

V

RATIOS OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN IN THE RURAL POPULATIONS OF THE STATES

The ratios of children in Table 31, column C, are for the native white women in the rural population. The first thing to attract attention is that they are considerably higher than those for the cities with which we have been dealing in the two preceding chapters. Detailed comparisons dealing with city and rural groups are discussed in Chapter VI; here attention is confined to the differences shown in the rural population of the States and to the factors that seem to account more or less fully for these differences.

The range of the ratios in the native rural population is fairly large, from 436 in Rhode Island to 1,012 in Utah, but not as large as in the cities. There is a little more homogeneity in the native white rural population in respect to the ratio of children than in the native white city population, although with this range, equal to one and one-third times the lower limit, and the general character of the distribution,¹ it can scarcely be said that this homogeneity in the native white rural population is very marked.

If Table 31 is compared with Table 20 in Chapter III it will be seen that, whereas the New England States in general have very low ratios of children in the native white rural population, several of the New England cities stand relatively high among cities in this respect. In absolute numbers, however, they are much lower than the rural districts by which they are surrounded. In contrast with New England cities, California cities keep the California rural districts company near the bottom of their respective lists. In the South most of the larger cities stand not far from the median in ratios of children, but the rural districts stand near the top. In the Middle West both cities and rural districts occupy a middle position in their ratios. It is in the South, therefore, that we find the greatest contrast in ratios of children to native white women between the cities and the rural districts.

RURILITY OF THE POPULATION

Of the factors of which we have been able to take account here, the rurality of the State as measured by the per cent of the total population that is rural appears to be most closely related to the

¹ There are 6 States with ratios under 500; 4 with ratios of 500 to 599; 16 with ratios of 600 to 699; 7 with ratios of 700 to 799; 12 with ratios of 800 to 899; and 3 with ratios of over 900.

TABLE 31.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY AND MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PERCENTS AND RATIOS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, FOR THE RURAL POPULATION, BY STATES: 1920¹

