

SELECTIVE PARTICIPATION of FARMERS and THEIR WIVES in RURAL ORGANIZATIONS

by

HOWARD J. BONSER
and
HERBERT W. BUTT

AGRIC. LIBRARY
AUG 28 1957
UNIV. OF TENN.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
KNOXVILLE

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
The Participation Pattern	5
Why Participate in Community Clubs	11
Factors Involved in Participation in All Organized Groups	16
Summary and Conclusions	23

Selective Participation of Farmers and their Wives in Rural Organizations¹

Howard J. Bonser and Herbert W. Butt*

INTRODUCTION

Rapidly increasing technology and communication facilities have brought about corresponding changes in farmers' community and social group relationships. Increasingly, farmers and their wives are becoming members of special interest group organizations but not all farmers respond to changing conditions in the same way. The lack of adequate communication is an obstacle to the integration necessary for a smooth functioning, democratic society. Communication in turn is closely related to selective participation of individuals in organizations.

Program planners desirous of influencing certain segments of society (as Agricultural Extension agents promoting better farming methods among farmers) can reach them best through their organizations. However, working through formal organizations will not reach the non-participants. It therefore becomes desirable to know what are some of the easily discernible characteristics of participants and of non-participants in organizations in general, and with respect to specific classes or types of organizations. This report deals with selective participation of farmers and their wives in organizations, and with factors associated with such selective participation.

The study was conducted in four communities: two each in Anderson and Blount counties in East Tennessee. Considerable industrial influence is found in each county; Oak Ridge (population 30,000) being located in the former, and Alcoa-Maryville (population 14,000) in the other. Knoxville, with a population of 124,000 is in an adjoining county within commuting distance of these families.

¹This report is a revised study of a M.S. Thesis prepared by the junior author for the University of Tennessee. Grateful acknowledgement is due Dr. E. J. Long, Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, University of Tennessee for counsel and guidance; to Mr. Crosby Murray of the Agricultural Extension Service; to the County and Home Demonstration Agents of Blount and Anderson Counties; to Mr. J. B. Burnett of the TVA, and to the farmers who made this study possible.

*Rural Sociologist and former Research Assistant, respectively, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Tennessee.

Procedure. Information was obtained from files of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) as to the amount of fertilizer received by individual farmers for watershed demonstrational purposes in communities of both Anderson and Blount counties. Two communities were selected in each county where watershed demonstration fertilizers had been distributed for five or more years. One community in each county still had an active community club at the time of study. The Community Club in the other community selected in each county had ceased to function.

Fifteen farmers and their wives were interviewed in each of the four communities; five had received fertilizers as a part of a community-wide test demonstration program for 3 to 5 years, five for 1 to 2 years, and five had received no such fertilizers. Families receiving fertilizers were randomly selected for interview within their strata from the TVA lists. Those receiving no fertilizers were selected at random among those not receiving fertilizers in the communities.

Information was secured from the farmers and their wives as to such items as family composition, income from off-farm occupations of farmers and their wives, farm inventory, fertilizer use, membership and participation in organizations, and certain attitudes toward the community-wide program.

The TVA Area Test Program. The Area Test Demonstration Program (or Test Demonstration Watershed Program) (1935-1951) operated on a local community level for purposes of general community improvement, soil protection, and promoting livestock farming. Fertilizers supplied by the TVA for test and demonstration were available to all farmers desiring them for use on pastures and grasses at no cost to the farmer other than transportation once the community organization was effected and approved.² So far as is known membership or participation in any organizations, was not a requirement for receiving fertilizer by a farmer in any of these communities. It is reported, however, that in some communities participation in the program has been stressed as a favorable factor in determining eligibility. Fertilizer then, became one factor in a community-wide program of adult education in watershed protection and in farm, home, and community improvement.

The Communities. The communities were small open country communities except for Wildwood which had a small village center.

²During the later years of the program some changes were made. No test fertilizers were distributed after 1951.

They lay within easy driving distance from their county seat towns (5-15 miles). Each had one or more churches. Wildwood had a grade and high school within the community. The Farm Bureaus, unions, lodges, breeders associations, and other similar organizations were not community oriented, but were within the counties and accessible to families who desired to participate. Community Clubs had been organized in each community during the middle 40's, but were inactive in the two communities of Wildwood and Belmont at the time of study.

Considerable numbers of the people in each community were industrially employed. Incomes from farming were supplemented by wages for off-farm work in many cases. A general type of farming prevailed with some livestock and dairy. Tobacco was the main cash crop. Soil fertility maintenance was a significant problem.

