage under cultivation, and after the railroad penetrated the county in 1887 a gradual shift from corn production to wheat production took place. (The corn had in earlier days been grown and fed to livestock. By 1915 but 119,600 bushels were produced while over 1,600,000 bushels of wheat were grown.) In 1888 the boom collapsed, many families left the county as the figures cited above show, and the population materially declined. About 1903 immigration set in again and while no boom resulted there was a steady increase in population. From this year until 1915 the emphasis was on cattle raising, there being a steady increase in the number of livestock in the county up to 1912, when a slight decrease occurred. During the war the farmers almost

unanimously turned to wheat production, a specialization they have continued ever since. This may be seen by the fact that of 933 farms in Meade County in 1930, 731 or 78 per cent were cash grain farms, the grain being wheat. The average production per acre for the last 10 years was 10.29 and the total average production over 10 years has been in excess of 1,900,000 bushels, the greatest crop on record being that of 1926 when 4,133,074 bushels were produced. While there was an average crop in 1930 and a production of about 3,700,000 bushels in 1931, the drouth has sharply reduced production. In 1933 but 175,160 bushels were produced, the estimate for 1934 being a little over 233,000 bushels. This makes it plain why the county is in difficulty.

The larger part of the county consists of Richfield silt loam which is well adapted to wheat production. Of the 622,709 acres in Meade County, approximately 330,000 are in pasture and 293,000 in crops. Wheat accounts for 220,000 acres. There is a region known as the Artesian Valley which has about 3,000 acres devoted to alfalfa raising and 10,000 acres utilized for miscellaneous crops. There are submarginal areas in the southwest and central district. About fifty farms are on submarginal land. The normal reinfall for Meade County is just short of twenty

inches and since most of the rainfall comes between April and October it is possible, given favorable conditions, to raise large wheat crops. Unfortunately, even when the total for the year is normal there is frequently a shortage of rainfall in important growing months which cuts down production. Hail often falls in western Kansas during June and July, doing extensive damage to the crops, and high winds are a problem both summer and winter. The average growing season is 180 days. In spite of the known limitations to wheat production even under the best of circumstances and in spite of the special discouragements of recent years, the farmers of Meade County are still optimistic about the prospect of growing a bumper crop and pulling themselves out of the red.

Other than agricultural resources, Meade County has practically nothing that promises to provide employment. Two silica mines are in existence but together they employ only twelve men. The material is used for soap powder, as filler for toothpaste, etcetera, and one large tract is controlled by the Cudahy Packing Company. No oil has yet been discovered in Meade County but since it is near the producing fields of Oklahoma the local people have hopes, though the present conditions in the industry make it un-

likely that anything will be done about this matter in the near future. In some parts of the county the boring of artesian wells has led to the discovery that there are extensive salt deposits but since plenty of salt is produced elsewhere in the nation, this also is hardly to be considered an employment resource. Meade County is, has been, and in all probability will remain, an agricultural county.

(3)

Drouth during two seasons is the real cause for the need for relief in this county. The three years prior to this were of fair crop productions, but due to the fall in commodity prices, the producers suffered loss. During the year 1933-1934 this county has suffered severely from wind erosion. Lying within the "blowout" area of Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, 10,000 acres have been destroyed by wind erosion. Cattle and other livestock were shipped out of the county the past year because of lack of feed and growth of pasture grasses.

There has been little or no rainfall for the past two years but the farmers hopefully continued to cultivate and

plant crops. As a result of this land tillage, the seed beds have become very friable and powdery. The conditions are such that the land has become a shifting sand-like terrain.

This country is subject to local weather conditions, and there have been "spots" within the county which have yielded a helpful quantity of forage crops that have helped a few farmers through the winters.

There was one bank failure during this period. The failure or closing of business houses is of minor importance in the retardation of industrial progress in this section.

Gray County

Gray County, Kansas is in the southwest part of the state, with its southern border touching Meade County. "According to the 1930 census there are 1,380 families, of whom 1,270 were native whites. Of this, 795 were farm families. Median size for all families was 3.87.

During the last four years there has been a growing need for relief by families in Gray County. The chief cause of this growth has been crop failures. In the last four years there has not been a normal wheat crop produced

in the county. The total value of the wheat crop produced in 1930 was 43 per cent of that produced in 1929. This condition was also true for all farm crops. The following year, 1931, the crop was the largest ever produced in the county. The total amount of wheat produced exceeded the 1930 total by two million bushels. This was in spite of the insect and hail damage in various parts of the county. Even though the county had a bumper wheat crop, the price dropped to such an extent that the value of the wheat alone was three million dollars less than in 1929, and \$354,670 less than the value of the crop in 1930. Statistics show that the value of all crops was \$3,581,000 less than the value of the 1929 crop and \$512,000 less than the value of the 1930 crop.

The years of 1932 and 1933 were almost total failures. The report of the State Board of Agriculture shows the total value of all crops produced in 1932 to be \$5,000,000 less than the 1929 crop, the wheat crop alone was worth \$4,430,000 less than the 1929 crop.

These years, 1932 and 1933, might be termed double failures. When the condition of the wheat in the spring of the two years was such as to give little hope of a wheat crop, the farmers obtained crop loans and planted spring crops, as corn, maize, forage or barley on the land where

they had planted wheat the preceeding year. Lack of moisture caused these crops to fail also and so this double failure was another blow to the farming industry in the county.

The commercial failures have been due almost entirely to the decreased buying power of the community, caused by the crop failures.

In Cimarron, the county seat and principal village of Gray County, were found the greatest number of relief cases living in villages. A study of the history of this town shows that twenty-five businesses have either failed or changed hands during the last four years. Many of the families who were depending on these for a living had to apply for relief. One Gray County bank failed during the four years. In October 1933 there were 118 families in Gray County receiving relief in some form. There is a feeling that a few of the relief families will never be self-supporting.

In order to understand the relief situation as of October, 1933 it is necessary to know a little of the history of the relief problem of the county. Previous to 1931, there were only four or five county dependents. These were mostly widows or old men unable to work. They were cared for out of the general fund of the county. The

county clerk and attorney handled these cases with the assistance of the township trustees and county commissioners.

After the two poor years of 1930 and 1931, the number of relief applicants increased. It was necessary to make a levy for a county poor fund to take care of the applicants. Relief was given in the form of work. The men were put to work burning weeds along the road sides. There was no goal or aim in the work, the idea being to give the men something to do to pay for the relief granted. There were no projects and no foremen. This arrangement was not satisfactory and created quite a little criticism on the part of land owners, but it was the best that could be done at that time. This plan was used until the spring of 1933.

The county is agricultural. The type of farming is generally of a speculative nature. Given the proper climatic conditions everyone can make money, while under adverse conditions very few, if any, can show a profit. The farming is done on a large scale. A quarter section, or 160 acres, is the smallest unit of operation, practically all farms have at least two quarters, and several farms are over 2,000 acres in size. This large scale operation requires an immense outlay of capital and necessitates going into debt rather deeply. The returns, in good times or years, are sufficient to more than justify doing this.

These conditions give rise to unbounded credit in good times, which causes a large indebtedness and clamping down of credit in years of crop failures. An indebtedness of several thousand dollars is not looked upon as an especially serious matter in most cases, for most farmers could show a profit of several times that amount in a good year.

There are three distinct soil areas in Gray County. The area north of the Arkansas river is a rich, black loam soil of very fine texture. With proper moisture conditions this land yields very heavily. The land is very level and large machinery can be used quite successfully. Just south of the river is an area from four to ten miles in width which is of an entirely different soil type. The land is very sandy, and is subject to wind erosion. It is termed "blow sand" by the people of the county. This land is very rolling and is not, as a whole, suited to power farming, though it is done rather extensively. This is the corn and maize section of Gray County. Crops are very uncertain in this area and the relief cases are more numerous here than in any other part of the county. South of this strip of land is another area of land similar to that north of the river. The farming here is of the same, large extensive type as that north of the river. In these two level fertile areas are found the more successful farmers of the

county.

One can sum up the attitude of Gray County farmers by the quotation which most of them give - it is, "Give us a crop or two and we won't need any help from the government or anybody else."

Linn County

Linn County, which is in the northeastern part of the state touching the Missouri border line, has been principally affected by the decline in prices of farm products, crop failures, and the use of marginal land. In 1931, 1932 and 1933, there were light corn crops, and prices were low. The 1932-1933 wheat crop was about one-third of the normal yield. The tobacco which is usually raised in the east central part of the county was also a complete failure in 1932-1933, due primarily to drouth conditions.

In the southwestern part of the county there is a layer of limestone which is very close to the surface of the soil. There is very little if any sub-soil here, and during the very best of years this marginal land will only produce a very light crop. In 1928 a flood occurred along the Marais des Cygnes River, covering a large portion of Valley and Potosi Townships. During this year there was a complete failure of crops in the flooded territory. The

after effects can still clearly be noticed.

Being almost entirely agricultural in nature Linn County has suffered very little if any by commercial and industrial failures. The county was effected to some extent by three bank failures which occurred during 1929-1930. There have been no bank failures during the last four years in Linn County. Very few businesses have changed hands since January, 1930.

Linn County has a population of 3,766 families, of which 3,623 are native whites. The median size for all families is 3.10 persons per family. There were 262 rural families on relief in Linn during October 1933, and half of these were selected for the sample. Linn County is all rural. The largest town has a population of about 1500.

Norton County

Norton County, which is in the northwestern corner of the state, unlike some of the other western counties of Kansas, has not been affected as much by crop failures during the last four years as by price declines. In spite of a bumper crop in 1930, farmers did not save large reserves. ~~Farm operation costs have increased rapidly during the past~~ decade. Cost of farm machinery, competition, and higher

living standards have all played a part. When a slight crop shortage occurred in 1931, the farmers were in general, still able to break even, and in many cases make slight gains. The major shock did not come until 1932, and for some farmers, in 1933.

Wheat planted in Norton County is approximately 85,000 acres per year. This has not varied greatly during the past four years. Corn acreage is usually near 150,000 acres though this figure jumped to 157,000 acres in 1932. The following table gives a summary of average wheat and corn acreages, yields, and prices for the past three years:

Wheat				
Year	Acreage	Bushels yielded:	per acre	Price per Bushel
1931	85,000	11		40¢
1932	85,000	7		30¢
1933	85,000	3		85¢
Corn				
1931	150,000	18		40¢
1932	157,000	9		17¢
1933	150,000	4		35¢

It will be seen that the wheat and corn yields in 1932 were not far short of the county average which is 12.5 for wheat and 18 for corn. In 1932 the value of the farmer's dol-

lar was much below normal, however, and herein lies the major reason for failure to weather the depression. Seven bushel wheat brought only 30 cents in 1932, yet value per acre averaged higher in 1933 despite a practically complete failure of only three bushel per acre. The same idea holds for corn prices. The fact of crop failures need not be disregarded but farmers cannot grow corn for from nine to seventeen cents per bushel and these are the actual prices received by many farmers for the major portion of their corn crop in 1932.

The chief reason for crop failure has been drouth. This has varied over the county, many local sections having received showers aiding in decreasing their extent of failure and often bringing the crop yields to nearly average. Wind-storm damage has been alight, the little which has occurred having been in the western half of the county. A few localities suffered hail damage in 1932. Hessian Fly and other insect damage, and Foot Rot in wheat decreased yields by approximately twenty per cent in 1932 and 1933. Such damages may be expected to be more severe in dry seasons.

The extent of failure due to poor farming methods was not estimated, though this factor is sure to have played some part. About two thousand acres were double farmed in 1932 because of failures of wheat. This was increased to

20,000 acres in 1933, and since the corn sowed in wheat ground also failed these farming operations constituted double failures. Livestock diseases in 1932, especially mange and cholera, caused livestock losses of approximately ten per cent.

Commercial and industrial losses have not been extensive in Norton County. Only seven business failures occurred during the four depression years. These were scattered through the five larger towns of the county. Very few businesses have changed hands. No bank failures have occurred. In Norton County there were 303 families on relief during the month of October, 1933. There were 238 families in the rural areas of Norton County who received aid in October, 1933. Of these, one-half, or 118 families were selected for a sample. In the city of Norton, with a population of 2900 people, 67 families secured assistance. In Norton County there is no distinction made between aid given to families in the country and to those in the villages. All of the relief activities are under the supervision of the county case supervisor.

Three miles east of Norton, Kansas the State Tuberculosis Sanitarium is located. In former years the necessary supplies and equipment for this institution were purchased

in Norton, but at the present time all of the equipment and supplies are contracted for, thus causing some loss to Norton merchants.

Seven miles to the north and east of Norton, near the village of Calvert, two silica mines of unlimited resources have been operating for several years, employing from 8 to 30 persons weekly. The mined silica is transported to the eastern manufacturing states.