| STATE | RURAL POPULATION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| | Per cent of total population | Males to 100 females in white rural population | Children under 5 per 1,000 women 20 to 44 years of age | | | | Per cent of white women 20 to 44 years of age who are married, widowed, or divorced | | Per cent of white population on farms | | Per cent of whites who are tenants on farms | |
| | | | Native white | | Foreign-born white | | Native white | Foreign-born white | Native white | Foreign-born white | Native white | Foreign-born white |
| | | | All women | Married, widowed, or divorced women | All women | Married, widowed, or divorced women | | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | |
| NEW ENGLAND: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maine..... | 61.0 | 107.6 | 603 | 762 | 811 | 924 | 79.1 | 87.7 | 43.7 | 29.3 | 4.1 | 4.6 |
| New Hampshire..... | 36.9 | 107.9 | 517 | 677 | 798 | 894 | 76.4 | 89.3 | 47.7 | 37.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| Vermont..... | 68.8 | 107.1 | 587 | 749 | 906 | 1,014 | 78.3 | 89.4 | 52.2 | 47.1 | 12.1 | 8.7 |
| Massachusetts..... | 5.2 | 100.5 | 461 | 683 | 827 | 965 | 67.5 | 85.7 | 57.1 | 68.6 | 7.0 | 7.6 |
| Rhode Island..... | 2.5 | 106.9 | 436 | 613 | 856 | 964 | 71.1 | 88.8 | 97.6 | 119.8 | 14.4 | 19.0 |
| Connecticut..... | 32.2 | 101.4 | 442 | 663 | 910 | 1,036 | 66.6 | 87.8 | 21.6 | 19.3 | 9.1 | 7.0 |
| MIDDLE ATLANTIC: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New York..... | 17.3 | 105.1 | 494 | 656 | 837 | 963 | 75.3 | 86.9 | 46.0 | 35.5 | 19.7 | 16.0 |
| New Jersey..... | 21.6 | 106.2 | 480 | 647 | 896 | 994 | 74.2 | 90.2 | 21.8 | 17.6 | 25.4 | 13.1 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 35.7 | 107.2 | 671 | 882 | 1,336 | 1,423 | 76.0 | 93.9 | 33.5 | 10.2 | 22.3 | 16.0 |
| EAST NORTH CENTRAL: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ohio..... | 36.2 | 107.1 | 633 | 793 | 1,067 | 1,129 | 79.8 | 94.5 | 56.2 | 34.9 | 30.1 | 18.4 |
| Indiana..... | 49.4 | 105.3 | 622 | 768 | 847 | 937 | 80.9 | 90.4 | 63.1 | 50.8 | 32.4 | 18.2 |
| Illinois..... | 32.1 | 108.6 | 618 | 791 | 879 | 956 | 78.1 | 92.0 | 54.6 | 33.9 | 43.1 | 38.7 |
| Michigan..... | 38.9 | 110.2 | 668 | 819 | 1,020 | 1,090 | 81.6 | 93.5 | 60.4 | 54.8 | 20.3 | 9.7 |
| Wisconsin..... | 52.7 | 112.0 | 679 | 915 | 1,002 | 1,064 | 74.3 | 92.4 | 67.1 | 63.0 | 17.3 | 7.3 |
| WEST NORTH CENTRAL: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Minnesota..... | 55.9 | 115.3 | 687 | 981 | 1,048 | 1,146 | 70.0 | 91.5 | 68.3 | 63.7 | 31.4 | 13.7 |
| Iowa..... | 63.6 | 108.3 | 641 | 829 | 926 | 1,017 | 77.4 | 91.1 | 65.2 | 57.8 | 43.1 | 34.0 |
| Missouri..... | 53.4 | 106.6 | 685 | 840 | 738 | 831 | 81.6 | 88.8 | 67.5 | 54.1 | 29.3 | 11.1 |
| North Dakota..... | 86.4 | 114.5 | 788 | 1,045 | 1,269 | 1,390 | 75.4 | 91.3 | 70.3 | 71.8 | 31.3 | 19.5 |
| South Dakota..... | 84.0 | 115.1 | 727 | 941 | 1,048 | 1,155 | 77.3 | 90.7 | 68.0 | 67.2 | 39.1 | 26.1 |
| Nebraska..... | 68.7 | 110.2 | 677 | 868 | 916 | 1,004 | 78.0 | 91.3 | 66.0 | 62.1 | 46.7 | 28.0 |
| Kansas..... | 65.1 | 109.8 | 663 | 828 | 912 | 996 | 80.1 | 91.5 | 65.1 | 55.4 | 42.6 | 21.5 |

¹ Column A, Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. I, p. 47; column B, Vol. III, Table 1 for each State; columns C, D, E, F, Detailed Table I; columns G and H, Detailed Table II; columns I and J, calculated from Census Monograph VI, Farm Population in the United States, 1920, p. 238; columns K and L, Vol. V, Agriculture, 1920, pp. 303 and 173.

TABLE 31.—CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WHITE WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE, BY NATIVITY AND MARITAL CONDITION, WITH PERCENTS AND RATIOS FOR CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS, FOR THE RURAL POPULATION, BY STATES: 1920—Continued