THE PARTICIPATION PATTERN

Nature of Participation. Since these communities were not greatly isolated, and since there were interests other than farming there appears to have been opportunities for the men and women to choose organizations in which to participate. This matter of choice is evidenced by the number of farmers who reported competition with other organizations for time as a limiting factor in their attendance at community club meetings. It is logical, then, to assume that there should be a selection of organizations by farm people, and that this selectivity should be evidenced by certain characteristics or types of individuals. The procedure in this section will be to present first the extent of participation by type of organization, and later to discuss certain characteristics of people and participation.

Organizations were grouped into 10 main categories on the basis of interests or nature of activity. These categories were Church, Farm Bureau, Parent-Teachers Association, Community Club, Home Demonstration Club, Labor Union, Lodge, Breeders Association, Youth Club, and others (including such as Educational Associations, Red Cross, Social Clubs, etc.).

Participation was considered in terms of membership, attendance at meetings, supporting the organization financially, committee service, and holding of offices. Holding membership in and supporting an organization financially were reported more often than were other types of participation; for example, while

73 percent of the men were church members and 70 percent supported some church financially, the percent attending meetings was 52, and those serving on committees and holding office were only 28 and 27 percents respectively (Table 1). This pattern held true for other classes of organizations with two exceptions; (a) participation was not as great in any other class of organizations, and (b) in youth clubs where adult participation was mainly of a leadership and advisory nature.

Table 1 — *Percent of Farmers and Their Wives Participating in Organizations by Type of Participation and by Type of Organization, 60 Farmers and 56 Homemakers, 4 Rural Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954*

Type of Organization	Percent Participating by Type of Participation									
	Member		Attend Meetings		Give Financial Support		Serve on Committee		Officer	
	Man	Wife	Man	Wife	Man	Wife	Man	Wife	Man	Wife
Church	73	86	52	66	70	80	28	23	27	27
Farm Bureau	33	2	15	2	33	2	3	2	2	0
P. T. A.	25	34	15	27	22	34	7	18	3	11
Community Club ¹	22	9	15	7	0	0	5	2	5	2
Home Demonstration Club	0	29	0	20	0	21	0	12	0	12
Unions	20	0	5	0	18	0	2	0	0	0
Lodge	27	0	15	0	25	0	10	0	5	0
Breeders Association	18	0	7	0	18	0	3	0	3	0
Youth Clubs	12	2	8	2	7	2	10	2	7	2
Other	27	14	10	12	17	12	8	7	5	4

¹One-half of the farmers and their wives lived in the two communities where community clubs were inactive in 1954. Therefore participation in the two communities having active clubs was twice as great as the data in the table indicate.

Selective Participation Among Farmers. Calculations were made for percentages of farmers participating in each class of organization by differences of the farmer or his farm with respect to such characteristics as age, education, gross income, full-time versus part-time farm status, and receipt of Test Demonstration fertilizer (Table 2).

Schedules were first sorted into three groups on the basis of age of the farmer, and the percentages of farmers calculated who participated in each type of organization (Church, Farm Bureau, Community Club, etc.). Participation was used in a broad sense to include either membership, attendance, financial support, committee service, or leadership responsibilities on the part of the farmer. Age groups were under 40 years, 40-54 years, and 55 and over.

Table 2—Percent of Farmers Participating in Organizations by Class of Organization and by Characteristic of Farm, 60 Farmers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954¹

Characteristic of Farmer	Class of Organization									
	Farmers Number	Church Percent	Farm Bureau Percent	P.T.A. Percent	Unions Percent	Community Club Percent	Lodge Percent	Breeders Association Percent	Youth Groups Percent	Other Percent
Age: Under 40 years	12	67	42	17	42	17	0	8	8	17
40-54 years	27	78	30	41	22	22	15*	26	15	30
55 & up	21	71	33	10*	5	24	33	5	5	23
Education:										
0- 8 grade	32	59	22	3	19	16	9	6	0	9
9-12 grade	17	94*	41*	47*	29	24	29	29	12*	24*
13 & up grade	11	82	54	54	9	36	27	18	36	73*
Gross Income:										
Under \$1,000	10	80	20	0	10	20	10	10	0	10
\$1,000-4,999	28	71	21	25	10	14	18	7	7	29
\$5,000 & up	22	73	54	36	36	32	23	27	18	28
Job Status:										
F-T farmer	26	65	46	77	4	19	8	12	4	31
P-T farmer	34	79	24	38*	32*	24	26	18	15	21
Test Fert. Rec'd.:										
3-5 years	20	80	50	40	15	30	20	25	20	50
1-2 years	20	85	20	30*	30	25	25	15	10	10*
None	20	55*	30	5	15	10	10	5	0	15
All Farmers	60	73	33	25	20	22	18	15	10	25

Differences between the two percentages bracketed were statistically significant at the .05 level of probability when tested for significances between proportions. Corrections were made for percentages under 20 or over 80. Differences not starred by an asterisk () were not statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

¹Participation in an organization as used here includes either membership, attendance at meetings, supporting the organization financially, serving on committees, or holding offices. Persons not participating in any of these ways were classed as non-participants.