The Cooperative Elevator of Norton has not been successful since its formation. The Norton County Cooperative Creamery, like the cooperative elevator, has paid no dividends. The county is not suited for operation of a creamery cooperative because the dairying industry is not extensive enough. There are practically no dairy cattle in the county, and farmers in general do not like dairying.

The Cooperative Telephone Company operates a county-wide exchange. It is carrying so many farmers and other subscribers on its books and so many have had phones removed that it is said the company could not operate except for the income received as rent for a building housing the post-office. A number of farmers are operating lines without the use of a central exchange, keeping up neighborhood lines for private use.

Norton County may be roughly divided into two sections,

the western half being level and of a lighter soil which is suited more to wheat production, the acreage of wheat to corn being a ratio of about 60 to 40 per cent. Windstorm damage is greater in this section, though it rarely attains large proportions. Ninety-five per cent of the wheat is harvested by combine. The eastern half of the county is more rolling and of a slightly different type of soil which is more suited to corn production. The southern, eastern, and northern townships are more devoted to livestock raising than the others, though livestock is raised throughout the county. Very few sheep are raised.

Wheat acreage per township varies from 500 in the eastern section to 6000 in the western, while corn acreage varies from 13,000 acres in eastern townships to smaller acreages in other parts of the county.

The county surface is broken by streams and ravines, much of it being unsuited to cultivation. Erosion has cut deep and extensive recesses in the hills and slopes throughout its area.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES

Order of Presentation. In general, topics are presented in the order in which they appear in the schedules used in collecting field data. The data for individual counties are presented in the following order: Meade, Gray, Linn, and Norton. This arrangement is purely arbitrary, and was selected wholly as a matter of convenience.

Prior Relief History As stated in the section entitled "Caution Necessary for Interpreting Results", but few of the families treated in the study could be considered chronic relief cases. Such cases would not be of value in analyzing the background factors of the normal family which is compelled to accept public aid only in times of depression.

Records of public and private relief organizations were checked in each county in order to ascertain the prior relief histories of every family. Of the total number of families studied but 2.1 per cent had had relief histories prior to January 1, 1930. An additional 1.8 per cent were located in communities where their prior histories were not available, consequently their records could not be checked. Meade county had the greatest prior relief load, with eight families on its rolls, and of the Gray County group, with records for all families available, no family had received relief prior to January 1, 1930. (Table I)

TABLE I - NUMBER OF FAMILIES RECEIVING RELIEF PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 1930
IN 520 SELECTED KANSAS RURAL HOUSEHOLDS

	: Weade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Morton County :		: Four Counties : Combined :	
Total	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :
Number Receiving Relief	8	5.2	0	0.	1	.8	2	1.7	11	2.1
Number Receiving No Relief	139	89.8	116	100.0	129	98.4	116	98.3	500	98.1
Number Not Ascertained	8	5.2	0	0.	1	.8	0	0.	9	1.8
Total Families	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

TABLE II - NUMBER OF DIFFERENT YEARS IN WHICH RELIEF WAS RECEIVED
 SINCE JANUARY 1, 1930, BY 520 RURAL NEEDING FAMILIES

IN FOUR SELECTED COUNTIES IN KANSAS

	: Keosauqua County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Horton County :		: our Counties	
	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :
	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :	: Per :
Number Receiving	53	34.2	66	56.9	83	67.2	84	71.2	291	55.9
Relief in 1 year	84	54.2	48	41.4	40	30.5	29	24.6	201	38.7
Number Receiving	5	3.2	2	1.7	3	2.3	2	1.7	12	2.3
Relief in 3 years	13	8.4	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	16	3.1
Relief in 4 years	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0
Total Families										

29

Period of Relief Duration. Table II shows that the families selected were not chronic relief cases. Over one-half of the families have received aid in but a single year, and approximately an additional 40 per cent have received aid in any two years. Less than six per cent have received any form of relief in more than two years.

In Meade County the majority of the families had received relief in two years, while in the other three counties the major portion of the families had been on relief in only one year. This is explained by drouth and price decline which have affected this county during the 1932 and 1933 seasons.

Location. For the purpose of this study, families were all grouped under county summaries, without distinction as to their place of residence. Except in the case of Meade County, where 57.4 per cent of the families resided in villages, the majority of the relief families lived in open country, in about the ratio of 2:1. Since the four counties are all essentially rural, with no major population centers (with the exception of the city of Norton whose families were not included in this study) it was felt that this dis-

inction was not essentially significant.*

In collecting the data, a "village" was defined as any population aggregate large enough to be considered a village by people in the community. It was not necessarily incorporated, and might range in size up to 2500 population. It is evident from the data (Table III) that due to the preponderance of "open country" families, any proposed rehabilitation program must, of necessity, be adapted to "open country" conditions. Programs depending upon close community organization, or village cooperation will not adequately fit the needs of the relief population.

* According to an unpublished summary in "Kansas State Planning Board Report" of September, 1934, Kansas has 1,880,999 residents. It is the twenty-fourth state in population, and with 82,158 square miles is thirteenth in area. It has an average of 23 persons to the square mile. Of the total population, 729,834, or 34.9 per cent are on farms, and 446,564 or 23.7 per cent reside in rural non-farm areas embracing towns and villages of less than 2500 population.

The relatively small percentage living on farms in what is predominately an agricultural state is explained by the nature of the state farming practices. Large areas in Kansas are devoted to one crop farming -- wheat. Many persons operating large wheat acreages live in town and work their farms only a few months in the year. They are listed in the census as village or urban dwellers, although they make their living by farming.

In the United States Census the distinction between farm and rural population is therefore also not clearly indicative of the true situation.

TABLE III - LOCATION OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES IN
FOUR SELECTED COUNTIES IN KANSAS

	: Meade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Norton County :		: Four Counties : Combined :	
	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :	: No. :	: Cent. :
In Open Country :	66 :	42.6 :	61 :	52.6 :	99 :	75.6 :	89 :	75.4 :	315 :	60.6 :
In Villages :	83 :	57.4 :	55 :	47.4 :	32 :	24.4 :	29 :	24.6 :	205 :	39.4 :
Total Families :	155 :	100.0 :	116 :	100.0 :	131 :	100.0 :	118 :	100.0 :	520 :	100.0 :

Nativity and Race. The rural relief households studied are essentially of white, native born stock, with male heads. Problems of extraneous racial or cultural assimilation or amalgamation are, therefore, not manifest. The problem of relief is not due to lack of social unity, or to racial conflicts. In general, the racial composition of relief families (Table IV) is similar to that of non-relief families, or to the state population as a whole.

According to the 1930 Census, (4) the state population figures with families classified by color and nativity of head showed the following:

	All Families	Rural Farm Families
White	95.5 per cent	99.2 per cent
Negro	3.6 per cent	0.6 per cent
Other Races	0.8 per cent	0.2 per cent
Native	88.2 per cent	91.2 per cent
Foreign Born	7.4 per cent	8.0 per cent

Tables IV and V indicate clearly that the nativity and race of the relief families included in this study were of

TABLE IV - FACILITY OF HERDS OF 520 RURAL FAMILIES HOUSEHOLDS IN 1938

	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Morton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Native Born Head	148	95.5	113	97.4	150	99.2	116	98.3	507	97.5
Foreign Born Head	7	4.5	3	2.6	1	.8	2	1.7	13	2.5
Total Families	155	100.0	116	100.0	151	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

TABLE V - COLOR OF HEAD OF 520 RURAL WHITE FAMILIES IN KANSAS

	: Meade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Norton County :		: Four Counties Combined :	
	: No. :	: Per Cent. :	: No. :	: Per Cent. :	: No. :	: Per Cent. :	: No. :	: Per Cent. :	: No. :	: Per Cent. :
White	: 154 :	: 99.4 :	: 113 :	: 97.4 :	: 120 :	: 91.6 :	: 118 :	: 100.0 :	: 505 :	: 97.1 :
Negro	: 1 :	: .6 :	: 3 :	: 2.6 :	: 11 :	: 8.4 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 15 :	: 2.9 :
Mexican	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :
Other	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :
Total Families	: 155 :	: 100.0 :	: 116 :	: 100.0 :	: 131 :	: 100.0 :	: 118 :	: 100.0 :	: 520 :	: 100.0 :

the same general type as that found elsewhere in the state.* In general, where differences exist, it appears that there are fewer of the foreign born in relief families than in the population of the state at large.

Age of Head of Household. Approximately one-third of the heads of relief households are in the 31 to 45 year group, and over one-tenth (11.9 per cent) are over sixty years of age, the average age for all heads of both sexes being 44.6 years. (Table VI)

Approximately one-fourth are below thirty years of age; and 57 per cent are forty-five years of age or less. Gray County has the youngest average age, while Norton County relief heads average eight years older. In general, percentage totals for the various age groups do not differ materially from those of the age groupings of heads of rural households for the state population as a whole.

* A similar study of 1040 non-relief families in the same counties indicated the following:

	Number	Per Cent
Total Non-relief Families	1040	100.0
Native Born Head	1004	96.5
Foreign Born Head	36	3.5
Total Non-relief Families	1040	100.0
White	1038	99.8
Negro	1	0.1
Mexican	1	0.1

TABLE VI - AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HEADS OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Age Group (years)	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County		Our Counties Combined	
	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.
1 - 30	34	21.9	30	25.9	28	21.4	28	23.7	120	23.1
31 - 45	50	32.3	41	35.3	41	31.3	46	39.0	178	34.2
46 - 60	49	31.6	36	31.0	40	30.5	35	29.7	160	30.8
60	22	14.2	9	7.8	22	16.8	9	7.5	62	11.9
Total Number of "Heads" of Households	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

According to state population figures, 54.4 per cent of all male heads were forty-five years of age or less, as compared to 57.3 per cent for relief families. State figures show that 11.1 per cent are sixty-five years of age or more, and the relief figure was 11.9 per cent for heads over sixty years of age.

From these figures it seems safe to assume that relief heads are slightly younger than those in the general population. This assumption is also confirmed by the results of the South Dakota study previously cited.* The average age of head in years, for the four counties is as follows:
 Meade - 44.0 - Gray - 40.8 - Linn - 44.8 - Norton - 49.1 -
 for the four counties combined - 44.6.

Sex of Head of Household. Slightly more than 96 per cent of the relief families have male heads. (Table VII)
 The proportion of rural relief households with female heads is less than the percentage of widows in the state population as a whole.

* The South Dakota study showed that rural relief heads were approximately four years younger than the heads of non-relief families in South Dakota. Landis, Paul H. "Rural Relief in South Dakota" - Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 289 - June, 1934. pp. 23-24

TABLE VII - SEX OF HEADS OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	: Meade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Norton County :		: Four Counties : Combined :	
	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :
Male	: 148 :	: 95.5 :	: 106 :	: 91.4 :	: 131 :	: 100.0 :	: 115 :	: 97.5 :	: 500 :	: 96.2 :
Female	: 7 :	: 4.5 :	: 10 :	: 8.6 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 3 :	: 2.5 :	: 20 :	: 3.8 :
Total Families	: 155 :	: 100.0 :	: 116 :	: 100.0 :	: 131 :	: 100.0 :	: 118 :	: 100.0 :	: 520 :	: 100.0 :

"The percentage of widows in Kansas has been increasing since 1890. The percentage of widowers has also increased, but only slightly. In 1930 over 12 per cent of urban females and over nine per cent of rural females were widows. The percentage of widowers, both urban and rural, were 4.8 and 4.9, respectively."*

Combined and Non-combined Households. The number of combined or doubled-up households (Table VIII) constitutes 12.7 per cent of the families studied. This is approximately twice the percentage reported in a study of a similar non-relief group situated in the same localities.** Typical reasons given for doubling up were: economic (which was most frequently given), old age, marriage of a younger member, sickness, unemployment, or (in the case of older persons) simply "no other place to go".

* Population summary in "Kansas State Planning Board Report" September, 1934. p. 24

** Study of the non-relief group showed the following:

	Number	Per cent
Combined	69	6.6
Not Combined	971	93.4
Total Families	1040	100.0
Combined prior to January, 1930	11	15.9
Combined after January, 1930	58	84.1
Total Number Combined Families	69	100.0

TABLE VIII - NUMBER OF COMBINED HOUSEHOLDS IN 520 RURAL RELIEF

HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	Meade County	Gray County	Linn County	Horton County	Four Counties Combined					
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.					
Combined Households	11	7.1	17	14.7	31	23.7	7	5.9	66	12.7
Not Combined Households	144	92.9	99	85.3	100	76.3	111	94.1	454	87.3
Total Families	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

The doubling-up of families has been largely accentuated by depression conditions. Approximately seven out of every eight combined families (Table IX) have been combined since January 1, 1930. Certain economies, inherent in the maintenance of but one household rather than two, have been the principal factor in these combinations. In certain cases, newly married young couples have found it impossible to maintain separate households and consequently have been forced to seek residence with either parents or relatives.

