Why Small Farms?

The American free enterprise system dictates: make it, make it big, or move on.

In farming, many enterprises have indeed made it big. Across the grain belt and into the miles of cotton fields, names of the biggest and best are familiar. Many have become conglomerates.

But the small family farm has always been an important American tradition. Some of these are the people who have kept to the same land, kept to the same ways, through generations. Many have other sources of income, many do not.

The small farm — what is it? The small farmer — who is he? And, most importantly, how can Research and Extension better understand and help small farming? Economic, community, social, and environmental studies and programs all have some importance as they touch on the influences, changes, and needs of this unique group of Americans.

This special issue looks at the southern small farmer, emphasizing specific Extension or Research approaches. The small farmer, for example, does not always seek to become a big farmer. He may be looking for better ways to produce and earn from a limited farm.

Recent small farm research, in a period of more intense interest and more urgent questioning, seems basically descriptive. There is much to learn and know about the economic, social, community, and environmental correlates of small farming. As yet not many prescriptive studies or program reports have had an impact.

These reports come from across the region. They reflect the growing concern of Extension and Research for small farming as a way of life and the increasing diversity of ways to meet and solve problems of small farms. The question stands: “Where do we go from here?”
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Who Is The Small Farmer?

By Ms. F. Jane Murray
Research Assistant

and

Dr. Milton Coughour
Department of Sociology
University of Kentucky

What Are the Policy Implications?

This profile can be useful so far as it assists researchers and program personnel in tailoring their work to help such a "type" of person in such a "type" of economic and social situation.

Small farmers less often than in the early 1960's depend primarily on farming. Some have stable dual careers; others supplement farm income with welfare or retirement income. Thus family incomes have improved, but family requirements have also increased even more rapidly. Judged against current desires, current income seems less adequate than ever before.

Yet in general, farmers in the South are more satisfied than dissatisfied with their quality of life and the direction of change. It may surprise some that far more feel the agricultural situation has improved during the past decade than that it has become worse, and two-thirds feel the situation is currently good despite low income. It appears that most are strongly attached to farming.

On the other hand, like most nonfarmers in rural areas, they are disillusioned with politics and local government, despite the expansion of public programs from which farmers and others have benefitted. Clearly farmers in the 1970's are likely to blame the government for problems that in earlier years they would have shouldered themselves.

Providing means for improving incomes and earning their trust are the biggest challenges facing those who serve farm people today and desire to assist them to improve the quality of life.

Can Small Farmers Be Helped to Change?

By Ron Atkinson
Farm Management Specialist
Georgia Cooperative Extension Service

America's small farmers have not kept pace in one of the world's most efficient industries. The reasons for falling behind are endless, but can be summed up generally as inefficient use of available help and resources and failure to apply new methods and resources.

Stumbling blocks to learning about and using new techniques keep many small farm operations from flourishing as they might. Introducing new ways of doing things to the small farmer means getting his attention, selling him on the benefits of change, and helping him put new practices to work in his own operation. It sounds straightforward, but experience has proved again and again that some groups will listen and learn more readily than others. How can Extension and Research reach out to help?

The Philosophy of Helping

Just how to assist small farmers brings up many questions of concern. Do we do nothing, and let those unwilling to adapt and change fade from the farming scene — into the cities to become a burden on society? Or do we develop self-help programs to increase farm income and family welfare? Either approach will cost the taxpayers something. But which will return the greatest dividends?

Most rural developers and agricultural workers have long been convinced that self-help offers the best alternative. But developing acceptable self-help programs requires imagination and persistence.

Two Farming Styles in Georgia

Georgia offers a useful case study of the wins and losses in trying to help small farmers. In 1974, more than 71 percent of all Georgia farms qualified as "small," reporting gross sales under $20,000. In many of these cases, the farm provided the sole source of family income.

But what is interesting in the Georgia experience is the split in character and farming styles between the northern and southern portions of the state. In the northern, mountainous area, farmers have fewer basic resources. The average is only 24 acres of tillable land per farmer. These farmers (most white) were reared in the area and farm the "old homestead" or a farm purchased nearby. Most of the land is debt-free, and many will tell you it will remain so. Expanding the operation would mean spending for rent or purchase of land.

Most of the family labor supply comes from the farm operator and his wife; a lack of hired labor restricts the size and success of farming operations. The children are available until high school graduation or until they drop out of school. In either case, they soon leave for the big money and glamour offered by a job in the city.

In the South, however, small farmers are not so restricted by land or in attitude toward renting and buying. These farms average 60 acres, used mostly for cash crops such as tobacco, peanuts, and soybeans. The greater return offered on these crops makes a decision on buying or leasing additional land less difficult.

These farmers (44 percent black) were born and raised in the area, but their young people are staying in the family enterprise because there are opportunities in agriculture. The cash crops are more mechanized than the north Georgia vegetable crops, and total farm investment is larger because of the greater investment in machinery and land.

Who Will Learn and Change?

Comparisons show how new ideas are accepted — or not accepted — in the two areas. In the Georgia example, location and topography are major factors in planning small farm programs. Cooperators in the southern area did better than their northern counterparts, generating $10,256 in average gross farm income as opposed to the northerners' $4,532.
What Can We Do?

In conclusion, a **people-oriented** program can help us be more successful in working with small farmers. Present **production-oriented** programs give little consideration to the farm family unit. We need extensive study of the family, however, to provide information on attitudes, values, goals, and aspirations. These valuable insights should aid development of more successful programs. A greater understanding of the small farm family will help to establish more workable programs for any area or group of small farmers.

Greater use should be made also of paraprofessionals in small farm programs. Qualified paraprofessionals, working on a one-to-one basis at the local level, can provide leadership and guidance for small farmers. Although these programs require competent professional supervision, they can reach more small farmers for the money than professionals in the same role.*

* Further information about developing a paraprofessional program is available in Georgia Small Farm Program: A Guide for Selection and Use of Agricultural Program Assistants, published by the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Georgia.

Why?

Attempts to introduce new crops to increase gross income have been unsuccessful in the north because of the changes in farming practices needed to produce these crops. The self-sufficient attitude of these old-line farmers blocks acceptance of new ways. The experience of progress in the south shows that small farmers can and will change.

Small farming in the Appalachian area of eastern Kentucky means poverty. Farm incomes are low because farms are small, averaging less than 200 acres. Steep, wooded or badly eroded hillsides provide only marginal cultivable or pasture area. Outside of public assistance, these small farmers can have few options: migration, off-farm employment, or earning more in their situation.