Some type of church participation was reported by 67 percent of the farmers under 40 years, by 78 percent of those from 40 to 54 years, and by 71 percent by those 55 years and older. Differences in proportions among these age groups were not great enough to be statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Income differences apparently were not reflected in church participation nor was part-time farm vs. full-time farming status. In fact the only instances where differences in church participation were great enough to indicate statistical significance were for farmers of less than high school education, and for farmers having received no Test Demonstration fertilizers.³ Fifty-nine percent of farmers with only grade school education participated in Church in contrast with 94 percent for those with high school and 82 percent for those having gone beyond high school. This lack of selectivity in church participation is not surprising when one considers that the desire for religious experience is as universal as it is, and also that individual congregations beam their appeal to different status and belief levels.

Significantly greater participation in Farm Bureaus was reported for farmers with high school education or above. Differences approached significance for farmers with \$5,000 or more incomes; for the full-time farmers in contrast with part-time farmers; and for farmers having received Test Demonstration fertilizers.

One-fourth of the farmers participated in Parent-Teacher Associations (P.T.A.) in some form. This was slightly less than with respect to the Farm Bureau (33 percent). P.T.A. participants tended to be the middle-aged farmers, those with education above grade school, the full-time farmers, and those who had received Test Demonstration fertilizers. It should be remembered, however, that this includes all farmers, whether or not they had children in school.

There were 12 labor union members among the 60 farmers. All but one of these were part-time farmers. The other was a former industrial worker who retired to the farm, but maintained his union affiliations.

Twenty-two percent of the farmers participated in Community Clubs in some way during the year. It should be recalled, however, that this participation was all in two communities since in the other two communities the clubs had ceased to function. Thus

³Unless stated otherwise the probability level of .05 was used for statistical significance in this report; i.e., not over 5 percent probability of the differences being due to chance.

where clubs were active they had 44 percent of their farmers participating in some way. Participation increased with education from 16 to 24 to 36 percents for the grade school, high school, and the college educated groups in the order named. These differences, though consistent, were not great enough to be statistically significant with the small number of cases in the sample. Differences among the age groups or between part-time versus full-time farmers were also not great enough to be statistically significant.

Lodges, or fraternal organizations, are becoming less numerous in rural areas in general. Apparently lodge membership is also declining in these communities since lodge membership was reported by 33 per cent of the oldest aged men, by 15 percent of the middle-aged group and was not reported by any of the farmers under 40. The lodge members also tended to be the part-time rather than the full-time farmers.

Participation in breeders associations tended to be by farmers with over \$5,000 gross income for the year, but the difference was not quite great enough for statistical significance with these few cases. Slightly increased participation in breeders associations was also noted for middle-aged farmers, for farmers with over 8th grade education, and for farmers receiving Test Demonstration fertilizers.

Participation in youth groups was largely of a leadership or advisory nature, and was by the farmers with higher education. Whereas 36 percent of the farmers with college education participated in youth groups, none of those with only grade school education did so. Likewise none with incomes of under \$1,000 did so, nor did any who received no Test Demonstration fertilizers.

Selective Participation Among Homemakers. The farm women in these communities were somewhat similar to their husbands in social participation, yet there were differences. Slightly more of them participated in church activities, 80 percent in contrast with 73 percent for the men. Sixty-four percent of the grade school women participated in church, in contrast with 91 percent for the high school group, and 100 percent for the college group. These were not quite great enough for statistical significance. Age, income, and job status of the husband appeared to bear no relationship to this factor (Table 3).