Size of the Household. Approximately one-half of the relief families consisted of four persons or less. Single person families numbered but three. In a comparison with a similar group of non-relief families, 49.9 per cent of the relief group consisted of five or more persons, while but 36.1 per cent of the non-relief group were in this class. For families consisting of five persons, the percentages for both relief and non-relief families was identical (15.6 per cent). (Table X) It is significant that a greater percentage of non-relief families were smaller than this size (five persons) while a higher percentage of the relief households were larger in number than this size. Larger family size is, therefore, a characteristic of relief households.

TABLE IX - DATA OF COMBINATION OF SIXTY-SIX COMBINED
RURAL WHITE HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	Weade County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.
Combinations prior to January 1, 1930	1	9.1	2	11.8	5	16.1	0	0.	8	12.1
Combinations after January 1, 1930	10	90.9	15	88.2	26	83.9	7	100.0	58	87.9
Total Combined Households	11	100.0	17	100.0	31	100.0	7	100.0	66	100.0

TABLE X - SIZE OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Number in Families	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Morton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1	0	0.0	0	0.	3	2.3	0	0.	3	.5
2	22	14.2	15	12.9	20	15.3	7	5.9	64	12.3
3	37	23.8	17	14.7	29	22.1	21	17.8	104	20.0
4	19	12.3	23	19.8	22	16.8	26	22.1	90	17.3
5	20	12.9	23	19.8	15	11.5	23	19.5	81	15.6
6	19	12.3	9	7.8	12	9.2	19	16.1	59	11.3
7	15	9.7	11	9.5	12	9.2	9	7.6	47	9.0
8	9	5.8	6	5.2	6	4.6	7	5.9	28	5.4
9	6	3.9	2	1.7	4	3.0	3	2.5	15	2.9
10	3	1.9	3	2.6	4	3.0	2	1.7	12	2.4
11	3	1.9	2	1.7	0	0.	0	0.	5	.9
12 or more	2	1.3	5	4.3	4	3.0	1	.9	12	2.4
Total Families	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

For purposes of comparison, the following figures are inserted.

Number of Persons in Family	Rural Farm Population	
	1930 Kansas Census percentage of 121,391 Families with	Non-relief Study percentage of 1040 Families with
1	12.6	1.7
2	27.5	19.9
3	21.1	22.7
4	16.3	19.6
5	10.1	15.6
6	5.8	9.0
7	3.3	4.8
8	1.8	3.1
9	0.9	2.1
10	0.4	.8
11	0.2	.5
12 or more	0.2	.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

The median sizes for all families in the respective counties, according to the 1930 census, are as follows: Meade - 3.49, Gray - 3.87, Linn - 3.55, Norton - 3.36.

The average number of persons in relief households, including the head, as indicated by this study, is as follows: Meade - 5.04, Gray - 5.3, Linn - 4.8, Norton - 4.98. This indicates that relief households are, in general, larger than those of the general population as a whole.

"Persons Other than the Head"

Sex - Of the 2092 "persons other than the head" recorded (Table XI) as members of relief households, 1226 persons or 58.6 per cent were females. Of this number approximately 490 were wives or homemakers, and 736 were females not homemakers. There were 866 males in the households, indicating that a larger number of families had more males than females as persons other than the head or homemaker.

Age Group - Over 25 per cent of the males were boys five years of age or less, and approximately 80 per cent were boys and young men eighteen years of age or less. Only eight per cent of the male members of the household were over twenty-five years of age. It is apparent that the male youth leaves the household at an early age. (Table XII)

Of the female group (including homemakers) 218, or 17.8 per cent were girls under five years of age, and approximately 52 per cent were girls and young women of eighteen years or less. (Table XIII) Numerical comparisons show that there were more males under ten years of age; more males in the eleven to eighteen years group; and more females in the age groups above the eighteen year level, due primarily to the number of homemakers influencing the total.

Of the combined number of males and females, (Table XIV)

TABLE XI - SEX OF PERSONS OTHER THAN THE HEAD
IN 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	Meade County	Gray County	Linn County	Norton County	Four Counties Combined					
	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.					
	Per	Per	Per	Per	Per					
	Cent.	Cent.	Cent.	Cent.	Cent.					
Males	256	40.8	213	42.8	212	42.6	185	39.4	866	41.8
Females	371	59.2	285	57.2	285	57.4	285	60.6	1,226	58.2
Total										
"Other Persons" (Male and Female)	627	100.0	498	100.0	497	100.0	470	100.0	2,092	100.0

TABLE XII - AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN THE
HEAD OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

"MALES"

Age	Neade County		Gray County		Linn County		Horton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.
0-5	65	25.5	67	31.4	42	19.8	57	30.3	231	26.7
6-10	69	26.6	47	22.1	45	21.2	43	23.2	204	23.6
11-18	71	27.8	63	29.6	72	34.0	55	29.7	261	30.1
19-25	31	12.1	22	10.3	27	12.7	16	8.6	96	11.1
26-45	14	5.6	6	2.8	12	5.7	6	3.3	39	4.4
46-60	3	1.2	4	1.9	6	2.8	3	1.7	16	1.8
Over 60	3	1.2	4	1.9	8	3.8	5	2.7	20	2.3
Total No. Males	256	100.0	213	100.0	212	100.0	185	100.0	866	100.0

TABLE XIII - AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN THE HEAD OF 520 RURAL FAMILIE HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

"FEMALES"

Age	Gray County			Linn County			Horton County			Combined		
	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.
0-5	64	17.3	61	21.4	38	13.3	55	19.3	218	17.8		
6-10	61	16.4	40	14.0	33	11.6	41	14.4	175	14.3		
11-18	68	18.3	64	22.5	64	22.4	62	21.7	258	21.0		
19-25	44	11.9	33	11.6	37	13.0	28	9.8	142	11.6		
26-45	80	21.6	62	21.7	59	20.7	65	22.8	266	21.7		
46-60	31	8.4	21	7.4	31	10.9	27	9.5	110	9.0		
Over 60	23	6.1	4	1.4	23	8.1	7	2.5	57	4.6		
Total No. Females	371	100.0	285	100.0	285	100.0	285	100.0	1226	100.0		

TABLE XIV - AGE DISTRIBUTION OF OTHER MEMBERS OF
RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS - BY SEXES

Age Group in Years	Males		Females		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
0-5	231	26.7	218	17.8	449	21.5
6-10	204	23.6	175	14.3	379	18.1
11-18	261	30.1	258	21.0	519	24.8
19-25	98	11.1	142	11.6	238	11.4
26-45	38	4.4	266	21.7	304	14.5
46-60	18	1.8	110	9.0	126	6.0
60-	20	2.3	57	4.6	77	3.7
Totals	866	100.0	1226	100.0	2092	100.0

over 64 per cent of the "persons other than the head" in relief households were under eighteen years of age, and three per cent were over sixty years of age. These two groups constitute a total of almost 70 per cent who can be generally classed as totally dependent.

Individuals Not in Household as of January 1, 1930.

Over one-half of the relief families reported members who were not in the household as of January 1, 1930. Of the increased number of individuals, (Table XV) 165, or 35 per cent, were the result of the formation of fifty-nine new families since January 1, 1930. Approximately two-thirds of the increased number of individuals were new members of families formed prior to January 1, 1930, thus approximately two out of three individuals entering relief households since January 1, 1930, were entering old families. Only one-fifth of the families reporting increases in size were new families of the post depression period. Of the 165 individuals reported in the fifty-nine new families (Table XVI) approximately 115 were husbands and wives, indicating that the fifty individuals unaccounted for were children born to the new unions. This indicates that birth rate in new families is about one child per family during the period.

Relationships to Head.* The most common relationships of the relief families indicate that the majority consist

* The relationship was considered the same for "step", "in-law", or adopted relatives; e. g. step-son, son-in-law, or adopted sons were classified as "sons", etc.

TABLE XV - NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS NOT IN HOUSEHOLD AS OF JANUARY 1, 1930, IN 520 RURAL MULTI-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	Meade : County	Gray : County	Linn : County	Norton : County	Totals	Per Cent: Families Reporting	Per Cent of 520
No. of New Individuals	93	81	59	80	313	65.4	40.8
In Old Families	45	51	58	11	165	34.6	11.3
Total	138	132	117	91	478	100.0	52.1

TABLE XVI - PERCENTAGE OF OLD AND NEW FAMILIES REPORTING INDIVIDUALS NOT IN HOUSEHOLD AS OF JANUARY 1, 1930

	Meade : County	Gray : County	Linn : County	Norton : County	Total	Number	Per Cent
No. of Old Families Reporting	61	34	40	55	210	76.1	
No. of New Families Reporting	16	19	20	4	59	21.9	
Totals	77	73	60	59	269	100.0	

*Four were new families in combined household
 *Two were new families in combined household

TABLE XVII - RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF "OTHER PERSONS"
IN 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Relationship	Meade County			Gray County		
	No.	No. Families With	Average Per Family	No.	No. Families With	Average Per Family
	No. without Mates	17*			11*	
Mates	153	138	1.0	105	105	1.0
Sons	230	108	2.12	190	91	2.08
Daughters	206	97	2.12	169	84	2.01
Grandsons	8	7	1.14	2	2	1.0
Grand-daughters	10	7	1.42	5	5	1.0
Parents	13	11	1.18	5	4	1.2
Others	22	15	1.46	22	14	1.57
Total Number	627	155	4.04	498	116	4.3

Relationship	Linn County			Norton County		
	No.	No. Families With	Average Per Family	No.	No. Families With	Average Per Family
	No. without Mates	19*			9*	
Mates	112	112	1.0	109	109	1.0
Sons	172	84	2.04	168	87	1.93
Daughters	137	62	2.2	171	87	1.96
Grandsons	10	7	1.42	0	0	0
Grand-daughters	8	5	1.6	1	1	1.0
Parents	22	17	1.29	15	14	1.1
Others	36	18	2.0	6	4	1.5
Total Number	497	131	3.8	470	118	3.98

* Not included in county totals.

of a head, a homemaker, two sons and two daughters.

(Table XVII) In ten per cent of the households the head was without a mate.* In nine per cent of the households, parents of either the head or homemaker were among the membership.

One household in every ten included persons not in the direct line of descent (such as brother, cousin, nephew, friend). A minor portion of the families reported grandsons or granddaughters within the household.

Of the total number of "other persons", (Table XVIII) approximately ninety-one per cent were either mates, sons, or daughters of the head, and but nine per cent were of other relationships. Clearly then, relief programs for future rehabilitation can be based upon the assumption of a close relationship among the members of individual household units. Some form of "family projects" may therefore be feasible.

Education of Head and Homemaker. Approximately 70 per cent of the heads of relief households have received eighth grade education or less. Only 36 per cent have finished the eighth grade, and but 4.5 per cent have finished high school.

* The state planning board report figures of nine per cent widows and 4.9 per cent widowers are in close agreement here.

TABLE XVIII - RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF "OTHER PERSONS"

IN 520 RURAL FAMILIES HOLDERS IN KANSAS

Relationship to Head	Gray : County	Linn : County	Norton : County	Four : Counties Combined	Per Cent : of "Other : Persons"	Number : Reporting	Per Cent : of Families Reporting	Average : per Family Reporting
No. without Mates	17	11	19	9	56 ^a			10.8
Mates	138	105	112	109	464	22.2	464	89.2
Sons	230	190	172	163	760	36.3	370	71.2
Daughters	206	169	137	171	683	32.6	330	63.5
Grandsons	8	2	10	0	20	1.0	16	2.0
Grand-daughters	10	5	8	1	24	1.2	18	3.5
Parents	13	5	22	15	55	2.6	46	8.8
Others	22	22	36	6	86	4.1	51	10.0
Total Number	627	498	497	470	2092	100.0	1295	

^aNot included in total of 2092 "other persons".

Over one per cent have had no schooling at all. Approximately 2.3 per cent have had some college experience.

(Table XIX)

In general, the homemaker is better educated than the head of the household. (Tables XX - XXI) Forty-three per cent have had more education, about 30 per cent have the same schooling, and only about 20 per cent have had less schooling. Approximately, 13 per cent have had education of a higher academic institutional level than the head of the household, and only six per cent have education of a lower institutional level. This last is interpreted to mean that they attended high school while the husband attended only grade school, or college while the husband attended merely high school.