| STATE | RURAL POPULATION | | | | | | | | | | Per cent of whites who are tenants on farms | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|------|--------------|--------------------|
| | Per cent of total population | Males to 100 females in white rural population | Children under 5 per 1,000 women 20 to 44 years of age | | | | Per cent of white women 20 to 44 years of age who are married, widowed, or divorced | | Per cent of white population on farms | | | | Native white | Foreign-born white |
| | | | Native white | | Foreign-born white | | Native white | Foreign-born white | Native white | Foreign-born white | | | | |
| | | | All women | Married, widowed, or divorced women | All women | Married, widowed, or divorced women | | | | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | | | |
| SOUTH ATLANTIC: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delaware..... | 45.8 | 104.6 | 571 | 704 | 893 | 1,031 | 81.1 | 86.6 | 50.2 | 38.4 | 38.7 | 9.9 | | |
| Maryland..... | 40.0 | 105.9 | 649 | 841 | 771 | 886 | 77.2 | 87.0 | 47.5 | 30.3 | 27.8 | 11.0 | | |
| Virginia..... | 70.8 | 105.1 | 809 | 1,036 | 837 | 923 | 78.1 | 90.7 | 65.7 | 38.5 | 22.6 | 7.8 | | |
| West Virginia..... | 74.8 | 110.8 | 915 | 1,103 | 1,393 | 1,427 | 88.0 | 97.6 | 47.8 | 39.4 | 16.0 | 29.8 | | |
| North Carolina..... | 80.8 | 102.7 | 910 | 1,149 | 655 | 867 | 79.2 | 75.6 | 70.7 | 31.4 | 32.9 | 14.0 | | |
| South Carolina..... | 82.5 | 105.0 | 872 | 1,037 | 741 | 851 | 80.3 | 87.1 | 67.9 | 16.4 | 45.6 | 22.0 | | |
| Georgia..... | 74.9 | 104.5 | 869 | 1,057 | 555 | 660 | 82.2 | 84.1 | 75.3 | 22.3 | 51.6 | 20.4 | | |
| Florida..... | 63.3 | 108.6 | 754 | 888 | 553 | 664 | 84.9 | 83.3 | 48.5 | 34.3 | 18.1 | 5.0 | | |
| EAST SOUTH CENTRAL: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kentucky..... | 73.8 | 106.8 | 854 | 1,019 | 971 | 1,103 | 83.8 | 88.0 | 74.8 | 28.9 | 32.3 | 14.2 | | |
| Tennessee..... | 73.9 | 103.8 | 816 | 994 | 802 | 887 | 82.0 | 90.4 | 74.0 | 41.5 | 35.3 | 20.5 | | |
| Alabama..... | 78.3 | 103.6 | 894 | 1,075 | 885 | 957 | 83.2 | 92.5 | 72.5 | 36.7 | 44.0 | 10.1 | | |
| Mississippi..... | 86.6 | 104.4 | 813 | 998 | 1,035 | 1,124 | 81.4 | 92.1 | 77.0 | 44.2 | 37.9 | 35.3 | | |
| WEST SOUTH CENTRAL: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arkansas..... | 83.4 | 107.5 | 888 | 1,016 | 900 | 1,022 | 87.5 | 88.1 | 76.6 | 58.9 | 39.2 | 15.1 | | |
| Louisiana..... | 65.1 | 106.5 | 853 | 1,031 | 1,191 | 1,285 | 82.8 | 92.7 | 64.6 | 47.4 | 36.1 | 38.0 | | |
| Oklahoma..... | 73.4 | 111.0 | 853 | 962 | 939 | 1,001 | 88.7 | 93.8 | 67.8 | 51.9 | 52.2 | 20.4 | | |
| Texas..... | 67.6 | 110.3 | 760 | 910 | 911 | 1,031 | 83.5 | 88.4 | 71.5 | 59.5 | 49.5 | 51.1 | | |
| MOUNTAIN: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Montana..... | 68.7 | 125.7 | 733 | 861 | 999 | 1,064 | 85.1 | 93.9 | 60.8 | 55.3 | 12.2 | 9.1 | | |
| Idaho..... | 72.4 | 122.6 | 824 | 948 | 961 | 1,027 | 87.0 | 93.5 | 65.3 | 52.8 | 16.7 | 10.8 | | |
| Wyoming..... | 70.5 | 132.6 | 670 | 777 | 980 | 1,028 | 86.3 | 95.3 | 51.8 | 33.3 | 12.2 | 13.0 | | |
| Colorado..... | 51.8 | 117.9 | 715 | 836 | 1,064 | 1,144 | 85.5 | 94.7 | 56.5 | 42.5 | 22.6 | 22.8 | | |
| New Mexico..... | 82.0 | 112.8 | 836 | 988 | 931 | 1,015 | 84.7 | 91.7 | 57.9 | 22.9 | 11.2 | 31.6 | | |
| Arizona..... | 64.8 | 127.6 | 710 | 819 | 900 | 978 | 86.7 | 92.0 | 40.5 | 27.9 | 18.3 | 19.0 | | |
| Utah..... | 52.0 | 111.6 | 1,012 | 1,203 | 1,104 | 1,169 | 84.1 | 94.4 | 62.8 | 39.5 | 10.9 | 7.4 | | |
| Nevada..... | 80.3 | 158.7 | 498 | 586 | 785 | 829 | 84.9 | 94.7 | 26.1 | 22.8 | 9.7 | 9.8 | | |
| PACIFIC: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Washington..... | 44.8 | 125.7 | 628 | 745 | 774 | 828 | 84.3 | 93.5 | 47.2 | 43.9 | 20.7 | 11.8 | | |
| Oregon..... | 50.1 | 122.0 | 619 | 730 | 757 | 817 | 84.8 | 92.7 | 54.9 | 52.0 | 20.0 | 12.1 | | |
| California..... | 32.0 | 129.0 | 501 | 612 | 806 | 878 | 81.9 | 91.8 | 46.1 | 45.4 | 16.6 | 21.1 | | |