This study was intended to gauge potential increases in net farm incomes from given resources. Two likely prospects were changes in the enterprise mix or improvements in technology. We also tried to identify nonresource constraints to achieving higher incomes. In sum: what can we do to help small farmers receive a greater return from their enterprises?

**Typical Farmer in Appalachia**

The small farmer in this study matches the usual description. He is low in education and income, owns little land and has few livestock. Most income comes from crops, with tobacco dominant. Two types of farms emerged from our survey results: those that used tractors and those that used mainly animals. While the tractors were mostly old and small, they were used on farms with somewhat better educated operators, slightly larger resource bases, and larger net income. The results indicate that it is possible for operators of these farms to improve their net incomes substantially. Increases from incomes of about $2,000 to $6,500 appear to be possible under some conditions. The greatest improvement is possible when the farmers emphasize labor-intensive crops such as tobacco, cucumbers, and peppers, use improved technology, and have no limit on capital borrowed.

**Technology**

In the analysis of prospects for these small farmers, a typical farm was defined and its options weighted. Two levels of technology were studied — existing and improved — based on recommendations of Kentucky Cooperative Extension specialists. Although some yields were the same on both types of farms, inputs were not necessarily the same. Under improved technology, for example, an animal-power farm was assumed to have higher labor requirements.

The effects of factors other than technology were also considered. We look at limitations on capital borrowing, changes in regulations on tobacco allotments, and eliminating tobacco production entirely.

**Borrowing**

With unrestricted borrowing, a tractor-power farm could increase its net income $1,900 with no change in technology. Table 1 shows the possible results:
The "building capital" required in such budgets would account for slightly more than half of the optimal-technology plans; none is required for observed enterprise combinations.

We don’t need to go into the particular requirements of the tobacco allotment leasing plans that were devised. Leasing tobacco allotment, purchasing necessary fertilizer and other inputs, and building the needed curing barn space require buying capital that could mean elimination of livestock production, if capital availability is limited. Also, if the large-scale mechanical harvesting and curing techniques are introduced, large enterprises might be favored over small ones if allotment transfer restrictions are removed.

Crop and Livestock Yields

Table 2 shows the dramatic results for both types of farms that could be obtained with improved technology. For example, dolly yields can be nearly doubled.

What Can They Do?

Some of these factors are controlled by the farmers; others are not. For example, present regulations on use of tobacco allotments limit expansion of production. Without a supporting educational program, improving technology may be unrealistic, especially considering the client group of older, less-educated farmers. Advanced age, tradition, and limited education present obstacles to change. The potential income benefits, however, from even partial adoption of improved technology and more profitable enterprises can be relatively large. Thus, for some of those with substandard family incomes, public investments in improvement of their farming systems may yield greater improvements in economic welfare than similar expenditures for direct financial aid. These possibilities need to be explored in depth in future studies, probably through pilot technical assistance programs.

And for Policy?

The results here show that low-income farmers can increase their incomes. Yet by some standards, even the largest of these incomes is still low. Why are low-income farmers not making these changes that would help them realize larger incomes? We do not know whether it were reluctance to change established patterns or lack of information or possibly adaptations required for the resource conditions of small Appalachian farms. Some additional effort by public educational organizations may be required to show these farmers the profitability of new enterprises and to make available the information they will need.

We have seen, then, the potential for increasing farm incomes among limited-resource farmers. To realize that potential may require new educational and technical assistance methods for answers to questions as to how to best serve small farmers. Some of these questions are being addressed in additional research now getting underway.
One Man’s Viewpoint

"I’ve Been There And Come Up"

By Alvin C. Blake
Extension Publications
University of Tennessee

If Essau Lipscomb had his way about it, there wouldn’t be any “low-income” farmers. After you visit with the former tenant farmer, listen to his story, and see where he is now, you will be inclined to agree that he just might know what he is talking about. Because he is a man who has “been there and come up.”

“...you have to use your head, to plan and work, and use the resources available,” says Lipscomb. “There are plenty of resources available to everyone these days. If people would just make use of the help they can get now, there wouldn’t be any poor farmers.”

He refers to the Agricultural Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Home Administration, Production Credit Association, local banks, marketing services, the Farm Bureau, and other agencies, associations, and groups. "And then there's people in general," he adds. "People will help you if you are sincere and show that you are willing to help others yourself."

Sharecropper’s Son

The son of a sharecropper, Lipscomb was a sharecropper himself early in life. Today, he is a successful farmer and farm leader, respected in his community and county, and wherever he is known. He is ready and willing to share his knowledge and experience with anyone who wants to learn. He owns 180 acres of good farmland near Gilson, Tennessee, and rents more land to farm a total of around 350 to 400 acres. He and his wife, Aline, have a fine brick home, two brick tenant houses, and a farmyard full of machinery. While this article has no figures on gross or net income, it is obvious that the Lipscombs live comfortably.

"I found out early in life that we weren't getting anywhere sharecropping," he explains. "Back in those days, it was mostly cotton. If you had a good crop, you barely had a living; if the crop failed, you didn't have anything. And that's what I tell people today."

"I learned to lay brick, so I'd have work in the off-season, and I worked in the building trade. We saved our money and bought 18 acres of land. We learned to grow vegetables — several different crops. We saved more money and bought more land."

"We found that people were willing to help us when they found out we meant business. The county Extension agents were a lot of help. They provided us with information and referred us to other available resources. We began to use these resources."

Problems Solved

"We had some problems, particularly before we became well established. There was a time when we couldn't borrow some money we needed to expand the business. But we found a way. Today, we can go to the bank and get all the money we need."

"I've known Essau Lipscomb ever since I began working in Gibson County over 30 years ago," said Ted Gee, the late county Extension leader. "We worked with him and helped him get started on some things. Now, he helps us. He is one of the best vegetable growers in the county, and we use his farm regularly for demonstrations. He is an innovator, a leader, and he has helped a lot of his neighbors. His yields are well above the county average on everything he grows, and he often sets the pace on some crops."

"One day Lipscomb came to our office, looked around, and said, 'When I see the county Extension office, I don't mind spending my tax dollars.'"

Lipscomb’s list of farm enterprises is impressive — he doesn’t believe in putting all his eggs in one basket. "I grow crops I can sell and make money at," he points out. "I grow a lot of different crops. You won’t hit on all of them every year, but you’re bound to make it on some of them."

Farm Labor

"Lipscomb says that getting adequate farm labor is no problem, contrary to what you often hear from small farmers. He has two full-time hands on the farm — a middle-aged bachelor who has been with him for 17 years, and a young married man with three small children. Each family lives in a neat brick home that Lipscomb built. He is obviously a good brickmason, as evidenced by the 'straight-as-a-string' mortar joints."