Since educational comparisons seem an important factor in the determination of the standards of the home, further analysis seems justifiable. (Tables XXII - XXIII) It is perhaps significant that in Linn County, where the greatest proportion of the "heads and homemakers" had received at least an eighth grade education, the average number of persons in the household is smallest; while in Gray County, which had the smallest percentage of heads and homemakers

TABLE XIX - EDUCATION OF HEAD AND HOMEMAKER

A Percentage Summary of the Educational Backgrounds of the Head and Homemaker in Relief Households

	Head	Gray	Linn	North	Four
	County	County	County	County	Counties
	:	:	:	:	:
Home-Head	: Home-Head	: Home-Head	: Home-Head	: Home-Head	: Home-Head
: Maker	: Maker	: Maker	: Maker	: Maker	: Maker
: Per	: Per	: Per	: Per	: Per	: Per
: Cent	: Cent	: Cent	: Cent	: Cent	: Cent
No School Experience	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0	0.8
Finished Eighth Grade	40.6	39.3	25.0	29.3	34.7
Finished One Year High School	5.2	3.0	6.6	5.1	5.1
Completed High School	6.4	7.7	8.6	7.7	11.0
College Experience	2.6	1.9	2.6	6.0	3.3
					1.7
					2.5

TABLE XX - EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF HEADS
OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Schooling Completed by Head	Moore	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
No Schooling	0	2	4	0	6	1.2
Grade 1-3	8	7	8	8	31	6.0
4-5	21	20	22	13	76	14.6
6	12	4	14	13	43	8.3
7	21	16	19	28	84	16.2
8	65	89	98	45	197	36.7
High School 1	8	10	4	2	24	4.6
2	5	10	1	5	21	4.0
3	3	5	0	1	9	1.7
4	10	10	2	1	23	4.4
College Experience	4	3	1	4	12	2.3
Total	155	116	131	118	520	100.0

College Education

College Experience	4	3	1	4	12	-
Total Years College	9	6	1	8	24	-
Ave. Yrs. Per Person	2.2	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	-

TABLE XXI - EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF HOMEMAKERS
OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Schooling Completed by Homemaker	Moore	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
No Schooling	0	0	0	1	1	0.2
Grades 1-3	2	5	2	3	12	2.3
4-5	12	9	18	11	50	9.6
6	12	3	7	3	25	4.8
7	16	16	18	24	73	14.0
8	61	34	61	41	197	37.9
High School 1	14	6	6	6	32	6.2
2	3	7	4	7	26	5.0
3	7	3	2	3	15	2.9
4	12	18	5	13	48	9.2
College Experience	3	7	1	2	13	2.5
Female Head or No Homemaker	9	10	7	4	30	5.8
Total	155	116	131	118	520	100.0

College Education

College Experience	3	7	1	2	13	-
Total Years College	8	11	2	3	25	-
Ave. Yrs. Per Person	2.6	1.6	2	1.5	1.9	-

TABLE XXII - HOMEMAHER COMPARED TO HEAD
IN 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Years of Education	Meade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Same as Head	47	30	44	38	159	30.6
One Year More	16	16	14	18	64	12.3
Two Years More	18	13	16	7	54	10.4
Three Years More	10	13	9	6	38	7.3
Four Years More	11	8	10	12	41	7.9
Five Years More	12	5	5	8	30	5.7
One Year Less	14	5	11	7	37	7.1
Two Years Less	7	3	7	6	23	4.4
Three Years Less	5	6	1	6	18	3.5
Four Years Less	4	4	3	1	12	2.3
Five Years Less	2	4	2	3	11	2.1
Man - No Homemaker	4	1	9	3	17	3.3
Woman - No Husband	5	8	-	3	16	3.1
Total	155	116	151	118	520	100.0

TABLE XXIII - SUMMARY GROUP CLASSIFICATIONS - COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS
OF HOME MAKER COMPARED WITH HEAD IN 520 RURAL BELIEFF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

	: Meade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Norton County :		: our Counties : Combined :	
Education of Homemaker to Comparison Possible	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :	No. :	Per Cent :
	9	5.8	9	7.8	9	6.9	6	5.1	33	6.3
Same as Head	47	30.3	30	25.9	44	33.6	38	32.2	159	30.6
More than Head	67	43.2	55	47.4	54	41.2	51	43.2	227	43.7
Less than Head	32	20.7	22	18.9	24	18.3	23	19.5	101	19.4
Total	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

completing at least an eighth grade education, the average number of "other persons" in the household was largest. (See section on "other persons" in the households). It is, therefore, possible to infer that the size of families is inversely proportional to the educational background of the majority of the parents.

Following is a summary table of those homemakers who have had education of a different academic institutional level than the head of the household:

County	Higher Institutional Level	Lower Institutional Level
Meade	21	5
Gray	22	12
Linn	11	3
Norton	23	9
Four Counties Combined . . .	77	29
Per Cent of 520 Homemakers . .	15.5	5.8

Young People in the Households. About 67 per cent of the young people under 25 years of age are in public school. Only 9.4 per cent are in high school, and over 23 per cent constitute an unoccupied out-of-school population which presents a serious challenge to educators and to the social planner. There are more boys in public school, but more girls in the high school groups. In the unoccupied group

under 25, the males again predominate, due partially to premature marriages of the girls. (Table XXIV)

Young people under 25 were considered as unoccupied if they were unmarried or had no children or direct family responsibilities. This number does not include married young men or young women who were unemployed. It includes those who are not in school, but who would ordinarily be attending school or college if financial circumstances enabled them to do so. It does not include young women with children, or girls acting as homemakers or helpers in families where their services are needed, even though they are not regularly employed.

The need for a distinct type of rural youth program for the educational and recreational needs of these young people is acute. In many cases the provision of facilities, especially for young women and girls, would be of immediate value in the rural sections. The boys frequently congregate in groups or "gangs" or perform odd jobs to occupy their time, but such outlets of expression are ordinarily impossible for the young girl. Frequently the only hope of

TABLE XXIV - DISTRIBUTION OF YOUNG PERSONS
 (Pre-School to Twenty-five Years of Age)
 IN 520 RURAL FAMILIAR HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

In Grade School	Meade	Cray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Male	103	86	80	82	351	51.4
Female	103	76	69	84	332	48.6
Total	206	162	149	166	683	100.0
In High School						
Male	15	15	14	3	47	48.9
Female	15	18	10	2	45	51.1
Total	30	33	24	5	96	100.0
Under Twenty-five Not in School or Occupied						
Male	38	25	47	30	140	58.1
Female	32	20	27	22	101	41.9
Total	70	45	74	52	241	100.0
Summary Classification						
In Grades	206	162	149	166	683	66.9
In High School	30	33	24	5	96	9.4
In College	0	0	1	0	1	0.1
Under Twenty-Five Unoccupied	70	45	74	52	241	23.6
Total	306	240	248	227	1021	100.0

"escape" for her lies in early marriage.

Many contrasts are present in the attitudes of the various families toward the education of their children. There was only one family with a child in college. The young man is a sophomore, and the son of a Linn County cistern cleaner whose average monthly earnings have never exceeded twenty-two dollars per month for his entire occupational history. On the other hand, many families withdraw their children as soon as they have completed the eighth grade, or have reached the legal age limit, and in some of these cases the home is without magazines, radio or any social contacts of an organized type. Clearly, such families have a tendency to perpetuate the relief problem. A striking example of this is that of one Linn County family where the head (twenty-six) has had but a sixth grade education, and the homemaker (twenty-two) but two years of schooling. Clearly, the child in such a household will experience difficulty in securing adequate education, particularly because of the low earning power of the head.

There appears to be a tendency for those families with a larger number of children to keep the greatest proportion of them in the schools, possibly to avoid problems of home discipline.

Many of the relief families will experience great sacrifices in order to give their children educational advantages. A Merton County widow of fifty-one has two sons (eight and ten) and two daughters (twelve and fourteen) whom she keeps in school by doing washings and part time farming. A Gray County family kept two sons in high school by selling their farm and borrowing on life insurance. Many other examples might be cited of the courage of these families in attempting to raise the standards of education for their children. On the other hand, several families have never sent their children to school, and in one case the interviewer in Merton County talked with one of these, now a grown man, who at the age of twenty-eight, can not read and can write only his own name.

In general, there seems to be a noticeable tendency for the children to achieve an education equivalent to the amount received by the better educated of the two parents, and there their schooling usually ceases. This is particularly true in the case of the young women and girls.

One Gray County family has kept four boys (twelve, sixteen, eighteen and twenty) in high school despite the fact that employment changes have forced them to move on ten different occasions.

Occupational Experience of the Homemakers. In order to partly indicate the after effects of this situation upon the young women in later life, a study was made of the occupational experiences of the homemakers in the relief households. (Table XXV).

Of the women, or homemakers, almost 65 per cent have no occupational experiences or training, and but two per cent have teaching or other professional experience. The largest occupational group consisted of maids or domestic help, which numbered less than three per cent. Only two per cent of the homemakers want, or are seeking work or employment, and a large majority emphatically were not seeking employment to supplement the family income. The majority offered "household duties", "does not want work", or "not interested" in answer to this question.

It will be seen, therefore, that in the large majority of cases, the homemaker has had insufficient vocational training or experience to aid the young women of the household in securing satisfactory occupational adjustments. In addition, the majority of the homemakers emphatically believed that "the place of women is in the home", and but little encouragement is given to the young women who desire to secure training for a future vocation or career.

TABLE XXV - PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND OF HOMEMAKERS
IN 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES IN KANSAS

	Meade County	Gray County	Linn County	Norton County	Four Counties Combined	Per Cent
No Occupational Experience	132	87	121	101	441	84.8
Ex-Wife	4	6	0	3	13	2.5
Home Help, Paid	0	0	0	2	2	0.3
Hired Girl, Farm	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Laundry Worker	2	0	0	0	2	0.3
Maid, Domestic Help	3	11	0	1	15	2.9
Cook	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Hotel, Restaurant	2	1	1	5	9	1.8
Teaching	3	5	0	2	10	2.0
Office, Skilled	2	2	0	0	4	0.7
Services	2	1	0	3	6	1.2
Store, Shop	1	2	0	0	3	.6
Families with No Homemaker	4	1	9	1	15	2.9
Total	155	116	131	118	520	100.0
Number of Homemakers Seek- ing Employment	4	1	6	0	11	2.1

A definite encouragement of women's "household arts" occupations, or vocational training for young women are two programs which would be of immediate value.

OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY, FARM TENURE AND MOBILITY
OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Occupational Factors

Types of Occupational Experiences. Almost 38 per cent of the heads of relief households are in the laboring or unskilled workmen's group, and an additional 43 per cent reported farming activities as their principal vocational experience. Only 1.5 per cent have professional training or experience, and but eight per cent have skilled occupational experience. (Table XXVI)

It is perhaps significant that Gray County, where the largest percentage of skilled workmen reside, also has the lowest proportion of homemakers with no occupational experience.

It is also significant that Gray County, which has the largest proportion of heads who are high school graduates or who have attended high school, also has the greatest proportion of workmen who have had skilled occupational experience. Norton County, with the lowest proportion of

TABLE XXVI - TYPES OF MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE REPORTED
BY HEADS OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Type of Experience	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Morton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Labor--Unskilled	69	44.5	45	38.8	41	31.3	40	33.9	195	37.5
Farm Operations	50	32.3	41	31.3	72	55.0	63	53.4	226	43.5
Mechanic--Skilled	12	7.7	15	12.9	11	8.4	5	4.2	43	8.3
Professional	6	3.9	1	0.8	0	0.	1	0.9	8	1.5
Services	18	11.6	14	12.1	7	5.3	9	7.6	48	9.2
Total No. "Heads" Reporting	155	100.0	116	100.0	131	100.0	118	100.0	520	100.0

high school graduates or pupils (Table XX) also has the smallest percentage of skilled workmen.

Gray County also has the lowest proportion of young people under twenty-five who are unoccupied, and the highest proportion of young people attending grade school and high school. (Table XXIV)

The inference here is that those households which have parents with more education also have the more skilled occupational background, with consequent better living conditions due to better wages, and hence have a greater proportion of children who can secure school opportunities, and who can therefore subsequently secure a greater proportion of the positions for employment. The cycle is therefore continuous, and the education of the parents is reflected in the education of the offspring. Conversely, those family adults who have little education also can give their children but little, and their cycle is accordingly repeated.

There is a distinct need for the propagation of the "education idea" among the families of the unskilled classes, and there is also need of a distinct type of rural vocational education to more adequately prepare the young people in these families for their future vocational life.