Thirty-four percent of the women participated in some way in P.T.A. during the year. This was in contrast with 25 percent for the men. All of the factors listed except income were definitely

Table 3—*Percent of Farm Homemakers Participating in Organizations by Characteristic of Homemaker, 56 Farm Homemakers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954¹*

Characteristic of Homemaker	Class of Organization							
	Farm Home-makers	Church	Farm Bureau	P.T.A.	Community Club	Home Demonstration Club	Youth Clubs	Other
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Age:								
Under 40 yrs.	17	82	0	29	0	29	0	0
40-54 years	26	81	4	50	15	31	0	19
55 & up	13	77	0	8	7	23	8	15
Education:								
0- 8 grade	25	64	0	8	4	12	0	0
9-12 grade	22	91	5	50 [*]	14	46 [*]	5	23 [*]
13 & up	9	100	6	67	11	33	0	22
Gross Income:								
Under \$1,000	9	78	0	11	0	0	0	0
\$1,000-4,999	28	79	0	29	7	32	4	14
\$5,000 & up	19	84	5	53	16	37	0	16
Job Status of farmer:								
P-T farmer	22	82	5	18	9	14	0	9
F-T farmer	34	79	0	44 [*]	9	38	3	15
Test Fert. Rec'd.:								
3-5 years	17	94	0	71	3	35	6	18
1-2 years	19	79	0	26 [*]	11	42	0	16
None	20	70	5	10	10	10	0	5
All Homemakers	56	80	2	34	9	29	2	12

Differences between the two percentages bracketed were statistically significant at the .05 level of probability when tested for differences between proportions. Corrections were made for percentages under 20 or over 80. Differences not starred by an asterisk () were not statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

¹See footnote 1, Table 2, for interpretation of participation.

related to P.T.A. participation. Fifty-percent of the middle-aged group participated in contrast with 29 percent of the younger women, and eight percent of the women 55 and up. The incidence of children of public school age was probably contributory to participation in P.T.A. Differences attributable to income not quite great enough to be statistically significant.

Women of grade school education were participating in P.T.A. in only eight percent of the cases. This was in contrast with 50 percent of the high school women, and 67 percent of the women with college training. Participation also increased with receipt of Test Demonstration fertilizer. Wives of part-time farmers participated in greater proportion than did wives of full-time farmers (44 percent in contrast with 18 percent).

Selective participation in community clubs was clouded by fewness of cases. Active clubs existed in only two of the communities. Thus with nine percent participation of all the women there was participation by 18 percent of the women in communities having active clubs. It looks as if participation might increase with income, and that women with high school and college education might participate in greater proportion than did women with only grade school education. This, however, was not verifiable from these data.

Twenty-nine percent of the women participated in Home Demonstration Clubs during the year. There appeared to be little selectivity except that high school and college women participated more than those of grade school education only; that women from homes having over \$1,000 income during the year participated more than those from lowest income group; and that women from part-time farms participated in greater degree than women from full-time farms. There may be some marginal families in terms of income and educational attainments that as a class the Home Demonstration program is yet unable to reach.

Two percent of the women participated actively in Farm Bureaus, two percent in Youth Clubs, and 12 percent in organizations other than those mentioned.

WHY PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY CLUBS

It was thought desirable to inquire into why the participants had become active in the Community Clubs and what they considered to have been the Club's contribution to them and to the community. Each farmer who had been active at some time in

his community club was asked: "Where, or under what circumstances, did you become active in the Community Club?" This question was repeated in the same manner to all persons interviewed who had been active at some time. Replies were recorded and later categorized into like responses. Only one reason, the dominant reason, was recorded per person. Seventeen of the 38 replying to this question (45 percent) stated that the reason was to learn new or better methods of farming (Table 4). Closely

Table 4 — *Reasons Given by Farmers as to Why They Became Active in Community Organization, 38 Farmers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties¹*

Comments of farmers (why they became active)	Number	Percent
To learn better and new methods of farming	17	44.8
Due to Area Test Demonstration program	6	15.8
To become sociable with a common feeling for improvement	6	15.8
To obtain better facilities; e.g., electricity, telephones, etc.	4	10.5
Interested to know how community organization would operate	3	7.9
Encouragement of neighbors & visits in other communities, or other	2	5.2
Total	38	100.0

¹Includes only 38 farmers who participated in 1954 or in earlier years. Does not include 22 who were not active at any time.

allied to this were another 16 percent stating activity due to the Test Demonstration program. Presumably these persons were primarily interested in securing the Test Demonstration fertilizer for use on their grasslands. An equal number said their purpose was primarily for reasons of sociability with others in a common feeling of improvement. Another 10 percent reported an interest in obtaining facilities such as electricity or telephones which could be had only through group action. Others were curious as to how a community club would operate, or were brought in through the encouragement of others.

It seems, then, as if the farmer's activity was stimulated first by a desire to improve, or get something for, his farm; second, for reasons of sociability with companions and friends, and third to secure some objectives which could be had only through group endeavor.

The farmer also appears to have some definite reasons for inactivity. As was mentioned earlier, the clubs ceased to function in two communities. Fourteen of the 30 farmers interviewed in these two communities stated that they were at least nominally active in the clubs when club activities ceased; seven reported inactivity due to other interests taking prior claim to their time. Another seven reported no interest in the club's affairs, and two reported inactivity due to health (Table 5).