"You treat people right, pay them for what they do, and they’ll work for you," he says. "We just got through building this new home for the young man and his family. I’m teaching him to lay brick so he’ll have something to fall back on when farm work is slack. I’m going to make a good bricklayer out of him. I’ve already taught him how to overhaul a tractor and fix farm machinery."

"As for extra labor during planting and harvesting, that’s no problem either," he continues. "All the labor I need shows up every morning. I pay them for what they do, and try to teach them something while they work."

Helping Neighbors

"Lipscomb has helped a lot of neighbors get started in growing vegetables and improving their production practices, according to Gee. They often come to him for advice and he is always willing to share his experience with them."

One of his major interests is the Farm, Home and Minister’s Institute held annually at Tennessee State University, Nashville. TSU operates the 1890 phase of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the University of Tennessee. This institute provides special training and guidance for rural black people. Lipscomb attended the institute for years as a participant; for the past five years he has appeared on the program as a speaker and resource person. Other farmers are more inclined to listen to people like Lipscomb than to some of the "experts." He makes a valuable contribution to the Institute by virtue of his experience and willingness to share. He is a man of strong convictions and speaks his mind freely.

"The place to teach these so-called low-income people is out in the field working alongside them," says Lipscomb. "I can teach people out in the cabbage field or standing beside me laying brick. You take that young tenant — he doesn’t have much education, but that doesn’t mean he isn’t intelligent. He can learn. I know, because I’m teaching him how to do things. He’s going to do all right. You have to get people like that out where you can get your hands on them.”

And that’s the word from a man who has “been there and come up.”
Paraprofessionals Showing The Way

By Dr. Dalton H. McAfee
Administrative Program Assistant
Ms. Eunice A. Williams
Communication Specialist
North Carolina A & T University

Jimmy and Benny are 2 of the 24 paraprofessionals, or agricultural technicians, who provide educational and technical assistance daily on a one-to-one basis to small, low-income farmers in 19 of 100 North Carolina counties.

Their is one way to help small farmers identify and solve their farm, home, and community problems. Jimmy and Benny work with the Farm Opportunities Program of the Agricultural Extension Service at North Carolina A & T and North Carolina State universities.

The Need To Know
Small farm families can benefit from new agricultural technology, sound farm management practices, ways to increase family income, services offered by public agencies, and ways to participate in community activities. But often they do not know of these and other means toward achieving family goals. Jimmy, Benny, and others in the Farm Opportunities Program are filling this need to know.

To be more specific, agricultural technicians assist small farmers in carrying out recommended cultural practices, following correct soil sampling procedures, applying herbicides and pesticides, making simple farm equipment repairs, keeping farm records, and improving homes and home grounds, as well as in many other ways.

A Familiar Story
For too many years, small farming has meant low income, poor crop yields, low-quality farm products, substandard homes and unwinviting physical surroundings. Small farmers often get discouraged, feel insecure, apprehensive, and somewhat reluctant to adopt new methods and seek a higher standard of living.

Jimmy and Benny’s program is an attempt to reach 56,000 North Carolina farms where less than $2,900 worth of farm products was sold. While some of these farms are residential or part-time, many of these farmers depend crucially upon farm income for a living.

And they’ve logged some measurable successes. The Farm Opportunities Program and the agricultural technicians have established rapport with these farm families, identified local leaders or potential leaders, identified farm problems and common family goals, and worked cooperatively with family members on new or better methods.

For Example...
Millard Dickerson is an agricultural technician in Vance County. He tells this story:

“In September 1973, I visited Mr. and Mrs. Russell’s farm. They were preparing some tobacco for market. We talked about goals they had in mind. Both of them wanted a new home. So we talked about how they might get a loan to build a home. I suggested they talk to their landlord and see if he would sell them a lot.

“Mr. Russell took a job in town and worked 40 hours plus still caring for his farm. He put in a lot of long hours to save enough money to buy the lot to build on.

“I introduced him to the FHA personnel here. They worked with him on his application, which was approved quickly. The money came in May. The contractor started the house in June.

“Mr. and Mrs. Russell will be able to spend this winter in a new, comfortable home for the first time in their lives. I suppose there is always hope for people if we are determined and help them in all their problem areas.”

Can We Hope?
Here’s an approach that’s working. Yet considering how many small farmers there are, and how many farm, home, and community problems they have to solve, can we expect accomplishments after one year — or even four years — of a program? What are reasonable goals for such a person-to-person outreach?

Jimmy, Benny, Millard, and their fellow technicians help a little bit every day. Days add up; accomplishments add up. Average yearly net income of farm cooperators in the program has increased from $7,000 to more than $11,000. Crop yields equal and in some cases exceed county and state averages for almost two-thirds of the 950 participants.

The small farmers who have been touched show nearly acquired confidence. More than 70 percent have attended or organized group meetings to seek assistance and follow through. Many of them have participated in regular Extension programs. New activities and enterprises have sprung up — improved home landscaping, new homes, remodeled homes, better farm recordkeeping, new production practices.

A Personal Touch
The Farm Opportunities Program has paid off handsomely for all involved. It works in North Carolina and has merit for other states.

Experience, backed by hard data, shows that the personal touch can bring about positive change. And Extension is committed to this unique outreach effort. Future plans include adding more technicians in more counties. Garden aides are helping families balance daily meals with home-grown produce. And Teletip, a telephone call-in service, is answering an increased demand for more information.

The Farm Opportunities Program, with people like Jimmy and Benny, is a spark of genuine help. It has made the difference in profits, satisfaction, and way of life for North Carolina small farmers.
Better use of land, labor, and capital can spell the difference between marginal and successful small farm operations. Yet many small farmers are not aware of the options open to them in improving or expanding their operations. More dollars flow from better-run operations — so what can and should these small farmers do?

Income can usually be increased on small farms with effective planning and completing of each part of the enterprise on time. For example, adding a high-value vegetable or specialty crop in a likely market area can help. Yet for others, multiple handicaps, such as a lack of experience in managing capital, or poor health, may set severe limits on what can be accomplished.

For many families, a relatively small increase in income can materially improve the level of living and perhaps make it easier to shift enterprises or expand in the future. Various ways in which incomes can be increased may appeal to different types of farm operators: work for higher yields, intensify an existing enterprise, add an enterprise, reduce costs, utilize resources more efficiently, and increase the resource base.