Work Record. Table XXVII shows that over 60 per cent

TABLE XXVII - PERIOD SINCE OCCUPATION BEGAN FOR HEADS OF 520
RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Years	Neade County		Gray County		Linn County		Worton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.
0-3	6	5.1	15	16.5	6	5.8	5	4.5	32	7.6
4-5	4	3.4	9	9.9	4	3.9	5	4.6	22	5.2
6-10	25	21.2	15	16.5	22	21.4	18	16.4	80	19.0
11-15	23	19.5	12	13.2	16	15.5	15	13.6	66	15.6
16-20	18	15.3	9	9.9	10	9.7	18	16.4	55	13.0
21-25	14	11.8	6	6.6	18	17.5	14	12.7	52	12.3
26-30	12	10.1	3	3.3	5	4.9	11	10.0	31	7.4
31-35	6	5.1	8	8.8	10	9.7	11	10.0	35	8.3
36-40	1		7		3		7		18	4.3
41-50	5	8.5	6	15.3	4	11.6	4	11.8	19	4.5
Plus 50	4		1		5		2		12	8.8
Totals	118	100.0	91	100.0	103	100.0	110	100.0	422	100.0
Ave. Months Since Occupation Began	241.41		218.83		244.84		251.90		240.11	

of the workers (heads of relief households) have an occupational history of twenty-five years or less, and 30 per cent of ten years or less. The average period since occupational activity for pay began is 240 months or twenty years. Gray County has the greatest percentage who began work not more than five years ago. It is significant that this county also has the highest proportion of high school students among the heads and homemakers, the smallest group of non-skilled or farming workers, and the youngest age groupings. The four factors have a positive correlation, and are characteristic of the post-depression family groups.

Job Duration. The average duration of a "job", or employment period is 36 months or less, for over 45 per cent of the heads. Approximately nine per cent report an average job duration of ten years or more. The average time spent in any one job for the entire group is fifty-five months, or approximately four and one-half years.

(Table XXVIII)

Unemployment Periods. Less than ten per cent of relief households reported unemployment periods prior to January, 1930, and about twenty-two per cent have experienced unemployment since that time. Approximately 72 per cent of all unemployment periods, and 54 per cent of all unemployed time have occurred since January, 1930. This is evidence

TABLE XXVIII - AVERAGE DURATION OF EMPLOYMENT, PER JOB, FOR OCCUPATIONAL WORKERS, HEADS OF 520 RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Job Duration in Months	Seeds County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.
0-6	4	9.3	7	24.2	4	12.6	2	10.9	17	4.0
6-12	7		15		9		10		41	9.7
13-24	18		20		13		20		71	15.8
25-30	8	29.7	11	38.4	5	28.2	10	40.0	34	8.0
31-36	9		4		11		14		38	9.0
37-48	19	23.7	11	22.0	10	19.4	15	24.5	55	13.0
49-60	9		9		10		12		40	9.3
61-72	13		5		5		7		30	7.1
73-96	9	28.7	4	11.0	12	22.3	8	16.4	33	7.8
97-120	13		1				3		23	5.6
121-156	7		2		6		6		21	5.0
157-240	2	7.6	2	4.4	7	17.5	1	0.2	12	2.8
Over 240	0		0		5		2		7	1.1
Total	118	100.0	91	100.0	103	100.0	110	100.0	422	100.0
Average Months Duration	57.2		36.3		74.6		51.3		55.4	

TABLE XXIX - UNEMPLOYMENT HISTORY AND PERCENTAGE OF COUNTY RELIEF
 TRAILS REPORTING UNEMPLOYMENT IN 520 RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN TEXAS

	Hood County		Gray County		Linn County		Forton County		Four Counties Combined	
History of Unemployment	Prior to Jan. 1930	Since Jan. 1930	Prior to Jan. 1930	Since Jan. 1930	Prior to Jan. 1930	Since Jan. 1930	Prior to Jan. 1930	Since Jan. 1930	Prior to Jan. 1930	Since Jan. 1930
Number of Periods	14	34	24	90	7	14	13	10	58	148
Number of Months	700 ^a	792	448	884	120	127	563	112	1831	1835
Average Months per Period	50.0	20.6	18.7	9.9	17.1	9.1	20.2	11.2	29.1	12.3
Number of Individuals Reporting	14	28	19	61	7	14	10	10	50	115
Per Cent of Relieved Heads Reporting Unemployment	9.0	18.0	16.4	52.6	6.8	18.7	8.4	8.4	9.6	21.7

Include one period of 404 months for a female head. Without this case, the average period is 22.7 months.

that the depression is a major factor in throwing families on the relief rolls since that time. (Tables XXIX and XXX)

TABLE XXX - SUMMARY OF UNEMPLOYMENT

	: Total No.:		: Total No.:	
	: Periods	: Per Cent	: Months	: Per Cent
	: of Unem-	: of	: of Unem-	:
	: ployment	: Periods	: ployment	:
Prior January, 1930:	56	28.2	1531	45.5
Since January, 1930:	148	71.8	1835	54.5
Totals	206	100.0	3366	100.0
Average per Family	:	:	:	6.4 months

Some periods of "unemployment" were due to sickness, war injuries, periods of unpaid work within the household, or similar causes, and these factors must be considered in an evaluation of the tables. The average period of unemployment, (per relief family), is 6.4 months.

Earnings. Almost seventy per cent of the heads of relief households have an average monthly earnings of fifty dollars or less for their entire occupational history, and 95 per cent report average earnings of less than \$125.00 per month for their entire occupational history. It is evident that the majority of relief families are in the low income groups for their entire life cycle. (Table XXXI)

TABLE XXXI - AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS DURING ENTIRE OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY FOR FAMILIES OF 520 RURAL WHITE HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Average Monthly Earnings	Woods County			Gray County			Linn County			Norton County			Four Counties Combined		
	No.	Per Cent by Groups	Per Cent by Groups	No.	Per Cent by Groups	Per Cent by Groups	No.	Per Cent by Groups	Per Cent by Groups	No.	Per Cent by Groups	Per Cent by Groups	No.	Per Cent by Groups	Per Cent by Groups
0-10	2			2			10			17			31	7.3	
11-20	17			16			16			28			77	18.2	
21-30	17	67.8		12	54.9		21	66.1		24	84.5		74	17.5	68.8
31-40	23			10			8			11			52	12.3	
41-50	21			10			13			15			57	13.5	
51-60	13			4			6			4			27	6.4	
61-70	5			9			7			4			26	5.9	
71-80	7	28.0		11	37.4		10	33.9		1	13.7		29	6.9	27.7
81-90	5			1			2			0			8	1.9	
91-125	3			9			10			6			28	6.6	
Over 125	5	4.2		7	7.7		0	0.		2	1.8		14	3.5	3.5
Total	118	100.0		91	100.0		103	100.0		110	100.0		422	100.0	100.0

Individual cases are quite startling; in Norton County a crippled man of fifty-five had never earned over ten dollars per month during his entire life; a fifty-six year old had never earned over five dollars per month and neither had he had any farming experience. How such families continue to exist is problematical. The contrasts in income for individual families is also interesting. Some heads have had salaries ranging from \$300.00 per month to as low as ten dollars per month during their occupational careers. One family reported (Meade County) an average income of \$323.10, and a \$500 per month income for a fourteen year period, despite their present relief condition. In some cases where the income of the head is low, income from other members of the household is used to supplement the family purse.

Distance to Job. The average relief head lives close to his work. Almost one-fourth of the heads of relief households work "at home" or have their residence at their place of employment; over fifty per cent work within an average distance of one mile from their place of residence; and over ninety per cent live within a five mile radius of the place where they earn their livelihood. (Table XXXII) Rehabilitation programs based upon giving men employment at great distances from their homes will probably fail among such fami-

TABLE XXXII - AVERAGE DISTANCE TO JOB FOR
OCCUPATIONAL WORKERS AS HEADS OF RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS

Miles to Job	Meade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
0.0	13	38	19	30	100	23.7
0.0 - 0.5	4	9	16	29	58	13.7
0.5 - 1	13	5	26	23	67	15.9
1 - 3	13	14	28	23	78	18.5
4 - 5	23	12	8	1	44	10.4
6 - 10	34	7	3	0	44	10.4
11 - 20	13	3	2	1	19	4.5
21 - 30	4	1	0	0	5	1.2
31 - 45	0	1	1	1	3	0.7
Over 45	1	1	0	2	4	1.0
Total	118	91	103	110	422	100.0
Average Miles To Job	10.4	3.2	1.8	3.7	4.8	-

lies, principally because the men are accustomed to working near their homes and families.

Changes in Vocation and in Residential Location. Approximately 57 per cent of all vocational changes or changes in "jobs" reported by heads of relief households, are

changes in occupation. The proportion of "changes in industry" and "inter-occupational changes" are approximately equal. The rural relief head changes his occupation about twice as frequently as he makes vocational changes in industry, or within his occupational limits.* (Table XXXIII)

Over one-half of family residential movements were within county boundaries only. Family movements across county lines were approximately equal to changes across state lines.

Mobility. The average number of vocational and location changes per family is 3.1 for their entire occupational histories. This indicates that excessive mobility is not a characteristic of Kansas relief families. Table XXXIV shows that over fifty per cent reported two changes or less for their entire history, and over seventy per cent reported less than four changes.

In each county there appears to be a small minority who have an excessively large mobility. A summary of this group follows: In Meade County 5.3 per cent of the workers averaged 7.5 changes per individual. In Gray County 20.9 per

* Occupational change indicates changes in occupation; an "Industrial" change was defined as where there was no change in occupation, but in industry - e. g. a farm laborer becoming a railroad laborer, the change is in industry, but not in occupation, etc. An inter-occupational change was defined as one in which there was neither change in type of occupation nor in industry, but merely a change in place of

TABLE XXXIII - CHANGES IN VOCATION AND LOCATION OF HEADS OF 520

RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Changes in Vocation

	: Meade County :			: Linn County :			: Norton County :			: Four Counties Combined :		
	No. :	Cent. :	Per :	No. :	Cent. :	Per :	No. :	Cent. :	Per :	No. :	Cent. :	Per :
Occupational changes in												
Industry	93	26.7	107	24.0	19	10.0	51	16.4	270	20.8		
Occupation	190	54.4	250	56.1	123	64.7	180	58.1	743	57.4		
Inter-Occupation	66	18.9	89	19.9	48	25.3	79	25.5	282	21.8		
Total Number changes in location	349	100.0	446	100.0	190	100.0	310	100.0	1295	100.0		
Type of changes	Changes in Residential Location											
Residential changes												
State	66	18.9	90	20.2	42	22.1	101	32.6	299	23.1		
County	103	29.5	114	25.6	30	15.8	71	22.9	318	24.5		
Inter-County changes in residence	180	51.6	242	54.2	118	62.1	138	44.5	678	52.4		
Total Number changes in residence	349	100.0	446	100.0	190	100.0	310	100.0	1295	100.0		
Average Changes per Individual	2.9		4.9		1.8		3.8		3.1			

Includes 3 international moves from Canada to United States.

TABLE XXXIV - MOBILITY - NUMBER OF EMPLOYMENT CHANGES FOR
HEAD OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Number of Changes: During Occupa- tional History	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Horton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Cent.	No.	Per	No.	Cent.	No.	Per	No.	Cent.
0 or unrecorded	23	19.5	9	9.9	32	31.1	23	20.9	87	20.9
1 - 2	39	33.1	19	20.9	40	38.8	31	28.2	129	30.6
3	14	11.9	7	7.7	14	13.6	11	10.0	46	10.9
4	11	9.3	17	18.7	7	6.8	11	10.0	46	10.9
5	11	9.3	6	6.5	3	2.9	7	6.4	27	6.3
6	7	5.9	4	4.4	4	3.9	6	5.5	21	4.9
7	6	5.1	8	8.8	1	1.0	15	13.6	30	7.1
8	3	2.6	2	2.2	0	0.	1	.9	6	1.4
9 or more	4	3.3	19	20.9	2	1.9	5	4.5	30	7.1
Total	118	100.0	91	100.0	103	100.0	110	100.0	422	100.0

cent of the workers averaged 10.6 changes per individual. In Linn County 1.9 per cent of the workers averaged 9.5 changes per individual. In Norton County 4.5 per cent of the workers averaged 11.2 changes per individual. In the four counties 7.1 per cent of the workers averaged 10.2 changes per individual.

About twenty per cent of Gray County workers report an excessively high mobility. This is due to a large amount of unemployment and jobs of short duration among the younger population in the county. Younger workers, having better education and skilled experience, are more versatile and attempt to secure odd jobs of any kind, with a consequent rise in the number of residential or vocational changes in the county.

Meade County had one individual with twenty-two jobs in his twenty years of occupational history. The number of changes is also increased by changes during war time or unemployment periods. Mobility increases during periods of economic stress.

employment. e. g. a farm laborer gets a job as a farm laborer in another locality, etc.

Employment Status of Other Members of the Household.