Table 5—*Replies of Farmers as to Why They Were Inactive in Community Club, 18 Farmers in Communities With Active Clubs and 30 Farmers in Communities With No Active Clubs, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954¹*

Comments of farmers (why they were inactive)	Community Club Status 1954	
	Active	Inactive
	Number of farmers	Number of farmers
Club ceased to function	-	14
Lack of time due to other interests	7 ²	7
Lack of interest in the club	4	7
Age or health reasons	5	2
No means of transportation to meetings	2	-
Total	18	30

¹Twenty-six reported having been active at some time prior to 1954; twenty-two were never active.

²Two part-time farmers reported working on the night shift.

With respect to the two clubs active at the time of study there were 18 farmers, or 60 percent, who were not actively participating in club activities in 1954. Seven of these reported lack of time due either to other interests, or work on the night shift which kept them away from the club meetings. Five were inactive because of age or health reasons; four because of no interest, and two because of no means of transportation to the meetings.

When asked what the community club had done for them personally almost one-half of the farmers either could not say or stated that it did not help. It should be recalled, however, that this question was asked of all the farmers whether or not they had been active. The values which were attributed to it were in the realm of education and stimulation of ideas. Thirty-eight percent stated that it brought in better education, improved farm practices, etc. Seven percent felt that it taught them team spirit, and an equal number that it aroused a conscious-

ness of many new things but they were not specific (Table 6). Proportionately more of the farmers in communities with active clubs in 1954 stated that the clubs had helped them personally.

Table 6—*Replies of Farmers as to What the Community Club Had Done For Them Personally, 60 Farmers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954*

Comments of Farmers as to What The Community Club Has Done For Them	Farmers in Active Communities	Farmers in Inactive Communities	Total Farmers	
	Number	Number	Number	Percent
Helped in new ideals, better education, improved farm methods, etc.	13	10	23	38.3
Taught cooperation, team spirit, helped get better acquainted with neighbors	3	1	4	6.7
Aroused consciousness of many new things	2	2	4	6.7
Did not help, or do not know	12	17	29	48.3
Total	30	30	60	100.0

When, however, the question was phrased in terms of what the community club had done for the community as a whole, over three-fourths of the persons interviewed felt that the clubs had made a definite contribution (Table 7). This feeling was more prevalent in communities where clubs were still active. These con-

Table 7—*Reasons Given By Farmers As To What The Community Club Has Done For The Community As A Whole, 60 Farmers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties, 1954*

Comments of Farmers as to What The Community Club Has Done For the Community	Farmers in Active Communities	Farmers in Inactive Communities	Total Farmers	
	Number	Number	Number	Percent
General improvement, cleanliness, telephone, electricity, sign boards, roads, schools, etc.	11	7	18	30.0
Made fertilizer popular, improved farming methods	8	9	17	28.4
Brought people together, created new interests, made people friendly and helpful to each other	7	4	11	18.3
Do not know, nothing, cannot say	4	10	14	23.3
Total	30	30	60	100.0

tributions essentially can be grouped in three categories: (a) clubs contributed to a general improvement in the community as evidenced by such things as more cleanliness, telephones, electricity, signs for farms and roads, road and school improvements, etc.; (b) they made the use of fertilizer popular and improved farming methods; and (c) they brought people together, created new interests, and stimulated people to be more friendly and helpful to each other.

Farmers who received Area Demonstration fertilizers were asked certain questions regarding the fertilizers, and their personal activity in organizations. Sixteen of the 40 expressed the opinion that they were more active in the community clubs as a result of their use of the fertilizer. The remaining 24 expressed no difference in activity (Table 8). Nine of the 40 thought that they were also more active in other organizations as a result.

Table 8—*Effect on Farmers' Group Participation by External Incentives (TDA Fertilizer or Prize and Other Incentives in the Tennessee Improvement Contest), 40 Farmers Having Received TDA Fertilizers, 4 Communities, Anderson and Blount Counties*

Question	Estimated Effect of the Incentive on Participation		
	Much More Active	Slightly More Active	No Difference
	Number	Number	Number
Have you been more active (or less active) in Community Clubs (area demonstrations) as a result of TDA Fertilizers?	6	10	24
Have you been more active (or less active) in other organizations as a result of TDA Fertilizer?	1	8	31
Have other monetary incentives (prizes, etc.) affected your activity in the Community Club (Area Demonstration)?	6	10	24 ¹
Have you been more (or less) active in other organizations as a result of prizes, etc.?	3	7	30

¹Includes two cases of no reply.