Increasing Yields

Limited-resource farmers frequently cannot schedule their operations for best yields and returns. They can be slow to adopt new practices which would increase yields. Yet this is the easiest and most promising way of increasing income on many small farms! Spelled out, 1,000 bushels of corn or soybeans could be produced with less labor and cash expense if more attention were paid to most desirable planting dates, use of lime and fertilizer, and other specific practices which affect yields. Improved sanitation and nutrition, for example, would increase pigs-weighed-per-litter or percent-ages of calf crops — and result in greater income.

Intensifying an Existing Enterprise

Frequently small farm operators can intensify an existing enterprise to increase income. Examples include feeding out pigs instead of selling feeder pigs, or selling calves at heavier weights. Similarly, some farmers might best double-crop or overseed selected crops such as soybeans and small grain.

Adding an Enterprise

Many limited-resource farmers could add an enterprise without hurting other farm activities. For example, family labor and only a few acres can add $1,000 in income from some high-value crops.

Opportunities may be available locally which can add dollars with little problem. Farmers may not have considered these options. Producers may be contracting for or purchasing vegetable crops in the area for canning or freezing. Relatively small quantities of high-value crops can still be a bonanza with a local market or nearby metropolitan or tourist market. Supplying area farmers with fence posts, dairy heifer replacements, or other products can also be profitable. Resources unique to a particular farming style or to an area can sometimes be used to advantage. Examples include raising native shrubs or capitalizing on high-quality vegetation in producing honey. Small farm operators need to be alert to these opportunities.

Reducing Cost

Many small farms suffer high costs for machinery per unit of production because of underutilization. Some farmers have partially solved this problem by exchanging services or by joint purchase of secondhand equipment with a neighboring farmer. Utilizing or providing custom work can be profitable, too.

Here’s a most significant opportunity in increasing income: to determine if land labor, and capital can be utilized more efficiently. This may mean changing (a) enterprises, (b) the size of existing enterprises, or (c) production practices.

For farms of limited acreage, available land must be put to the best uses. Usually the best land goes for high-value crops, and the remainder is allocated to the more extensive crops. If expected net income per acre is $295 for bell peppers, $99 for corn, and $22 for hay, of course peppers will be selected for land first.

Sometimes operators of small farms can pool their resources in a partnership arrangement in order to specialize or gain efficiency from increased size.

Increasing the Resource Base

Capital accumulation builds for the future with a base for borrowing capital and for absorbing losses. As families save part of their income, or invest in productive enterprises with borrowed funds, a buffer of capital accumulates against "hard times." When productive assets appreciate, the original investment seems worth the initial risk. Yet neither limited-resource nor large farm operators can always save enough from income to make all the investments desirable for the farm business. The answer: wise use of credit.

In many cases, additional land can be rented or leased, allowing the farmer to invest more profitably in crops and livestock production. It may also be feasible to clear high-quality land to use it more intensively.

Existing land can be made more productive over time. Practices which improve water holding capacity, reduce erosion, or increase fertility can materially increase future crop yields.

The extent to which a small farm family can increase its resource base is crucial in determining if it can reach and maintain acceptable standards of living. Moving up and out requires investment and dedication to the farm enterprise with more than just hard work and money. It requires imagination, commitment, and determination to do the best with available or obtainable resources. The potential is certainly there; these suggestions are meant to spur further thought about where and how small farms can expand or improve.

*For further information, see Sammy L. Comer and Roger C. Woodworth, Improving Income on Limited-Resource Farms in South Central Tennessee, Bulletin No. 36, School of Agriculture and Home Economics, Tennessee State University.
Low-income farmers are not able to achieve the economies of scale enjoyed by large farmers. They need to find ways to increase production, reduce costs and increase bargaining power in marketing their products. Cooperative organizations are generally considered to be one way in which low-income farmers can achieve these objectives. This study examined cooperatives for low-income farmers in South Carolina.

Because of small acreage and shortage of capital, low-income farmers find it convenient to produce vegetable crops which are an important source of farm income in the Coastal Plains area of South Carolina. The existing marketing cooperatives of low-income farmers are, thus, engaged in the marketing of vegetable crops. Most of them are also engaged in the sale of farm supplies.

**Extent of Cooperatives**

The co-op movement has not reached a significant portion of low-income farmers in the state. In 1972, there were only four functioning co-ops in the state, and they were all organized since 1967. The total membership of all these co-ops was 546 members in 1973. The smallest co-op had a membership of 46 and the largest one had 329 members. All the co-ops studied were incorporated.

**Marketing of Farm Products**

Only one co-op sold its products to the processing market and had its price determined by a contract with a broker before the start of the season, because the co-op did not have a large enough volume to deal directly with the processor. Remaining co-ops sold products to fresh markets. In dealing with the fresh markets the co-ops had to accept going market prices. Two of these co-ops once promised certain prices to farmers, but could not realize those prices on consignment sales. Thus, the co-ops and the members had to suffer losses which caused dissatisfaction among members. Meager sales volume, coupled with one-crop operation, was the principal obstacle faced by the co-ops in marketing farm products.

**Farm Supplies**

Only three cooperatives were engaged in the sale of farm supplies, with sales ranging from $4,000 to $48,000. Since prices of farm supplies are competitive with local prices, this itself was a great advantage to the members because they had to pay higher prices, with unreasonable credit arrangements, before the co-op supply stores were organized. Because of their small purchase volume of farm supplies, the co-ops could not get large discounts from the manufacturers.

At one co-op 60 percent of sales were on credit, and the manager’s major problems involved inadequate capital and warehouse locations necessary to serve customers scattered over a wide area. At another co-op all sales were handled with cash because of repayment problems the previous year.

**The Manager**

One of the most important factors in the successful operation of a cooperative is the manager. His role in assisting small farmers with little or no education, working with a board of directors which may not be business-minded, requires experience and motivation. All the managers interviewed were college graduates, native to South Carolina, and one was a recent business school graduate. Their professionalism would certainly be an asset, despite recurrent problems of untrained staff, inadequate financing, and lack of participation by members. Most of the managers emphasized that the lack of training and business orientation was one of the principal handicaps towards a successful operation of the co-ops.

**Financial Analysis**

Studies of these co-ops whose financial statements were adequate indicated that they suffered net losses in 1972. The losses ranged from $11,000 to $39,000, and they resulted from higher administrative expenses and higher costs of goods sold. The extremely high debt ratios of these cooperatives bring out a very important point in that the cooperatives organized by low-income people usually have a very low equity. Under these conditions, if the cooperatives invest in buildings, equipment and facilities, rather than rent them, a very risky situation is created. If this arrangement is successful, it could yield a substantial percentage return to the owners. However, even a moderate loss under these circumstances could hurt the owners’ equity.
Members' Evaluation of Cooperatives

A total of 98 farmers who were members of the co-op were interviewed. These members in general indicated that they had received better prices, guaranteed market and cheaper supplies from the co-op. Two most important suggestions by members to improve the co-ops were: (1) improvement in the management of the co-ops, (2) buying and selling a large variety of products by the co-ops. Members of one co-op rated its overall performance as above or below average.