In 1930, 94 per cent of the families had one or two persons regularly employed, and there were no families with no one employed. In October, 1933, 17.5 per cent of the families had no persons employed, and 97 per cent had two, or fewer than two, persons employed. This great decrease in the number of those regularly employed (Table XXXV) together with an accompanying decline in wages of those who are still employed is one of the underlying causal factors for relief.*

Persons Seeking Employment. There were 124 persons seeking employment in the 520 relief families of the four counties at the time of this survey. Of this number, 106 (85.8 per cent) were males, and 48 (31.2 per cent) were females. The two sexes combined represent approximately fifteen per cent of the total number of "other persons" in the relief households. There were twenty-eight such persons in Waade County; thirty-four in Gray; sixty-five in Linn; and twenty-seven in Norton County.

* A similar study of 1040 non-relief cases showed an increase of 16.2 per cent in the number of families with only one worker employed and an increase of 2.6 per cent in the number of families with no one employed, for the same period.

TABLE XXXV - NUMBER OF PERSONS
SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE AND OVER REGULARLY EMPLOYED
IN 520 FRRAL FRELIEF HENC HOIDS IN KANSAS

Number Employed Per Family	: Number Previously Employed		: Number Regularly Employed in October, 1933		: Per Cent Change
	: Number of Families:	: Per Cent	: Number of Families:	: Per Cent	
0	: 0	: 0.0	: 91	: 17.5	: 17.5
1	: 364	: 70.0	: 356	: 68.4	: 1.6
2	: 124	: 24.0	: 64	: 12.3	: 11.9
3	: 25	: 4.8	: 6	: 1.2	: 3.6
4	: 2	: .3	: 3	: .6	: .3
5 or more	: 5	: .9	: 0	: 0.0	: .9
Total No. of Families:	520	: 100.0	520	: 100.0	:

Farm Tenure

Period Since Farming Began. Of the 413 relief heads reporting a farming history, Table XXVVI shows that almost ten per cent began their first farming enterprise not more than three years ago, and nineteen per cent have a farm operation history of five years or less. Half of all relief family heads began farming at some period since the World War, and approximately three out of four began farming less than

TABLE XXVI - PERIOD SINCE FARMING BEGAN FOR HEADS OF

413 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Years Since Farming Began	Moade County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.
0 - 3	10	8.1	12	13.3	12	12.1	6	5.9	40	9.6
4 - 5	9	7.3	10	11.1	10	10.1	10	9.9	39	9.4
6 - 10	21	17.7	14	15.6	15	15.2	21	20.8	71	17.4
11 - 15	20	16.3	9	10.0	14	14.1	13	12.9	56	13.5
16 - 20	14	11.4	13	14.5	11	11.1	14	13.9	52	12.6
21 - 25	19	15.4	10	11.1	11	11.1	10	9.9	50	12.1
26 - 30	10	8.1	10	11.1	5	5.1	6	5.9	31	7.5
31 - 35	8	6.5	6	6.7	6	6.1	6	5.9	26	6.3
36 - 40	4	3.3	1	1.1	4	4.0	10	9.9	19	4.6
41 - 50	5	4.1	2	2.2	8	8.1	4	3.9	19	4.6
Over 50	3	2.4	3	3.3	3	3.0	1	1.0	10	2.4
Total	123	100.0	90	100.0	99	100.0	101	100.0	413	100.0
Average Months Since Farming Began	226.6		207.4		224.8		219.3		220.1	

twenty-five years ago. In general, the large percentage of relatively new farms would indicate the probability that they were on marginal or "worn out" land. This may be an additional causal factor of relief, and may also play a large part in the reasons for the great percentage of agricultural failures reported by heads of relief households. The average period since farming began is slightly more than eighteen years, and Gray County which has the youngest age group also has the shortest period since farming began.

Total Years of Farm Operation. In order to obtain a comparison of the actual amount of time spent in farm operation by 413 relief heads, the total farming periods for each operator were added together to secure the total time actually spent in farm operation. The results, recorded in Table XXXVII, indicate that while the average farm operator began farming 220 months ago (18.3 years), his total period of actual farm operation is but 171 months, or 14.2 years. This indicates that farmers spent, on an average, four years in some enterprise other than farming. Part of the interval can be ascribed to war service, or work in other occupations during the high wage periods of war time.

It is interesting to note, also, that while thirty per

TABLE XXXVII - TOTAL YEARS OF FARM OPERATION
FOR HEADS OF 413 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN KANSAS

Total Years of Operation	Wade County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County		Four Counties Combined	
	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.	No.	Cent.
0 - 3	25	20.4	23	25.5	16	16.2	15	14.9	79	19.1
4 - 5	12	9.8	10	11.1	10	10.1	15	14.9	47	11.4
6 - 10	22	17.9	17	18.8	18	18.2	19	18.8	76	18.4
11 - 15	21	17.1	7	7.7	15	15.2	14	13.8	57	13.8
16 - 20	18	14.6	11	12.2	14	14.1	12	11.9	55	13.3
21 - 25	10	8.1	7	7.7	8	8.1	7	6.9	32	7.7
26 - 30	8	6.5	7	7.7	6	6.1	5	4.9	26	6.3
31 - 35	1	0.8	3	3.3	4	4.0	9	8.9	17	4.1
36 - 40	3	2.4	2	2.2	1	1.0	3	3.0	9	2.2
41 - 50	2	1.5	2	2.2	4	4.0	1	1.0	9	2.2
Over 50	1	0.8	1	1.1	3	3.0	1	1.0	6	1.5
Total	123	100.0	90	100.0	99	100.0	101	100.0	413	100.0
Average Months of Total Operation	164.8	-	154.9	-	189.9	-	174.5	-	171.1	-

cent of the farmers have a farm operating period of five years or less, only nineteen per cent actually began farming within the last five years. Other comparisons show similar results.

Tenure Operation Status During Total Farming History.

Table XXXVIII indicates that 413 relief heads have spent almost seventy per cent of their farming periods operating rented land. Approximately one-fourth of their time has been spent as the owner of farm property. This large percentage of time spent in tenancy makes for a relatively mobile and economically unsettled group.

TABLE XXXVIII - TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT
IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF TENURE OPERATION STATUS
BY 413 HEADS OF RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS

Number Months Operation as:	Moade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Owner	8,011	5,272	2,721	3,816	19,820	27.9
Renter	10,553	8,150	15,400	13,701	47,804	67.2
Other	1,839	755	596	344	3,534	4.9
Total	20,403	14,177	18,717	17,861	71,158	100.0

From the large percentage of time spent in tenancy, it seemed reasonable to suppose that the greatest proportion of farming enterprises engaged in by relief heads during their farming history would be upon a tenancy basis. Table XXXIX shows that this is so.

TABLE XXXIX - CLASSIFICATION OF FARMING ENTERPRISES
ENGAGED IN BY 413 RELIEF HEADS DURING THEIR FARMING HISTORY

Number Times	Meade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Owned	56	43	22	24	145	25.9
Rented	97	77	94	94	362	64.6
Others	26	9	12	6	53	9.5
Total	179	129	128	124	560	100.0

From the foregoing data, it is clear that rehabilitation programs can and must be based upon a supposition of present tenancy in the majority of cases. This fact increases the possibility of moving families from marginal land and also prevents the planning of long time family projects upon present family sites.

Tenure Operating Status at the Time of Survey. Table XL gives the tenure status of the 520 households in the four counties at the time of the survey. It will be seen that while relief household heads spent 67 per cent of their farm history as "renters" of farms, nevertheless only 39 per cent were actually renters on farms at the time of the survey, and less than sixty per cent were engaged in any farming enterprises.

Relief families operate much smaller averages and rent a much greater percentage of their acreages than do non-relief families in the same localities. An analysis of these factors follow:

	520		1040	
	Relief Families Average Acreage	Per Cent of Total Acreage	Non-relief Families Average Acreage	Per Cent of Total Acreage
Farm Land				
Owned	32.4	27.5	275.5	61.1
Rented	86.5	72.7	170.5	38.9
Total	118.9	100.0	446.0	100.0

It will be seen that the percentage of owners among non-relief families was practically twice that of the relief families, and that farms of non-relief families averaged almost four times as large as those of relief families.

TABLE XL - TENURE STATUS OF THE HEADS OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS IN
KANSAS AT TIME OF THE SURVEY

	:Heade County :		: Gray County :		: Linn County :		: Norton County :		: Four Counties : Combined :	
	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :	: No. :	: Per : Cent. :
Owner	: 31 :	: 20.3 :	: 15 :	: 12.9 :	: 11 :	: 8.4 :	: 9 :	: 7.6 :	: 66 :	: 12.7 :
Renter	: 37 :	: 23.9 :	: 36 :	: 31.1 :	: 71 :	: 54.9 :	: 59 :	: 50.0 :	: 203 :	: 39.0 :
Cropper Partner or Manager	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 2 :	: 1.2 :	: 0 :	: 0.0 :	: 2 :	: .3 :
All Others	: 80 :	: 51.6 :	: 65 :	: 56.0 :	: 45 :	: 34.3 :	: 49 :	: 41.5 :	: 239 :	: 45.9 :
Total Families	: 155 :	: 100.0 :	: 116 :	: 100.0 :	: 131 :	: 100.0 :	: 118 :	: 100.0 :	: 520 :	: 100.0 :

Average Acreages Operated During Farming History. Relief Heads have operated relatively small acreages during their entire farming history. Average acreages were obtained for each head by adding acreages for each enterprise, and dividing by the total number of enterprises he had operated during his entire farming history. (Table XLI). Over 75 per cent of relief households have operated on an average of less than 240 acres during their entire farming history. The average acreage operated by relief heads for their entire farm history is slightly less than 226 acres. Rehabilitation programs must, therefore, be based on the assumption that relief heads are accustomed only to the operation of relatively small farms. Collective farming on large acreages would require outside management and experience, with the possible exception of Gray County, where several farms are over a thousand acres in size.

TABLE XLI - AVERAGE ACREAGE OPERATED DURING FARMING
HISTORY BY HEADS OF 413 RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS

	:Meade :County:	: Gray :County:	: Linn :County:	:Norton :County:	:Four Counties : Combined	:Per : Cent
0- 10	: 0	: 4	: 5	: 1	: 10	: 2.4
11- 40	: 2	: 2	: 8	: 3	: 15	: 3.6
41- 80	: 5	: 1	: 30	: 7	: 43	: 10.4
81-120	: 9	: 8	: 29	: 8	: 54	: 13.1
121-240	: 46	: 37	: 22	: 63	: 168	: 40.7
241-320	: 18	: 18	: 3	: 10	: 49	: 11.9
321-380	: 15	: 9	: 0	: 2	: 26	: 6.3
381-420	: 8	: 3	: 2	: 2	: 15	: 3.6
421-500	: 9	: 5	: 0	: 2	: 15	: 3.6
500-1000	: 10	: 2	: 0	: 3	: 15	: 3.6
Over 1000	: 2	: 1	: 0	: 0	: 3	: 0.8
Total	: 123	: 90	: 99	: 101	: 413	: 100.0
Average Acres Individual Operated During Farming History	: 328.4	: 254.5	: 104.3	: 194.7	: 225.8	:

Full versus Part-time Farming. Relief heads are not accustomed to part time farming enterprises. Table XLII shows that only 4.8 per cent of farm enterprises conducted by relief heads during their entire histories were on a part-time basis. Rehabilitation programs based upon the idea of part-time farming must be preceded by a program of education to establish the idea of the values of part-time farming. In addition, suitable vocational training must be given to relief heads that will enable them to participate in farming and vocational pursuits on a complimentary part-time basis. Such programs bear great promise of future possibility. It is significant that Gray County, with the largest number of young skilled workers, also has the greatest proportion of part-time farming enterprises.

TABLE XLII - PER CENT OF FULL AND PART-TIME
FARM ENTERPRISES OPERATED BY 413 RELIEF HEADS
DURING ENTIRE FARMING HISTORIES

Type of Enterprise	Meade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties	Per Cent
	County	County	County	County	Combined	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Full Time	407	337	400	355	1,499	95.2
Part Time	19	33	12	11	75	4.8
Total	426	370	412	366	1,574	100.0

Farm Mobility. In general, relief heads did not change location frequently during their farming histories. The average change per individual was slightly less than three. Since the average time of operation is 14.2 years, this would indicate one change about every five years of farm operation.

TABLE XLIII - OPERATION LOCALITY CHANGES
REPORTED BY 413 RELIEF HEADS DURING ENTIRE FARMING HISTORIES

	Meade County	Gray County	Linn County	Norton County	Four Counties Combined	Per Cent
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
State	47	29	27	37	140	12.4
County	66	97	55	48	266	23.6
Inter County	154	154	235	180	723	64.0
Total Changes	267	280	317	265	1,129	100.0
Average Changes per Family Head	2.1	3.1	3.2	2.6	2.7	-

Results of Farming Operations.* Approximately 45 per cent of all farming enterprises conducted by relief heads

*In interpreting these results it must be borne in mind that the categories "profitable", "broke even", and "suffered loss" are very general, and that the classification is based entirely upon the farmer's own classification of himself.

resulted in loss. Only one out of four enterprises resulted in profit. It is significant (Table XLIV) that in Gray County, where there is a greater proportion of high school educated persons, and a larger proportion of part-time farming enterprises, there was reported the highest percentage of profitable farming enterprises, and the lowest percentage of failures. The inference is that those families which have had the advantage of high school education have probably received some training along agricultural and vocational lines, thereby encouraging farm success and perhaps stimulating part-time vocations. In order to make future rehabilitation possible, it is essential that extensive training in proper agricultural methods must be given in order to reduce the extremely high percentage of agricultural failure.