The farmers were also reminded of the prize incentives involved in the East Tennessee Community Improvement Program for which each community was eligible to compete. They were asked whether in their opinion these prizes tended to make them more or less active. Here, too, the feeling was expressed that their activity was increased in community clubs and in other organizations in about the same proportion as for fertilizer. It

seems worthwhile to point out that in no case was an opinion expressed that either the fertilizer program or the prizes had decreased activity in any organization.

FACTORS INVOLVED IN PARTICIPATION IN ALL ORGANIZED GROUPS

In order to measure the farmer's and homemaker's participation in all organized groups a score was devised, allowing one point for each of the five measures of participation.⁶ In the case of irregular attendance, a fractional part of one was allowed depending on the proportion of the regularly scheduled meetings attended during the year. Thus farmer A who attended six of the 12 regularly scheduled meetings of his community club received one-half of a point score for attendance. He was also eligible for one point for membership, one for financial support, one for committee service and one point for office holding. The maximum points possible for participation in any one organization was five. An individual's total participation score reflected both his degree of participation in a given organization and the number of organizations in which he participated. Participation scores ranged from 0 to 25 for the 60 men with an average of 7.6; and from 0 to 29 for the 56 women with an average of 5.8.

It will be recalled that the previous section indicated that age, income, receipt of TDA fertilizers, and other factors were associated with the proportion of farmers and their wives participating in certain classes of organizations. The question arises however, "What relationships exist between these factors and the total participation of farmers and their wives in organizations?"

It is reasoned among some workers that the farmer's well-being is tied up in his participation in organized group endeavor; therefore, if some stimulus to his participation can be provided he will improve his well-being. Such a stimulus was conceived in the Area Test Demonstration Program (or Watershed Program) where farmers organized themselves into groups for the purposeful endeavor of correcting some serious soil management problems with the aid of Agricultural Extension representatives in their county, and the receipt of demonstrational fertilizers at very low

⁶Membership, attendance at regular meetings, financial support of the organization, committee service, and holding office were used in the scale. This follows the method followed in the Rundquist-Sletto Scales (see E. A. Rundquist and R. F. Sletto, "Personality in the Depression," Minneapolis, 1936). Validity was tested by constructing another scale in which membership bore a weight of one; attendance, two; financial support, three; committee service, four; and office holding, five. Individual farmer scores based on each weighting were correlated, the correlation coefficient being $r = .990$.

or no cost, providing such fertilizers were used in certain prescribed ways. Thus the Test Demonstration fertilizers became an incentive to community organization, and conceivably a stimulus to increased total organized group participation.

Farmers having received fertilizers three to five years (the high fertilizer group) averaged participation scores of 11.4; this was in contrast with 6.7 for those receiving fertilizer for one or two years (low fertilizer group), and 4.7 for those receiving no fertilizers. These differences were great enough to show statistical significance at the .05 level of probability.

Differences in group participation were similar for the women, the participation scores being 8.8 for the high fertilizer group, 5.6 for the low fertilizer group, and 3.6 for women in families who received no TDA fertilizer. Gross correlation coefficients were $r = .39$ for the men and $r = .40$ for the women. These relationships were statistically significant when tested.

Tables 9 to 12 present participation scores for farmers and their wives in two-way classifications using in each case receipt of fertilizer as one independent variable with the factors of acres of crop and pasture land in the farm, gross income, part-time vs. full-time work status of the farmer, age, and education. Differences attributable to the fertilizer factor were significant when tested in each of the sorts.

It was thought that size of farm might be a factor in social participation; that the farmers from larger farms might be accorded more deference, being in more organizations and placed in more positions of responsibility. If so their participation scores would be larger. Sorts were accordingly made on the basis of acres of crop and pasture land in the farms and the social participation scores for the farmers and their wives. Participation scores did increase from an average of 5.5 for farmers in the smallest farm group to 8.8 for the operators of the largest farms (Table 9). However, there was so much variation in participation within the groups that this difference was not significant. Differences in participation of the women by size of farm varied somewhat but was not consistent.