How Useful Can Co-ops Be?

Low-income farmers' cooperatives seem plagued by special organizational and operational problems. A cooperative can make it if the services it can provide are not otherwise available. For small farmers in the vegetable market, co-ops offer grading, packing, shipping, and marketing at better prices if there is enough volume for sale. Thus, potential membership and volume of production must be on the increase for a co-op to be feasible. If the number of farms or the volume of their production declines, co-ops cannot operate economically. Of course, a well run co-op depends upon adequate facilities and financing. To have the optimum volume of business, a co-op will have to attract the business of medium- and high-income farmers. Some suggestions are offered as follows:

1. A feasibility study must be conducted to judge economic viability. Close supervision in the formative stages of a cooperative is highly essential. At first, fixed investments in land, buildings, machinery and equipment are not advisable. Multiproduct grading and packing machines can increase diversification.

2. A beginning cooperative should not buy members' products outright. It should only sell these products for the members and give them the proceeds after deducting appropriate expenses.

3. A marketing cooperative should seriously consider selling farm supplies to members, to help increase the productivity of members' farms. Sound credit policies must be established.

4. While organizing a cooperative, leadership should avoid making exaggerated promises. If expectations are not met by the cooperative, the membership relations can be easily spoiled.

5. The board of directors should be acquainted with the basic facts about running a business and develop a strong working relationship with the county agent and the land-grant institutions.

6. Private foundations and charitable institutions should help the co-ops in such a way that they do not create a sense of dependency, which can ruin business incentives.

*Economic Feasibility of Organizing Marketing and Supply Cooperatives by the Low-Income Farmers of South Carolina, South Carolina State College Research Bulletin No. 6, Orangeburg, S.C., offers a cost analysis formula for evaluating economic feasibility for vegetable processing operation of certain vegetables. This study was funded by the Cooperative State Research Service.

Leaving The Farm

By Dr. Basil Coley
Department of Economics
North Carolina A&T University

The so-called plight of the small farmer isn't an abstract concept to those people who live and work — and rise and fall — there. They know day by day the frustrations of running a limited-resource farm. They don't need experts to tell them that they have problems.

One trend in American agriculture, toward consolidation and bigness, has passed them by. They are left, or choose, to run a "family" farm, a "small" farm, a "limited-resource" farm. Researchers have documented the dissatisfaction, income lags, and other problems of this group of people. A frequently heard question is, "Well, if things are so bad, why don't they just leave?"

This study asked small farmers just how willing they would be to undertake new jobs, to move, to retrain. Do they want to leave farming? No!

Here is the group of farmers often considered "least successful," but they do not want to give it up. How do they feel?

Low-income farmers in three North Carolina counties were asked:

Have you sought a nonfarm job within the past year?

Would you be willing to be trained for a nonfarm job?

Would you close down your farm and work in a nonfarm job if this was available in your vicinity?

Would you relocate to an urban area if a job were made available to you there?

No! We Won't Go

Overwhelmingly they did not want to move or to change. Despite the dreary statistics, they wanted to stay on and keep at farming. And interestingly enough, it was the very farmers lowest on the economic ladder who resisted the idea most strongly.

Age a Factor

No doubt the conservatism of this group can be attributed to age. As shown in most such research, small farmers were mostly older; in the counties studied, 44 to 58 percent were over 55. It is logical that they would be reluctant to change, having given so much of their lives to the same patterns of living and earning a living.

Naturally most of these older, settled small farmers had not sought off-farm employment. Many of them had been farming for over 30 years. Also, most respondents were unwilling to be trained for nonfarm jobs. However, some who had already had some experience working outside expressed an interest in such training.
Not farm income proved to be an important factor in interest in training. Ironically, the highest proportion of those unwilling to be trained fell in the $4,000 to $4,999 income bracket in one county. At first glance, these are the people most in need of income supplements. Yet they seem to be the firmest in resisting change toward new income sources!

**Standing Pat**

They just did not want to move away from the old patterns. Less than 24 percent of the farmers in each county would close down a farm to work in nonfarm employment. Only 12 percent could muster any enthusiasm for relocating in an urban area with employment there. More than 80 percent flatly said that they did not like cities and preferred country life.

**Other Limits**

Of the small group to seek employment off the farm, most wanted only part-time jobs. Their hearts were still with farming. They said that they wanted to remain on the farm, and did not wish to commute more than 30 miles.

What if new industries came to their area? Would local off-farm employment seem more attractive then? Two-thirds of the farmers wanted to see new industries come to their vicinity, but again they saw this move in terms of benefits to their farming enterprises. They sought indirect benefits, such as an increase in prices for their products.

**Their Own Solutions**

Against this background of unwillingness to adopt new ways or try new employment, what solutions would the farmers themselves offer? What are their priorities?

Predictably, the farmers saw changes for the future in terms of improved incomes from their farms. They proposed solutions in higher and more stable prices, more land and equipment, and participation in cooperatives. Again, their emphasis was on doing better with what they have, rather than finding new kinds of employment.

**Hardened Attitudes?**

"Attitudes of small farmers towards leaving farming" rang powerfully in the negative. The question, then, is not one of finding nonfarm employment or facilitating a change in way of life to nonfarm emphasis, because this group of small farmers just doesn’t want to let go.

As shown, it is unfortunately those farmers at the very bottom of the income ladder who most resist the idea of off-farm employment. And they are the ones who have the farthest to go on the farm, whether from lack of resources, low productivity, or other handicaps.

If this picture is a correct one, and it does seem to fit the usual picture of the small farmer in terms of age, years of farming, and way of life, what does it mean for small farm programs? Clearly these farmers seek programs aimed at helping them be more productive where they are. Pushing the idea of off-farm employment at such a group of people would create only resentment, for they do not see that as the answer. For the long run, they want to continue as they have, making a go of the small farm.

Understanding their backgrounds and attitudes makes it plainer to those of us working with small farmers how successfully we can reach and teach them: on the farm.