ratio of children in the native rural population. This was to be expected. It has been apparent from the outset of this study that urban living has a very depressing effect upon the birth rate. It would naturally be assumed in consequence that in proportion as the influence of urban living becomes greater and more pervasive, the ratio of children would show a decline. When we find, then, a fairly high degree of correspondence between the rurality of the State and the ratio of children in the native rural population, it would seem that we are justified in saying that the expectation has been fulfilled. We are also justified in concluding that the influence of the urban communities in a State does not stop at the cities' boundaries. Where a large part of the population of a State is rural, there the attitudes of mind and habits of life of the entire population tend to be those distinctive of rural dwellers; but where a large part of the population is urban, the attitudes of mind and habits of life characteristic of urban dwellers tend to permeate the entire community, at least as regards births. Even the rural population of a highly urbanized State has a lower ratio of children than in a more rural State.

This important influence of rurality on the ratio of children is quite obvious if we make a detailed comparison of columns A and C in Table 31. High ratios are found in those States where the rural population has little contact with urban life, the Dakotas, West Virginia, and the Southern States as a whole. How slight is the urban influence in these States is also shown by the per cent of their gainfully employed who are engaged in manufacturing as compared with the industrial States of the North. (Table 32.)

TABLE 32.—PER CENT OF THE GAINFULLY EMPLOYED WHO ARE ENGAGED IN MANUFACTURING, IN CERTAIN SOUTHERN STATES AND IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIAL STATES IN THE NORTH: 1920¹

| STATE | Per cent | STATE | Per cent |
|---------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| RURAL STATES | | RURAL STATES—continued | |
| Virginia..... | 23.5 | Texas..... | 15.6 |
| West Virginia..... | 23.8 | North Dakota..... | 9.3 |
| North Carolina..... | 23.6 | INDUSTRIAL STATES | |
| South Carolina..... | 16.2 | Massachusetts..... | 51.4 |
| Georgia..... | 16.1 | Rhode Island..... | 58.9 |
| Florida..... | 26.1 | Connecticut..... | 53.9 |
| Kentucky..... | 17.3 | New York..... | 39.0 |
| Tennessee..... | 18.2 | New Jersey..... | 48.0 |
| Alabama..... | 16.6 | Pennsylvania..... | 41.6 |
| Mississippi..... | 10.4 | Ohio..... | 41.7 |
| Arkansas..... | 12.0 | | |
| Louisiana..... | 20.4 | | |
| Oklahoma..... | 15.4 | | |

¹ Fourteenth Census Reports, Vol. IV, p. 50.

In this table we see that no Southern State (not counting Delaware and Maryland as Southern States), except Florida, has as many as 25 per cent of its gainfully employed working at manu-

facturing. The average is only about 17 or 18 per cent, which is from a third to a half as many as in the Northern industrial States. When it is remembered that in addition to manufacturing, commerce and its adjuncts also occupy proportionally a great many more people in the North, we can readily see that our measure of rurality rather understates than overstates the differences between the agricultural and the industrial-commercial States in this respect, at least, as regards the native population. Furthermore, the small cities in the South and the farming West are much more rural in outlook than those in the Northeast. They even look quite different and show clearly in their outward aspect that they are organized around a different set of interests. There can be little doubt that they radiate quite a different influence.