Participation increased for both men and women with increases in income; e.g., men from farms of under \$1,000 gross income from farm sales and wages had participation scores averaging 4.5. This was in contrast with 6.9 for the middle income families, and with 10.4 for those with incomes of \$5,000 and up. Scores for the women for the same income groupings averaged 2.4, 5.8,

Table 9—*Average Social Participation Scores by Acres of Crop and Pasture Land in the Farm, and by Receipt of Test Demonstration Area Fertilizers, 60 Farmers and 56 Farm Homemakers, 4 Communities, East Tennessee, 1954**

	Acres of Crop and Pasture Land in the Farm			Total
	Under 40	40-79	80 & up	
	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score
Farmers				
High fertilizer	6.2	11.2	14.7	11.4
Low fertilizer	6.5	9.0	5.4	6.7
No fertilizer	4.0	3.5	6.5	4.7
All Farmers	5.5	8.7	8.8	7.6
Farm Homemakers				
High fertilizer	6.0	10.6	7.8	8.8
Low fertilizer	5.5	7.6	4.0	5.6
No fertilizer	2.2	3.0	5.4	3.6
All Homemakers	4.2	7.7	5.7	5.8

*Significance of differences when tested by variance analysis were as follows:

Acres of land factor — p. of	Men	Women
Fertilizer factor — p. of	NS	NS
	.05	.05

Table 10—*Average Social Participation Score by Income for the Farm Family, and by Receipt of Test Demonstration Area Fertilizers, 60 Farmers and 56 Farm Homemakers, 4 Communities, East Tennessee, 1954**

	Total Income From Farm Sales and Wages			Total
	Under \$1,000	\$1,000- 4,999	\$5,000 and up	
	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score
Farmers				
High fertilizer	7.9	11.7	11.9	11.4
Low fertilizer	5.1	4.5	9.9	6.7
No fertilizer	2.0	4.6	7.9	4.7
All Farmers	4.5	6.9	10.4	7.6
Homemakers				
High fertilizer	5.0	10.4	7.3	8.8
Low fertilizer	2.0	2.9	9.8	5.6
No fertilizer	2.2	3.9	3.8	3.6
All Homemakers	2.4	5.8	7.6	5.8

*Significance of differences when tested by variance analysis were as follows:

Income factor — p. of	Men	Women
Fertilizer factor — p. of	NS	NS
	.01	.05

and 7.6 as incomes rose (Table 10). These differences, while consistent, were not quite great enough to be statistically significant even at the .10 level of significance.

The part-time farmers were more active in organizations than the full-time farmers. Participation scores for part-time farmers averaged 9.0 while scores for the full-time farmers averaged 5.9 (Table 11). These differences were significant when tested. Differences for the women on this classification were less, with the women from full-time farms more active than the part-time farm women. To some extent this is as one would expect when the family car was used for commuting, and therefore was not available for the housewife's use during a large part of the day.

Table 11 — *Average Social Participation Scores by Part-Time or Full-Time Farm Status of Farmer, and by Receipt of Area Test Demonstration Fertilizers, 60 Farmers and 56 Farm Homemakers, 4 Communities, East Tennessee, 1954**

	Work Status of Operator		Total
	No off-farm work	Off-farm work	
	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score
Farmers			
High fertilizer	8.8	14.1	11.4
Low fertilizer	3.4	8.3	6.7
No fertilizer	4.4	5.2	4.7
All Farmers	5.9	9.0	7.6
Farm Homemakers			
High fertilizer	10.2	6.9	8.8
Low fertilizer	7.1	1.4	5.6
No fertilizer	2.7	4.4	3.6
All Homemakers	6.7	4.5	5.8

*Significance of differences when tested by variance analysis were as follows:

	Men	Women
Occupational factor — p. of	.05	NS
Fertilizer factor — p. of	.01	.01

Sorts were also made on the basis of age of the man and of the wife. While there might be some slight tendency for the middle-aged (40-54 years) to be more active, more data are necessary on this than these limited schedules provide (Table 12).

Sorts were then made on education of the individual. Men with no education beyond the grade schools averaged participation scores of 3.9, the high school group averaged 11.1, and the college

Table 12 — *Average Social Participation Scores by Age of Farmer, Age of Homemaker, and by Receipt of Test Demonstration Area Fertilizer, 60 Farmers and 56 Homemakers, 4 Communities, East Tennessee, 1954**

	Age of Farmer or of Homemaker				Total
	Under 40	40-46	47-54	55 & up	
	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score
Farmer					
High fertilizer	12.2	19.5	8.3	8.3	11.4
Low fertilizer	7.3	7.4	7.3	6.0	6.7
No fertilizer	2.6	1.7	7.8	4.8	4.7
All Farmers	7.0	10.0	7.9	6.3	7.6
Farm Homemakers					
High Fertilizer	10.3	8.6	7.0	11.3	8.8
Low fertilizer	5.7	9.0	9.5	1.7	5.6
No fertilizer	2.9	1.8	6.4	3.0	3.6
All Homemakers	5.4	6.2	7.5	4.3	5.8