---

**Communications Gap: Extension And The Small Farmers**

The SRDC Small Farms Network held a workshop on "Communication and Small Farm Programs" this spring at Gainesville, Florida. Dr. Everett M. Rogers, Professor of Communications and Sociology at Stanford University, was the featured speaker. A recognized authority in the diffusion of innovations, the adoption process, and communication in rural societies, Dr. Rogers began his discussion with reference to the standard model of communications: source, message, channel, receiver. He went on to apply concepts of communication to small farm programming — and its successes and failures. Some of his remarks are abstracted here.

You know agriculture. And you don’t know how to get it across to the people.

Your message may mean a different thing to you than it did to your receiver.

Start with the receiver, such a simple and basic fact — that we don’t often do. Sometimes we are unable to do it; sometimes we act as if it were the message that is important, as if the content were the overriding consideration, as if knowledge of agriculture and other related content in rural development is somehow the most important thing.

We often fool ourselves into thinking that our content is so important, and it seldom is. I am not trying to fool myself today. Sometimes we think that the channel is the most important part of the communication process, and sometimes we run into people who are channel freaks. Perhaps they have produced a radio program — maybe some of you have a weekly radio program. I once did, and I used to be very proud of it. I thought that radio was really the way to get through to people, and I was convinced that radio was a great thing. That was a mistake, too.

Many of us are source-oriented, meaning self-oriented. Somehow we think that, and often we make a mistake. We build in messages on the premise that people think like we do. Yet we know that they don’t.
Feedback

The communications model in social science research comes from an idea in engineering in the 1940's. And many of the terms are engineering terms. Feedback is one of them. Whenever you think of feedback, think of thermostat. When the temperature gets to a certain point, it sends a signal back to the furnace – STOP. That is feedback. It is a message about the effectiveness of communication. And it says either everything is in fine shape, or you have got problems. The effects you intend to produce are not happening.

Now if there is feedback, there must also be feed forward, because we would like to know a lot about our receivers, finding out what dimension we needed before we try to communicate with them. Let's say that you are newly assigned, your first day on a job in a county with 2,000 farmers. First, you aren't going to talk to all 2,000. You are going to reach some of those intensively, and some less intensively. You are not going to reach some of them at all – probably 1,500. The point is: with many people we will have no contact. You probably have something in common with those you talk to. As a rule of thumb, two people who have a lot of contact become more and more like each other. Yet if we do not communicate effectively with clients who are different from us, we aren't doing anything. There would be no need for us.

Small Farm Problems

But there would be a need for somebody else to fill in for what we are not doing, and I think that is the root of many of the problems in communication that we have with small farmers. You may not think that the necessity for communication between two different types of people is at the root of the process of diffusion, by which word of innovations is spread from one person or group to the next. We speak of communications, innovations, sending new ideas to receivers who are not like ourselves.

Now I will make this a little more complicated. We have been talking as if there were one receiver and one source. Just two people – that is the simplest case. Each of you carries around a network, your little close-in communications environment, the people that you talk with most. Here in a world of three billion people, it is really your three best friends that you talk to. There are other networks operating here, as in your job contacts.

Informationally, a network branches out. It links you to a larger environment. With small farmers, we have come a long way. We have helped agriculture come a long way.

What would happen to most of you in your regular, everyday jobs if you devoted most of your attention to small farmers? If you and your work at all levels aren't rewarded for doing something for society, something that you feel needs to be done, not much of this work will go on for very long.

Improving Rural Life

Making rural life better means that in comparison there is less motivation for people to move to the city. That is a simple but profound redirecting of national activities. We see some of it in this country and a lot more of it in other countries.

We talked of a continuum, with NEED on one end and SUCCEED on the other. I believe we always have had and will have competing goals in rural development. It's much more than production; it's economic growth, industrialization, etc.

Communication Effectiveness

Let's say that we have a measure of some communication effect – knowledge, adoption of innovation, whatever the goal of a program may be, high or low. Given some kind of educational campaign, there has been intervention. Now how are we going to know whether that does any good or not? In the past, we've taken some measure of the average member of the intended audience, before and after. In the aggregate, perhaps incomes have improved thousands of dollars.

Now in the 70's we started talking about another dimension in development. We measure, instead of just a point, an average for everybody, which makes it a little more complicated. Let's have two groups: big farmers and little farmers. Let's call them the UPS and the DOWNS. And remember the meaning was like this, and some people were below it and some above it at the beginning before we did anything. And there is a little gap; there's already a difference. Now we know that in the aggregate everybody gained some what from our intervention. Who gained more? Usually, the UPS. That's right. And so now the gap gets bigger, because the UPS got further. The DOWNS are better off, but less so than the UPS. This is a very typical situation, I think you'll agree. Should the DOWNS be happy? We have actually produced less equality.

We compare ourselves to those around us; usually the reference is to others in our system who are gaining more than we are. So relative to them we feel worse off, yet absolutely we're better off. Probably the DOWNS are happy about having progressed above a minimum line, but they compare themselves to the UPS in the absolute sense, and feel topped over.

Growing Gaps

Limiting ourselves to agriculture, why do gaps widen? Usually our intervention focuses on a message content that is of greater usefulness to the UPS than the DOWNS. It's more relevant to their problems. We who do the interventions are more similar to the UPS than to the DOWNS, which brings us back to the earlier discussion of communication effectiveness.

Sometimes, crazily, we say that the DOWNS aren't receptive. Their aspirations and desires, conditioned by the past, help widen the gap. As someone mentioned, the best way not to widen gaps is not to do anything.

When we go out that door, we can say, "I realize the problem. From now on I'm going to start narrowing these gaps."

What can we do? Here are four things, a summary. They're perhaps not practical; you have to try them out for yourself. They are general strategies for ways in which we can communicate with small farmers.

One is to begin with their needs. That's very obvious. We must base our educational programs on these needs. If we don't we lose credibility. That's vast in its implication.

A second suggestion is to use opinion leaders.

A third one is to use aides, or para-professionals. Both aides and opinion leaders help a professional magnify his efforts. Would you try to reach one farmer with 100 acres or 100 farmers with one acre each? Aides come from the client system. We have a little more control here than with opinion leaders, because we pay them to work for us. If one of the things we want is one-on-one contact, that's the kind we can afford. And they can do a better job, because, again, they are like the people we want to reach.

Finally, organize people in small groups which pursue a self-development task. There are some great successes at doing this with small farmers. They are an important context multiplier. The principle here is that wherever there's a social structure use it — don't make a new one.
Over and over again it's said that small farmers need to make the most of what they have. "The best use of available resources" means putting land, equipment, and people to work in the most profitable ways.

But practical suggestions for doing just that may seem few and far between. In Mississippi, all agricultural agencies join Extension efforts to help increase returns on the limited resources of small farms.