TABLE XLIV - PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF FARMING OPERATIONS
FOR 413 RELIEF HEADS DURING ENTIRE FARMING HISTORY

Results	Meade	Gray	Linn	Norton	Four Counties
	County	County	County	County	Combined
	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	No. : Per Cent
Loss	41.8	39.4	50.5	46.1	701 : 44.5
Even	22.8	21.4	40.0	38.3	481 : 30.6
Profit	35.4	39.2	9.5	15.5	392 : 24.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1574 : 100.0

Years of Loss Prior to 1930. In order to more definitely establish that a high percentage of farm operation losses are characteristic of relief families, and are not merely the result of current economic conditions, a study was made to discover the amount of losses occurring prior to January 1, 1930, together with the percentage of the families reporting such losses. From the results (Table XLV) it seems reasonable to assume that farm losses of relief families are a characteristic not wholly dependent upon depression conditions. This further bears out the assumption that agricultural education must be a necessary part of future rehabilitation programs.

It is significant here also, that Gray reported the lowest average period of loss, and had the smallest percentage of individuals reporting such losses, prior to January, 1930. Differences in land, of course, count considerably, but it is nevertheless characteristic that Gray County relief people, on the whole, seem of more successful calibre than those of the other counties.

TABLE XLV - MONTHS OF LOSSES PRIOR TO JANUARY, 1930

REPORTED BY 413 RELIEF HEADS

	Meade County	Gray County	Linn County	Horton County	Four Counties Combined
No. Losses Prior to January 1, 1930:	6,807	3,048	6,123	37,711	53,689
No. of Individuals:	88	57	65	67	277
Average per Individual	77.4	53.5	94.2	562.9	193.9
Per Cent of Families Reporting:	71.6	63.3	65.7	66.3	67.1

ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HOUSEHOLDS

Land and Livestock as of January 1, 1934

Note: See section entitled "Tenure Status at Time of Survey". (Table XL).

The acreage ranges operated by relief families as of January 1, 1934, were as follows:

TABLE XLVI - RANGES OF ACREAGES OPERATED BY 520
RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS

	Meade County		Gray County		Linn County		Norton County	
	Size in Acres	Per Cent of Fam- ilies	Size in Acres	Per Cent of Fam- ilies	Size in Acres	Per Cent of Fam- ilies	Size in Acres	Per Cent of Fam- ilies
Highest	241- 1280	28.4	161- 800	25.9	80- 414	38.9	161- 540	23.8
Medium	1-240	28.4	1-160	25.8	2-79	28.3	1-160	38.1
Lowest	Less than 1	43.2	Less than 1	48.3	0-1	32.8	Less than 1	38.1
Total		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0

Meade County had the greatest percentage of village families and the largest farms operated by open country families. The average total acreage operated by relief families was 118 acres of both owned and rented land. Rented land represented 72.7 per cent of the total acreage; and owned land, 27.3 per cent of the total operated.

Of the total number of relief households, 28.1 per cent were owners* of land, 70.9 per cent were renters, and all others constituted but one per cent of the total. Of those who owned land, forty-two (or 8.1 per cent of the 20 families) were both owners and renters. This last was interpreted to mean that they were using rented land in addition to that which they owned.

Livestock

Horses and Mules. Approximately 52 per cent of relief families possess neither horses nor mules. Sixty-five per cent of the families possessed less than two horses or mules. The table below indicates that the majority of relief families did not possess draft animals. The lack of such animals

TABLE XLVII - PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES POSSESSING HORSES AND MULES

<u>Number of Head Owned</u>	<u>Per Cent of 520 Families Reporting</u>
0	52.3
1	4.4
2	11.3
3	5.4
4	10.0
5	5.4
6	4.4
7	2.5
Over 7	4.3
Total Per Cent	100.0

* An "owner" was one who both owns, and operates or lives on the land. The land may be mortgaged. A "tenant" was one who operates or lives on, but does not own his land, or use it by some arrangement other than tenancy.

in a group so largely rural and agricultural is due partly to the high cost of feed, and partly to the lack of grazing facilities caused by drouth. The lack of draft animals caused a reduction in size of farm acreages operated and gave a consequent reduction in potential earning power.

Milk Cows. The majority of relief households possessed few milk cows. Seventy per cent of the families possessed two cows or less. Milk cows are kept principally to supply family needs and to provide a small cash income from sale of cream. A summary of the number of milk cows owned by the 520 families showed the following:

TABLE XLVIII - PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES POSSESSING MILK COWS

<u>Number of Head Owned</u>	<u>Per Cent of 520 Families Reporting</u>
0	38.3
1-2	31.7
3-4	12.9
5-7	10.2
8-10	5.2
11-15	1.7
Total Per Cent	100.0

There was an average of 1.9 cows per family. Of the total number of families 38.3 per cent had no cows.

Poultry. Approximately four out of five families had some poultry. The sale of eggs for produce or cash, and the use of chickens for table food represent a material aid to many of the relief families. An analysis of this factor follows:

TABLE XLIX - PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES POSSESSING POULTRY

<u>Number of Fowls Owned</u>	<u>Per Cent of 520 Families Reporting</u>
0	20.0
1- 20	19.6
21- 40	21.3
41- 60	15.0
61-100	15.8
101-150	5.6
Over 150	2.7
Total Per Cent	100.0

Other Livestock. The majority of relief households possessed few cattle other than milk cows. There were no sheep possessed by the majority of households, and but few families owned more than from three to five hogs.

In general, relief families possess all types of livestock, only in small numbers. This may be explained in part by the smaller acreages operated, which would effect the number of livestock, but would have no necessary connection with the number of small stock owned.

It was noted in this study, and also in the South Dakota study previously referred to, that the farmer who had diversified by milking cows, raising hogs, poultry, or sheep, in addition to crop raising, was the one who had come through the depression the better. Apparently livestock raising has been an important differential factor in setting apart relief and non-relief families*, although it is, of course, true that the greater possibilities for borrowing constitute an advantage to the stock raiser and may have been the means for keeping him off relief. In addition many relief families have suffered severe stock losses.

Outstanding Indebtedness As of January 1, 1934. The average indebtedness reported by the heads of 520 relief families as of January 1, 1934, including all outstanding debts of the members of the immediate family was \$970.90. Linn County showed the low average of only \$360.03 per family, while Meade County heads were indebted on an average of \$1763.25 per household.

Table L indicates the ranges for the four counties:

* The South Dakota study indicates that these findings also agree with findings of Hampson and Christopherson presented in "Estimated Returns from Operating 800 Acres in the Spring Wheat Area Under Four Different Plans", South Dakota Experiment Station, Circular 21, May, 1934.

In general, large indebtedness is closely related to large scale farm operation, and where farms are smaller and little machinery is utilized, the average indebtedness of the head is also smaller.

Increases in Indebtedness, January 1, 1930 to January 1, 1934. The total increased indebtedness for all relief families averaged \$813.69 for the four year period, which represents an increase of approximately \$203 per year per family. The chief factor in this increased liability per family came from medical and personal debts. Over 56 per cent of the families reported such increases in indebtedness. The largest monetary increase in indebtedness was in the form of mortgages or liabilities against farm lands and buildings. Less than ten per cent of the families reported debt increases on village property, principally because of the low percentage of families located in the villages. Most village families owning property incurred increased liabilities against them.

Table LI shows that no item effected more relief families than did increases in medical and personal debts. Aside from increases in indebtedness on "chattels" and "farm land and buildings" as reported by 37 and 14 per cent of the families respectively, no item represented a larger per family amount of increase in indebtedness. Unpaid taxes were

TABLE LI - SUMMARY OF INCREASES IN INDEBTEDNESS OF 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS FROM JANUARY 1, 1930 TO JANUARY 1, 1934

Item of Indebtedness	Amount	Per Cent of		Average		Increase Per		Families Reporting	
		Increased	Indebtedness	Relief Family	Family	Reporting	Number	Per Cent of 520	
Farm Land and Buildings	\$153,042	32.5		\$255.06		\$1822.50	73	14.0	
Chattels	112,675	27.6		216.68		580.79	194	37.3	
Village Property	33,882	8.3		65.15		720.89	47	9.0	
Unpaid Taxes	9,748	2.4		18.74		58.02	168	32.3	
Medical and Personal	70,656	17.3		156.87		241.14	293	56.4	
Supplies	15,684	33.8		30.16		105.56	150	28.8	
Notes, Rents, Others	33,032	8.1		63.52		227.60	145	27.9	
Total	408,719	100.0		813.69					

reported by 32 per cent of the families.

Some items of increased indebtedness were difficult to classify. One family reported an increase of \$400 in indebtedness which the field worker felt represented the cost of drugs. Some families refused to stipulate what the increased indebtedness represented, except in very general terms.

Decreases in Reserves, January 1, 1930 to January 1, 1934. Table LII shows that the largest item of decreased reserves suffered by relief families during the four year period represented decreases in life insurance protection. Approximately one-third of these families dropped life insurance policies in order to conserve available cash. For many this represented a "last gesture" in the struggle to stay off the relief lists. Approximately twelve per cent of the families had borrowed upon their insurance, and over seven per cent had forfeited installment payments for the same reason.

Individual examples are occasionally quite tragic. For many families a coveted radio, lamp, piano, or other household article represents the last visible evidence of a former, happier economic status, and the loss of these is averted for as long as possible only through undue sacrifice.

TABLE LII - SUMMARY OF DECREASES IN RESERVES OF 520 RURAL RELIEF FAMILIES FROM JANUARY 1, 1930 TO JANUARY 1, 1934

Item of Decrease	Amount	Per Cent of Total Decreased Reserves	Average : Decrease Per Family :		Average : Decrease Per Family Reporting :	
			Relief Family	Reporting Family	Relief Family	Reporting Family
Savings	\$ 20,737	4.5	\$ 39.87	\$ 452.02	48	9.3
Chattels	49,994	10.9	96.14	340.09	147	28.3
Land and Buildings	86,039	18.7	165.45	2458.25	35	6.7
Forfeited Installments	7,104	1.6	13.81	189.05	38	7.3
Borrowed on Life Insurance	19,156	4.2	36.83	308.96	62	11.9
Decreased Life Insurance	239,352	56.6	499.71	1594.18	163	31.3
Others	15,915	3.5	30.60	936.17	17	3.3
Total	458,977	100.0	882.42			

When the family is finally forced to forfeit them, the loss of morale is considerable. A Meade County woman forfeited a considerable amount of household goods in order to retain a washing machine; a Gray County family sacrificed an old car in order to retain their piano, etc. Numerous other examples of similar instances could be cited.

The average decrease in reserves per relief family amount to \$882.42. Decreases in life insurance, chattels, and land and buildings accounted for three-fourths of the total decreases. The decreases in savings represented but a very minor part of decreases in reserves, and less than ten per cent of the relief families reported such decreases. In all probability this was because but a small fraction of the relief families had accumulated savings at the beginning of the period.

Losses of Relief Families, January 1, 1930 to January 1, 1934. Crop losses of relief families have been extremely heavy. Over fifty per cent of all relief families reported an average loss of \$365.25 per family. Table LIII shows that such losses constitute an important item in the reduction of relief families to their present status. The average total loss per relief family is \$5071.92 for the four year period, or approximately \$1267 per family per year.

This amount is still more significant in view of the fact that it represents a figure more than twice as large as the average annual earnings of almost seventy per cent of the relief heads. It is obvious that these losses are a direct cause of the necessity for relief.

TABLE LIII - SUMMARY OF LOSSES OF 520 RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS FROM JANUARY 1, 1930 TO JANUARY 1, 1934

Item of Loss	Amount	Per Cent of Total Losses	Average Loss per Relief Family	Average Loss per Family Reporting	Families Reporting	Per Cent
Stock, Bonds, Bank Losses:	\$ 8,908	3.4	\$ 17.13	387.30	23	4.4
Bad Debts:	32,866	12.5	63.20	236.44	139	26.7
Failure of Farm:						
Cooperatives:	1,929	0.7	3.51	121.86	15	2.8
Livestock:	30,210	11.4	58.09	138.57	218	41.9
Crops	189,933	72.0	365.25	716.72	265	51.0
Total	\$263,745	100.0	\$371.92	-	-	-

Bank, bond or financial stock losses represent but a small portion of the total losses, and effected less than five per cent of the total number of relief families. Major losses came through losses on crops and livestock in

the course of regular farm operations. Aside from these factors, one family out of four reported losses due to bad debts. The average loss per family incurred for the four year period represents a serious obstacle to future economic recovery.