*Significance of differences when tested by variance analysis were as follows:

Age factor	— p. of	Men	Women
Fertilizer factor	— p. of	NS	NS
		.01	.05

Table 13 — *Average Social Participation Scores by Education of Farmers and of Farm Homemakers, and by Receipt of Test Demonstration Area Fertilizers, 60 Farmers and 56 Farm Homemakers, 4 Communities, East Tennessee, 1954**

	Years of School Completed			Total
	1-8	9-12	13 & up	
	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score	Participation Score
Farmers				
High fertilizers	3.2	12.6	19.2	11.4
Low fertilizers	4.2	10.5	9.3	6.7
No fertilizers	3.9	7.5	7.3	4.7
All Farmers	3.9	11.1	13.4	7.6
Farm Homemakers				
High fertilizer	3.8	10.9	9.2	8.8
Low fertilizer	2.6	8.2	10.3	5.6
No fertilizer	1.9	5.4	6.0	3.6
All Homemakers	2.5	8.4	8.9	5.8

*Significance of differences when tested by variance analysis were as follows:

Education factor	— p. of	Men	Women
Fertilizer factor	— p. of	.01	.01
		.30	.10

group 13.4 (Table 13). Scores for the women of grade school education averaged 2.5, for high school women 8.4, and for college women 8.9. The educational factor was highly significant between grade school education and education of the high school level or above. Differences between college folk and high school folk were minor.

Multiple correlation coefficients and regressions were run for both the farmers and their wives with social participation as the dependent variable and the following as independent variables:

X_2 = Years of schooling completed (man and wife separately)

X_3 = Years that TDA fertilizers were received

X_4 = Income from farm products sold and for wages received by the family 1954

X_5 = Acres of crop and pasture land in the farm 1954

X_6 = Months of off-farm work by the farmer 1954

X_7 = Months of off-farm work by the homemaker 1954⁷

This analysis indicates an increase in social participation of .8028 points on the man's participation score with a corresponding increase in education of one year when the effects of the remaining variables were held constant at their mean. Social participation also increased .6591 points on the score with an additional year of demonstration fertilizer. An increase of \$100 in total income was associated with a .0273 point rise of the participation score; an acre increase of crop and pasture land in the farm with a rise of .0018 points, and a month's off-farm work with a rise of .1116 points. The net change in participation for a change in one unit of the independent variables was similar for both men and women. Education and social participation scores are very closely related, but changes in participation associated with the other factors are so small that within the range of the data little effect on participation could be expected from this.

Partial correlations were then run for each independent variable and participation. These show the correlation between the dependent factor (participation) and each of the independent factors, while eliminating any (linear) tendency of the remaining independent factors to obscure the relation. The partial correlations for education and participation for men and women were statistically highly significant. Partial correlation coefficients were also significant for both fertilizer and for acres in the case of

⁷Months of off-farm work by the homemaker was used only in calculating relationships for the homemaker.

homemaker participation. None of the other partial correlation coefficients were large enough to be statistically significant.

The multiple correlation coefficients of $R = .6556$ for the men and $R = .5967$ for the women were both highly significant. Coefficients of determination were: for men, $R^2 = .4298$; and for women, $R^2 = .3560$. Thus 43 percent of the variation in participation for the men was attributable to these five independent factors, and 36 percent of that for the women.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This is a study of participation by farmers and their wives in organized groups in four rural communities in East Tennessee. The following conclusions are drawn from observations in these communities. While the communities are not a randomly drawn sample the conclusions drawn appear to be generally true.

Evidence indicates that given organizations draw their membership from somewhat limited status levels among the population. The P.T.A. tended to be selective of the middle-aged farmers, the full-time and better educated farmers and their wives. Lodges were selective of the older men. While age, income, and education levels appeared unrelated to church membership and participation, there is reason to believe that individual congregations did have a tendency to draw from select status levels.

If it were possible to measure accurately the status levels of all people in a community and determine their organizational affiliations a grouping of organizations among given strata of status levels might be expected. There exist also some strata in the rural population relatively untouched by any organization. These strata, while relatively high in aged, uneducated and low income people, are by no means confined to the latter groups.

While the organization of rural community clubs constitutes an attempt to enlist participation of all persons in the community regardless of status, age, education, or other traits, this was not entirely successful in these four communities. Evidence indicates that farmers join rural Community Clubs first in order to improve or get something for the farm; second, in order to satisfy some desire for sociability; and third, to secure some objectives which could be had only through group endeavor. The task of creating a comprehensive program that will satisfy the interests of many people needs to be met if these clubs are to draw participation community wide.