Seeking to put together some concrete answers for farmers, Extension published "Earn an EXTRA $1,000" with suggestions for growing cucumbers, okra, pimiento peppers, greenhouse tomatoes, and watermelons and for raising feeder pigs, market hogs, light calves, beef cattle, cattlub, and dairy cows. Each offers a succinct formula for earning that $1,000. For example, for greenhouse tomatoes, "you need one 20-foot by 20-foot plastic quonset house." Farmers are shown how they can earn extra money to help themselves and help the state's agricultural situation by putting idle acres to work, asking —

1. Look at your land. Is every acre producing as much as it could?
2. Study how you and other members of your family are using your time. Are there hours, days, or seasons when you have extra time?
3. Select the enterprise that best fits your idle acres and available labor.

"Choose one," the pamphlet says, "and harvest your extra $1,000."

---

**A Test Of The Two-Step Theory With Disadvantaged Farm Families**

By Estelle E. White
Department of Adult and Community College Education
Rex J. Clay
Research Associate
North Carolina State University at Raleigh

From whom, and how, do disadvantaged farm families receive information? Using 20 two-member teams, we interviewed 130 farm operators and 139 homesteaders in three North Carolina counties. Together, they used 467 information sources. Electronic and print media accounted for about 50 percent of these totals, so perhaps considerable information does flow directly to the farm families without the intervention of opinion leaders.

Because farm families are exposed to more than one medium and use several simultaneously, it seemed appropriate to introduce another dimension — credibility. How believable are the various sources to which they listen? Overwhelmingly, they ranked interpersonal communications as most credible — by more than 70 percent.

Again, we found that the theory doesn't always hold. Many communications, or transfers of information, took more than two or three steps. Of 47 communications studied, only 17 conformed to the theory's two-step pattern.

In summary, the two-step theory obviously has major shortcomings. It seems to be too rigid in specifying that information flows from the mass media to a mass audience via leaders. Dealing with farm families, then, will require recognition of the effect of direct communication from the mass media to the farm population. Also, identifying other disadvantaged small farmers as opinion leaders would mistakenly attribute credibility which the farmers in fact see only in socio-economically superior opinion leaders.

Perhaps small farm programs can make use of this finding in their use of films, publications, or other mass-media approaches to the small farm audience. Those "receivers" are ready for helpful information, not always needing the intervention of opinion leaders to validate its usefulness. There are so many areas in which the small farmers need and want assistance and information — economics, technology, labor, to name a few — that perhaps mass-media type programs can be tailored directly to this audience.

The two-step theory has been criticized by those who believe that information flows directly to the public from the mass media, by those who see more than two steps in the process, and by those who categorize opinion leaders as being in a higher social class than those whom they influence.
Essential Elements Of A Successful Small Farm Program

By Dr. D. H. Seastunk
Assistant Director
Texas Agricultural Extension Service

The Target Group

Current national guidelines define limited-resource farmers as those who gross less than $20,000 annually from their farming operations. But without guidelines at state, district, county, and community levels, the true identity of the limited-resource farm population becomes confused. The terms "small farms," "marginal farms," and "family farms" represent different concepts in the minds of different people.

One useful procedure is to define limited-resource farmers on a scale.

Low Middle High

For example, farm income can be plotted on this scale to determine where most small farmers rank economically in a county. This exercise should be helpful in delineating the specific target group to be assisted in any area.

While each category of farmers could benefit from assistance, a truly effective educational program must take into consideration the subtle differences that exist. Marginal crop yields may be quite acceptable to farmers in some enterprises when they have others going well for them. When program planners understand more deeply the motivations and differences of groups of people they can reach out to them with more than conventional teaching methods.

For program development purposes, the farmers who fall in the lower one-third of the continuum should be considered as the primary target group. This is essential in communicating the idea that the population to be assisted has different characteristics, needs, and interests. It facilitates an understanding that while traditional Extension educational methods have proven successful with commercial farmers, a somewhat different approach will be required with this group.

In addition, it is always easier to move toward the high end of the scale in selecting program participants for maximum results and recognition. As a result, program developers must anticipate this tendency and build into the program appropriate safeguards to counteract this drift. Without this critical step, those involved will put up increased resistance.

An effective small farm program requires an in-depth understanding of some key conceptual elements to facilitate planning, implementation, monitoring, and program evaluation. The following is a listing of selected conceptual elements which should be useful to program planners and field staff. Program success is enhanced when:

1. At each programming level there is a working definition of the target clientele that is understood and agreed upon by all concerned.
   a. National level
   b. State level
   c. County level
   d. Community level
   e. Individual level
2. Administrative support reflects an understanding of the program thrust.
   a. Economic return
   b. Social return
3. The philosophical orientation of the staff reflects an understanding of potential benefits.
   a. Economic benefits
   b. Educational benefits
4. Positive assumptions are related to the characteristics of the target clientele.
   a. Personal
   b. Situational
5. Programs are related to clearly defined educational objectives which involve teaching decision-making and vocational skills.
   a. Elementary decision-making skills
   b. Vocational skills
6. Program direction is determined by the basic alternatives available to the target clientele.
   a. Upgrade farming skills
   b. Sell skills of the farm
   c. Upgrade and sell skills
7. Program design is facilitated by classification of target clientele by potential.
   a. Full producers
   b. Part producers
   c. Nonproducers
8. Individual goals specify educational assistance needed for program participants.
   a. Short-range goals
   b. Short-range goals
   c. Long-range goals
9. Specific steps are followed to individualize program planning, implementation, and evaluation.
   a. Use existing resources
   b. Use limited outside resources
   c. Expand operation based on capabilities and desire to participate
10. The paraprofessional is utilized as a key element in the total program.
    a. Qualification
    b. Working
    c. Relating

A Working Procedure

Generally, every limited-resource farmer is trying to improve his farming operation and increase his net agricultural income. However, each farmer can be found at different stages in terms of achieving this goal. As a result, each may have a different need and may desire different degrees of assistance. Some farmers will recognize the need for a complete farm plan, while others may need direct recommendations for a particular enterprise rather than for developing a complete farm plan. In each case, each farmer has a need for a particular kind of assistance.

The success of an educational program depends upon how well the farmer's educational needs can be identified and the kind and type of assistance that must be provided. If he needs a direct recommendation, this information should be provided. Otherwise, he may not use any of the assistance available because it does not fit his immediate need. This same thing would be true in working with a commercial farmer who has a need for a complete farm plan. If such a plan is not provided, he will go elsewhere to obtain the needed information.