On the other hand, one only needs to wander through southern New England, New York, and New Jersey to be impressed with the omnipresence of cities and of nonagricultural industries and with the inevitableness with which rural people come in contact with city life at many points. The same is true in nearly all sections of the Pacific coast where practically every one is urbanized by the climate, good roads, and the specialty types of farming prevailing there. The "rancher" of California is not a real farmer. He generally belongs to the town as much as he does to the country and tends to develop urban attitudes of mind on most matters of vital concern. Urbanism is very nearly all-pervasive on the Pacific coast.

Urban influence is, of course, on the increase in all parts of the country, but it certainly is far less pervasive in the States where farming is the chief interest of the people than in those where farming is only incidental to industry and commerce. Unquestionably one of the important differences between urban and rural people and between rural people in different parts of the country is in the extent of the knowledge of conception control they possess. In the very nature of things people who live in cities and come into close contact with one another daily will learn of new things more rapidly than people who have few contacts with their fellows. Such being the case the less the influence of cities on the lives of people in general the slower would be the spread of contraception and the larger the number of children. It should be made clear in this connection, that we do not believe that the difference between rural and urban communities in the extent of their knowledge of contraceptive methods is the only reason for their differences in ratios of children but we do believe that it is an important reason.

Among the foreign born the ratio of children to women does not show the same close, clear relation to rurality that it does among the natives. Indeed, there are many cases that seem to deny any such relationship. Thus Ohio, having practically the same per cent of rural

population as Pennsylvania, is slightly over 20 per cent below it in ratio of children to foreign-born women, but it, in turn, exceeds its neighbor on the west by about the same amount, although having a considerably smaller proportion of its population rural. Again there are rather large differences in ratio of children between Iowa and Minnesota, the latter exceeding the former by about 13 per cent, but having a smaller per cent of rural population. Nevada is also a conspicuous exception, having a very high proportion of rural population but a very low ratio of children to foreign-born women. On the whole, then, inspection does not reveal any very close relation between rurality and ratio of children among the foreign born.

Why is it that in the matter of birth rate the rural foreign born seem to be less influenced by their rurality than the natives? For natives, rurality is conceded to be a strong retarding factor in the actual spread of birth control practices, whether because of the difficulty of getting the knowledge, or because of the desire for, or at least the indifference to, large families. But the measure of rurality is entirely inadequate for the foreign born. The rurality (rural mindedness) of the foreign born is a more subtle quality than can be measured by the per cent of them living in the rural districts. It is an all-pervasive attitude toward life and is a product of their past history rather than of their present circumstances and place of residence. In order to get a measure for the foreign born of equal significance with rurality for the natives we should probably have to introduce some measure for the type of community the foreign born lived in abroad, and the occupation followed. Another way of expressing this idea is to say that the smaller variability among the foreign born in ratio of children is in itself an expression of their greater essential homogeneity.

Before leaving this matter of the rurality of the natives and the foreign born, it may be well to emphasize again that any measure of rurality is in itself quite inadequate to tell the whole story for either natives or foreign born. Certain important points must always be taken into consideration. For example, there can be no doubt that rural people marry earlier and more generally than urban people. It is also true that rural people in some parts of the country marry earlier and more generally than in other parts, but no wholly satisfactory measure of these differences can be found. Consequently earlier marriage which is associated with rurality is not taken account of. Rurality, then, is not a simple factor, separable from others, standing for some precise condition. It needs to be split up into its elements. Unfortunately this can not be done very satisfactorily at present.

Still another possibility that should be mentioned is that of selective processes at work in sorting people into different rural communities.