Medical Costs. The amount of money spent by relief families for various types of medical service present strong evidence for the need of an immediate and extensive health education program and homemakers education, in order to cut down the excessive per-family medical costs by the use of sanitary methods and personal hygiene, and to aid in the building of healthier families by proper nutritional practices and family hygiene. Possibly some program of socialized medicine might here find opportunity to fill a distinct need.

Table LIV shows the amounts spent by relief families for the different items of medical service, exclusive of the costs of drugs or similar items not generally included as part of the doctor's or hospital fees. Fees of medical specialists (such as "dentist") are also included. An analysis of these figures show that 83 per cent of the relief families incurred doctor bills averaging \$130.57 each. One family out of five incurred hospital bills averaging

TABLE LIV - COST OF MEDICAL SERVICE FOR RELIEF HOUSE-
HOLDS FROM JANUARY 1, 1930 TO JANUARY 1, 1934

Type of Medical Service	Amount	Number of Families Reporting	Per Cent of Families Reporting	Average per Family Reporting
Doctor				
Paid	\$31,204	355	68.3	\$ 87.89
Unpaid	26,166	194	37.3	134.87
Total	\$57,370	424*	83.5	\$130.57
Hospital				
Paid	\$ 9,049	90	17.3	\$110.54
Unpaid	12,525	18	3.5	695.83
Total	\$22,474	108	20.8	\$208.09
Childbirth				
Paid	\$ 6,077	132	25.4	\$ 46.03
Unpaid	1,039	21	4.0	49.97
Total	\$ 7,116	153	29.4	\$ 46.50

* Some families reported both paid and unpaid bills.

\$208 each and approximately twenty-nine per cent of the families were faced with childbirth expenses averaging \$46.50 each.

It is interesting to observe that the greater majority of childbirth fees are paid, (very frequently in the form of labor done by the husband); and that over half the doctor bills are paid, but that less than half of the hospital bills are paid, usually because of the extremely high costs per individual.

Table IV shows that the average cost of medical service for relief families is approximately \$167.00, which is a sum equal to more than one-fourth of the annual average earnings of almost 70 per cent of the relief heads. Clearly, such costs are excessive, and medical aid must be given at less cost and medical losses must be reduced through health education.

TABLE IV - SUMMARY OF MEDICAL COSTS
FOR 520 RURAL RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS

Item of Medical Cost	Average Per Relief Family	Per Cent of Total Medical Costs
Doctor	\$110.32	66.0
Hospital	43.20	25.8
Childbirth	13.68	8.2
Total	\$167.23	100.0

Extraordinary Losses and Expenses. Approximately twenty-two per cent of the families reported expenses due to funeral or personal injuries averaging \$123.64 per family. Approximately seven per cent of the families reported other miscellaneous items of expense averaging \$277.08 per family.

Summary. Table LVI shows the summary of the foregoing items of economic loss or expense incurred by relief households during the four year period.

TABLE LVI - SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC REVERSES
OF EACH OF 520 RELIEF HOUSEHOLDS
DURING THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1930 TO JANUARY 1, 1934

Item	Average per Relief Family
Increased Indebtedness	\$ 813.69
Decreased Reserves	882.42
General Losses	507.20
Medical Costs	167.23
Funerals,	
Injuries and Miscellaneous	406.67
Average Total	
Economic Burden per Family	\$2,777.21

The sum of these items, totaling \$2,777.00 constitute an amount greater than the average yearly income for any of the relief families studied. If this total is divided by four, to get the average "per family per year" figure, the result (\$694.30) represents an amount larger than the average annual earnings reported by approximately seventy per cent of the relief heads during their entire occupational histories. (Table XXXI) From these comparisons, it is

clear that annual economic reverses suffered by the majority of relief families have been greater than their average incomes during the past four years. Since most relief families operate with but small reserves, it was inevitable that they should eventually be forced to seek relief.

In closing, it must be stated that all of the data in this section on "Economic Status" doubtless contains a high percentage of error. Most farmers keep no account books, and so have to depend upon memory for estimates of losses. In all cases there can be no definite criteria for judging losses on crops or livestock; and, at best, the data presented represents but a rough approximation of actual figures. Without doubt however, such approximations may be deemed of some value in an effort to uncover facts.

SUMMARY

The relief situation in Kansas, which has led to the expenditure of several millions of state and federal funds and to the depletion of local funds, may be attributed for the most part to factors which have been beyond individual human control. The chief causes have been drouth and price declines which have persisted for several years with accumulative disasterous results.

This study was primarily interested with determining the backgrounds characteristic of those relief families who have been recipients of public relief during the current period of depression. The results of the findings of this survey may be summarized briefly as follows:

Race and Family Factors. The rural relief families studied are essentially of white, native born stock, with male heads. Problems of extraneous racial or cultural assimilation are therefore not manifest. 96 per cent of the families were not on the relief rolls in 1930, and over half have received relief in but one year since that time. The majority of the families are not in combined households. Approximately 40 per cent of the families number three or less, and about 70 per cent are five or less in number. The sexes of "other persons" in the household, not including the head, is predominately female. Sex of the children is

about equally divided. New families (eleven per cent) formed since 1930 accounted for thirty-four per cent of the increased number of individuals.

Age. About one-third of heads of relief households were in the thirty-one to forty-five year group, and over one-tenth (eleven per cent) were over sixty years of age, the average for all heads of both sexes being 44.6 years.

Education. Approximately seventy per cent of the heads have received eighth grade education or less. Only thirty-six per cent have finished the eighth grade, and but 4.5 per cent finished high school. In general, the homemaker is better educated than the head of the household. Forty-three per cent have had more education, about thirty per cent have the same schooling, and only about twenty per cent have had less.

Young People. About sixty-seven per cent of the young people under twenty-five years of age are in public school. Only ten per cent are in high school, and over twenty-three per cent constitute an unoccupied out-of-school population which presents a serious challenge to educators and to the social planner.

Occupations. Almost forty per cent of the heads of relief households are in the laboring or unskilled group, and over forty per cent are in the farming class. Only 1.5 per

cent have professional training, and but eight per cent have skilled occupational experience. Of the women, or homemakers, almost eighty-five per cent have no occupational experiences or training, and but two per cent have teaching or other professional experience. Only two per cent of the homemakers want or are seeking work or employment.

Occupational History. Over sixty per cent of the workers have an occupational history of twenty-five years or less, and 30 per cent of ten years or less. The average period since occupation began is 240 months. The average duration of a job, or employment period is thirty-six months or less for over forty-five per cent of the workers. Less than ten per cent reported unemployment periods prior to 1930, and about twenty-two per cent have experienced unemployment since that time.

Earnings. Almost seventy per cent have an average monthly earning of \$50.00 or less for their entire occupational history, and ninety-five per cent report average earnings of less than \$125.00 per month for their entire occupational history.

Distance to Job. The average relief head lives close to his work - 23 per cent work "at home", and over 50 per cent work within an average distance of one mile from their place of employment.

Mobility. The greatest number of moves come from changes in occupation, fifty-seven per cent being reported for this reason. Over half of family moves were inter-county changes only and in twenty-three per cent of the cases it involved movement from one state to another. The average number of geographical location changes per individual was 3.08. In 1930, 94 per cent of the families had one or two persons regularly employed, and there were no families with none employed. In 1935 17.5 per cent of the families had no persons employed, and ninety-seven per cent had two or less employed.

Farming History. Of the 413 "heads" reporting farming history, approximately fifty per cent have begun farming since the World War, and almost twenty per cent within the last five years. The average period since farming began is eighteen years. The average period of total operation is fourteen years. Sixty-seven per cent of the farming period has been upon a tenancy basis and sixty-four per cent of the acreage utilized has been rented. About seventy per cent operated an average acreage of 240 or less, and the average acreage for the group was 225 acres. Relief families are essentially full time operators, less than five per cent reporting part-time farming enterprises.

When the farmer moved, sixty-four per cent of changes in location were within the county, and only one out of four enterprises were deemed profitable. Almost three out of four reported losses prior to 1930.

Family Economic Factors. The average debt of the head of a relief household was \$970.00. Average increase in indebtedness since January 1, 1930 was \$813.69. In addition there was an additional average decrease in reserves of \$892.42. Various losses accounted for \$507.20 more.

Medical costs were extremely high, with an average cost of \$167.00 per family. Doctor bills accounted for approximately two-thirds of this cost, with hospital and childbirth fees accounting for the remainder. Over eighty per cent of the families reported either paid or unpaid doctor bills for the period.

CONCLUSIONS

Distinct needs, which this study indicated must be provided for, in order to insure a successful future rural rehabilitation program, are as follows:

1. A definite rural type of educational program with emphasis upon vocational training, and with special reference to an acute need for an extensive adult educational program.

2. A well planned program to provide for the interests and leisure-time needs of an increasing out-of-school population of unoccupied young people, twenty-five years of age or less, who constitute almost a fourth of the rural youth.

3. An intensive program of popularization for the "education" idea, to prevent withdrawal of so many young people from school in the "teen" age, and also to help retard early marriage and motherhood of the girls, which in itself tends to perpetuate the relief problem.

4. A definite program of instruction in agricultural methods, to cut down the number of agricultural losses and the proportion of unprofitable agricultural enterprises.

5. A definite encouragement of the idea of part-time farming and training for womens' household arts occupations, to aid the family income.

6. An extensive "health education program", and an efficient homemaker's education, in order to cut down the excessive per-family medical cost by the use of sanitary methods and personal hygiene, and to aid in the building of healthier families by proper nutritional practices and family hygiene. Possibly some program of socialized medicine might here also find opportunity to fill a distinct need.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Rehabilitation programs, in order to be successful, must be based upon the assumption of "open country" conditions, closely related native family groupings, lack of skilled training and experience upon the part of the heads of the households, little occupational experience upon the part of the homemaker, general lack of higher education for all members of the household, general lack of knowledge of the principles of successful farming, little or no part-time farming or part-time occupational experience, lack of knowledge of scientific farming methods, a large proportion of unoccupied young people having little vocational training or experience, the lack of draft animals to supply power on farms, the lack of a popular recognition of the necessity or value of higher education, the lack of desire for employment or part-time home projects on the part of the homemakers, and finally the lack of training in proper nutritional practices and maintenance of family health resulting in excessive medical costs for a low income economic group which is already burdened down with excessive economic losses.

The principal avenue of hope for a permanent future rehabilitation can be summed up within the limits of the general term - "education". In closing, the following excerpt seems appropriate:

"To any community, the hope of enjoying the best lies in the accomplishment of three things; first, a thorough knowledge of existing conditions; second, a definite ideal as to what ought to be; and third, a definite plan for bringing the real into harmony with the ideal." (5)

It has been the purpose of this study to accomplish the first of these three things; the second can be supplied only within the knowledge of human experience and the programs heretofore suggested; and as for the third, only future developments shall present the final reckoning. Economic security is, in general, a purchasable commodity, and the price is education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Randall C. Hill, under whose direction this work has been done, for making available the original survey data, and for constructive criticisms and suggestions during the course of the study.

Thanks are also due to Mr. Glenn W. Long for suggestions as to the arrangement of tables, and to Mrs. W. S. Allman for extensive aid in classifying and tabulation of data.

LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Steiner, Jesse F.
The American community in action. New York.
Henry Holt, 387 p. 1928. (Ref. p. 211).
- (2) Landis, Paul H.
Rural relief in South Dakota. South Dakota
Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 289. 63 p. June, 1934.
- (3) Coen, B. P. and McGill, K. H.
Rural problem area survey report. 35, FERA
Bul. 4179. 30 p. 1934. (Ref. p. 4-5).
- (4) Fifteenth census of the United States. Population
Bul., families in Kansas. U. S. bureau of
census report. 33 p. 1932. (Ref. p. 5-6).
- (5) Vogt, Paul L.
Introduction to rural sociology. New York.
D. Appleton. 372 p. 1917. (Ref. p. 203).

Other References

- Henry, Odum and Jocher, Katheryn.
An introduction to social research. New York.
Henry Holt. p. 488. 1929. (Ref. Chap. XVI,
XIX, XX).
- Kansas State Planning Board Progress Report.
Population summary, Kansas. 185 p. September,
1934. (Ref. p. 24).
- Thurow, Mildred B.
Interests, activities and problems of rural
young folk-women, 15-29 years of age. New York
Cornell Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 617. p. 57.
December, 1934.