It is important to remember that some farmers will be able to move from one step to a higher step rather easily, while others, because of lack of resources or due to other limiting factors, will move much more slowly. The degree that this fact is recognized will influence the success of an educational program.

It is essential to recognize that each farmer will be at a different point on a scale in terms of readiness to learn. For this reason, the following suggestions are considered applicable for the farmer who is located at the lower end of the economic ladder.

Stage 1

Analyze the farmer's situation and determine what resources can be transferred within the operation. Under no circumstances should outside resources be brought in at this time. These suggestions are offered:

a. Use only existing resources.
b. Transfer resources within the operation.
c. Work with one enterprise or, at most, two.
d. Provide intensive assistance to develop confidence.
e. Teach basic skills.
f. Require records only on the enterprise or practice on which assistance is being provided.

Stage 2

At this level, bring in additional resources, but do not enlarge or expand the farmer's operation. Consideration should be given to these suggestions:

a. Use available resources with limited amounts of outside help.
b. Work on one enterprise or, at most, two.
c. Provide appropriate budgets.
d. Keep records on the enterprise budgeted.
e. Encourage participation in appropriate educational training meetings.
f. Consider enlarging the enterprise which was selected.
g. Do not try to budget combinations of enterprises.
h. Do not bring in large amounts of additional resources.

Stage 3

After careful analysis of the farmer's potential, consideration can be given to enlarging and expanding his operation with additional resources.

a. Consider a complete farm plan.
b. Consider complete farm records.
c. Encourage participation in ongoing educational programs in the county.
“Take A Walk In The Country”

Promoting tourism is one facet of rural development that has received little attention because it can help mostly those areas which have attractions to promote. The Livingston-Overtown County area of Tennessee, however, saw such a promotion as a chance to spotlight the area as a good place in which to live, work, and enjoy life.

The Livingston-Overtown County Chamber of Commerce met with Extension to find a way to meet continual requests for information about the county from individuals, businesses, and industries. A five-man committee selected Extension Agent Roger Thackston to take the pictures, with copy by Tom O'Brien, executive secretary of the Chamber of Commerce.

The brochures, and a new slide-tape program, offer information about attractions and facilities for recreation, education, industry, agriculture, finance, communications, and health care. They decided to do the work themselves, rather than bringing in an outside agency, to take their time, and have it just the way they liked it — and not have someone else thought it should be. "We feel we saved money by letting a local printer do the printing and have the money stay at home," commented Thackston. The funds for printing came from donations; local government will be asked for support for a second printing.

Small Towns Institute

"Do you ever wish that there were easier ways of solving community problems in your town? That you had a dependable source of fresh ideas and workable alternatives that could be implemented by local community leaders in cooperation with local government?"

This is the introduction to an announcement of the Small Towns Institute, Ellensburg, Washington. "The bright side of these dilemmas is that there are answers to most community problems... answers which are already working on other towns."

Sharing these ideas and helping communities to help themselves is the goal of the Institute, the only national non-profit organization whose activities concentrate exclusively on small towns and countryside communities. The Institute publishes a newsletter, Small Town, which features ideas "without the costs of special consultants."

STI also offers a special service. If you have a local problem for which there seems to be no answer, you can publish a short description in "Community Forum" and ask for ideas and opinions.

For more information about this educational and research organization, contact Clayton C. Deman, President, Small Towns Institute, P. O. Box 517, Ellensburg, WA 98926.

Extension And The Marginal Farmer

Who can gauge the effect on a local economy if several small farmers go broke? What stake does the community have in keeping them in business?

These questions intrigued Edward Buxton, University of Wisconsin Extension Leader for Social Service. Writing in Human Services and the Rural Environment, he describes a program which sought to upgrade management skills of limited-resource farmers. One of the initial problems involved local support. One farmer, in the middle of the program, reluctantly admitted that he did not feed his cattle grain! Others, at the end of the month, had little left to pay the bills, many used food stamps, and most had gardens, consumed home-produced milk, and slaughtered livestock. Some had bought their farm land and cattle at such inflated prices that they could not sell out and recover their original investment.

Home Mortgage Credit Terms

A University of Kentucky study of lending practices of credit institutions in metropolitan and rural areas of the state shows that much of the difference in credit terms depends on rural or urban residence. Rural borrowers depend heavily on local banks; savings and loan associations are major housing lenders in the metro area. In general, terms on housing loans offered by banks are more stringent, so rural borrowers do not get the same treatment as do urban ones. Home buyers in rural areas, for instance, had fewer years in which to repay their loans. The author of this study, available from the Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, is Hughes H. Sparrow.

New SRDC Publications

The Southern Rural Development Center publications series includes 20 titles on community resource development, rural development, and program and research strategies. Three of these are new:

Special Report on Federal Grants offers current information on federal assistance programs available to local governments throughout the region and the nation.

Social Impacts of Nonmetro Industrial Growth, an annotated bibliography of U. S. case studies.

Summary of Quarterly Reports, SRDC Functional Networks, Summer 1976, reports from the ten SRDC Functional Networks on their meetings, publications, and comprehensive bibliographies. Summaries of the progress and results of their research in important problem areas of rural development.


SRDC Plan of Work and Southern States’ Title V Programs, 1977, a brief overview of SRDC activities projected for 1977 and one-page summaries of the states’ Title V programs.

Network Bibliographies

In addition, as reported earlier, the SRDC Functional Networks are preparing annotated bibliographies as part of the results of their research. The first in this series, entitled Industrialization of Rural Areas, is now available at a cost of $5.00 per volume.

The other volumes will be available over the summer and fall as they are printed:

- land use issues
- citizen participation
- evaluative research literature
- small farm operations
- health care
- educational needs projection
- governmental transfer payments
- solid waste disposal, Financing
- housing

These will be available separately or as a series for $25 from the SRDC.

For a complete list of SRDC publications now in print, please write to the Editor, Southern Rural Development Center, Box 5406, Mississippi State, Mississippi 30762.
Announcing
The Rural Development Bibliography Series

ten valuable reference books bringing together hundreds of source material listings

A comprehensive presentation of recent works in rural development. These bibliographies will be available as they are printed from the Southern Rural Development Center.

Box 5406
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

☐ Please send me (when available) these volumes:

- Rural Industrialization $5.00
- Citizen Participation 5.00
- Solid Waste Disposal 3.00
- Small Farms 3.00
- Evaluative Literature 3.00

- Land Use Issues (to be priced)
- Health Care
- Educational Needs Projection
- Governmental Transfer Payments
- Housing

☐ Please send me the entire series

$____ enclosed ______ bill me ______ $25 enclosed ______ bill me