Part of the influence we are attributing to rurality may be due to selective processes of westward migration by which the less prolific, hereditarily, are found in the rural districts of the older and now more highly urbanized States. It seems rather improbable, however, that the selection operating in westward migration can account for more than a very small part of the actual differences between rural communities. The more probable selective processes at work would seem to be those operating as between country and city, leaving the more prolific in the country. More will be said on this point in the following chapter.

PROPORTION OF WOMEN MARRIED

In the native rural population, as a whole, there appears to be a slight tendency for the ratio of children to increase as the proportion of married women increases. It is not a very marked tendency, but certainly the proportion of married women in the Northeastern States is appreciably lower than in Southern and Mountain States. The Middle Western States stand between these two groups in both ratios of children and percentages of married women. In fact only the States that are very much out of line are Nevada and the Pacific Coast States which have low ratios of children with high percentages of married women. Here as elsewhere the ratio of children on the west coast seems to demand a special explanation.

Among the foreign-born rural population it appears that the same tendency is present as among the natives. In the Northeast where the ratio of children is rather low the percentages of married women are also low; in the Middle West where the ratio of children is higher the percentage of married women is higher; and on the west coast the ratio of children is low while the percentage of married women is high. In most parts of the South the numbers of foreign born in rural communities are too small to make the results significant.

It is interesting to note in this connection that in rural communities, particularly among the natives, the percentage of women married is much higher than in urban communities. This, of course, results in a greater degree of likeness between the ratios of children to *all* women and to *married* women than we find in the cities. Since a greater proportion of women 20 to 44 who are married means, in general, earlier marriages it seems safe to assume that there are considerable differences between different parts of the country in the age at which rural women marry. This fact will help to account for some of the differences in ratios because the period under 30 is by far the most fecund part of a woman's life. There can be no doubt that the same conditions which retard the spread of knowledge of contraception make for early marriages and thus tend to keep the proportion of married women high. The fact that these two variables seem to

move together can probably be explained by the same underlying conditions. It would appear to be a perfectly natural condition that this should be so, for the raising of children being one of the chief purposes of marriage we would expect that the latter would be more general where children were more desired. Where conditions of life are such that but few children are wanted fewer marriages would take place. Of course, it may well happen that in the future marriage will be less closely associated with the raising of a family and then we may expect to find the relationship between these two factors less close and direct. Indeed just the reverse relation might come to be the usual one, namely, that where the knowledge of birth control is widespread there would be earlier and more numerous marriages.

SEX RATIO

In order to see whether there was any relation between ratio of children and masculinity in the population the former was compared with the number of males per 100 females in the rural population.² If we study the relations of these two factors in the native rural populations of the States we find no such constant relation as Mr. Brunner found. The lowest ratios of children are in the New England States and here are also found the fewest males, although there are more males than females in the rural population in all of the States. But the next lowest ratios of males are found in the Southern States where the ratios of children are highest. In the Middle States the ratio of males is quite high but the ratio of children is not nearly as high as in the Southern States. But the real surprise is again in the far West where the ratios of males are very high and the ratios of children very low, almost as low as in New England. Certainly Mr. Brunner's findings will not apply to our native rural population. It appears that other factors are far more important in determining the ratio of children in the rural population than the ratio of males. When urban and rural are compared it may well be that an excess of males makes for earlier marriage in the country and thus renders larger families probable but this is not the case as between States.

Among the foreign born there does not appear to be any closer relation between the ratios of children and of males than among the natives. The foreign-born women are always considerably in the minority and this may in part account for the large percentages of

² The making of this comparison was suggested in reading an article by C. T. Brunner, *Local Variations in the Birth Rate*, *Economic Journal*, March 1925, pp. 60-65. To quote: "It is here suggested that the age of marriage of women largely depends on the keenness of the competition for them. The underlying assumption made is that most women wish to get married. Where the number of men exceeds the number of women, it is expected that the competition among men for wives will be keen, and the average age of marriage for the women will tend to be low. Where, on the other hand, the number of women exceeds the number of men, the competition for wives will be less acute, and men will tend to postpone marriage.

"We thus arrive at a kind of law of supply and demand by which the average age of marriage of women is determined. Where the proportion of women to men is high, their average age of marriage is also high, and conversely, where the proportion of women to men is low, their average age of marriage is low."

them married (Table 31, column H). This is in line with Mr. Brunner's observations, but it seems likely that custom and tradition have more to do with their early marriage than the excess of males in the population seeking wives.

It is well to note that the ratio of males to females is largely determined by the occupations dominant in different localities, by the industrial character of the district, as Mr. Brunner says, or by the stage of development attained by a community so that the sex ratio in so far as it is a factor in the birth rate is only one link in a chain of causes which trace back to the nature of the industry and the stage of its development in different communities. It may be then, that farming and mining which particularly call for male labor tend to keep the birth rate high partly because of the fact that people following these occupations marry young. (We shall have more to say regarding mining and the ratio of children in Chapter VII.) In any event, sex ratio is apparently only a secondary factor and arises out of other conditions more basic in their effects on the birth rate.

RURAL POPULATION ON FARMS

Table 33 shows that the ratio of children for the total farm population is considerably higher than for the village population. It seems likely then that if a larger proportion of the native white rural population lived on farms, the ratio of children might be higher. When columns C and I in Table 31 are compared there appears to be some relation between the ratio of children and the per cent of native rural whites on farms. The highest ratios and the highest per cents are found in the Southern States; the next highest are found in the Middle Western States; and the lowest in the Northeast and the far West. This seems to indicate that living on farms which, of course, represents the greatest degree of rurality, is conducive to the raising of larger families than living in any other type of community. If the reasons given above for the relation between greater rurality and higher ratios of children are sound then we would expect that the farm population proper would have the highest ratio of children. This is quite clearly the case at the present time.

This relation between ratio of children and per cent of rural population on farms holds for the native population only. Among the foreign born there seems to be no appreciable connection between these two series of facts. Some of the States with very high ratios of children (for example Pennsylvania and West Virginia) have low percentages of the foreign born on farms while others with rather low ratios of children have large percentages of their rural foreign born on farms. Thus once again we find that rurality, as we have measured it, does not appear to be as important a factor in determining the ratio of children to foreign-born women as to native women.

TABLE 33.—WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE; CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE; AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER 1,000 WOMEN IN THE FARM, VILLAGE, AND URBAN POPULATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, BY DIVISIONS AND STATES: 1920¹

| DIVISION AND STATE | WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE | | | CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE | | | CHILDREN UNDER 5 PER 1,000 WOMEN 20 TO 44 YEARS OF AGE | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|---------|-------|
| | Farm | Village | Urban | Farm | Village | Urban | Farm | Village | Urban |
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
| UNITED STATES ² | 4,969,744 | 3,524,274 | 1,505,560 | 4,003,330 | 2,317,445 | 5,252,455 | 806 | 658 | 457 |
| NEW ENGLAND..... | 91,964 | 177,327 | 1,188,614 | 57,325 | 104,652 | 591,053 | 623 | 590 | 497 |
| Maine..... | 26,363 | 48,267 | 58,319 | 18,641 | 29,723 | 26,776 | 657 | 616 | 459 |
| New Hampshire..... | 10,930 | 16,455 | 53,121 | 6,061 | 9,359 | 25,971 | 555 | 569 | 489 |
| Vermont..... | 18,619 | 19,903 | 21,768 | 12,353 | 11,907 | 10,284 | 663 | 598 | 472 |
| Massachusetts..... | 17,685 | 24,131 | 747,083 | 10,366 | 13,157 | 362,238 | 586 | 545 | 485 |
| Rhode Island..... | 2,193 | 1,767 | 117,395 | 1,233 | 898 | 60,225 | 562 | 508 | 513 |
| Connecticut..... | 14,174 | 66,804 | 190,928 | 8,671 | 39,608 | 105,559 | 612 | 593 | 553 |
| MIDDLE ATLANTIC..... | 289,395 | 643,727 | 3,504,029 | 184,734 | 446,783 | 1,722,934 | 638 | 694 | 492 |
| New York..... | 124,924 | 180,552 | 1,867,684 | 71,065 | 94,025 | 844,280 | 578 | 621 | 452 |
| New Jersey..... | 22,495 | 100,723 | 509,395 | 13,311 | 57,790 | 267,595 | 662 | 574 | 525 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 141,976 | 362,452 | 1,126,950 | 98,438 | 294,968 | 611,059 | 700 | 814 | 542 |
| EAST NORTH CENTRAL..... | 784,794 | 565,934 | 2,725,584 | 547,335 | 374,421 | 1,298,276 | 697 | 628 | 476 |
| Ohio..... | 181,101 | 158,580 | 768,524 | 119,584 | 104,194 | 362,358 | 660 | 657 | 471 |
| Indiana..... | 148,633 | 92,295 | 303,169 | 96,356 | 54,322 | 138,517 | 648 | 589 | 457 |
| Illinois..... | 185,899 | 167,620 | 943,034 | 124,485 | 100,351 | 430,237 | 670 | 599 | 456 |
| Michigan..... | 126,425 | 96,280 | 457,757 | 95,628 | 65,351 | 243,607 | 756 | 679 | 532 |
| Wisconsin..... | 142,686 | 81,159 | 253,080 | 111,282 | 50,203 | 123,567 | 780 | 619 | 488 |
| WEST NORTH CENTRAL..... | 837,192 | 466,236 | 1,019,604 | 653,295 | 273,146 | 1,124,971 | 780 | 586 | 407 |
| Minnesota..... | 136,492 | 76,944 | 228,036 | 110,511 | 48,466 | 102,418 | 810 | 630 | 449 |
| Iowa..... | 169,357 | 95,544 | 180,509 | 123,909 | 50,914 | 76,064 | 732 | 533 | 421 |
| Missouri..... | 192,727 | 105,716 | 357,477 | 140,476 | 63,373 | 124,060 | 739 | 599 | 347 |
| North Dakota..... | 59,032 | 29,736 | 19,134 | 59,886 | 21,410 | 9,593 | 1,014 | 720 | 501 |
| South Dakota..... | 58,976 | 31,330 | 21,499 | 51,066 | 18,780 | 9,985 | 866 | 599 | 464 |
| Nebraska..... | 98,213 | 55,278 | 85,258 | 77,488 | 29,363 | 36,389 | 789 | 531 | 427 |
| Kansas..... | 122,395 | 71,668 | 127,691 | 89,959 | 40,841 | 56,462 | 735 | 570 | 442 |
| SOUTH ATLANTIC..... | 981,159 | 587,242 | 860,639 | 893,794 | 428,072 | 377,067 | 911 | 729 | 438 |
| Delaware..... | 8,170 | 9,231 | 24,614 | 5,640 | 4,788 | 12,501 | 690 | 519 | 506 |
| Maryland..... | 42,675 | 52,550 | 185,919 | 31,697 | 33,033 | 82,275 | 743 | 629 | 443 |
| Virginia..... | 159,518 | 101,426 | 180,988 | 137,487 | 76,301 | 63,396 | 862 | 752 | 420 |
| West Virginia..... | 67,470 | 104,528 | 76,263 | 60,697 | 96,242 | 38,995 | 900 | 921 | 511 |
| North Carolina..... | 226,678 | 104,435 | 106,969 | 223,722 | 81,367 | 53,719 | 987 | 779 | 502 |
| South Carolina..... | 170,144 | 60,643 | 66,679 | 158,593 | 40,791 | 29,197 | 932 | 673 | 458 |
| Georgia..... | 263,974 | 92,688 | 169,954 | 240,876 | 57,447 | 64,906 | 912 | 620 | 382 |
| Florida..... | 42,530 | 61,741 | 79,253 | 35,062 | 38,103 | 32,078 | 825 | 617 | 405 |
| EAST SOUTH CENTRAL..... | 820,989 | 319,650 | 449,128 | 695,324 | 217,457 | 175,353 | 847 | 680 | 390 |
| Kentucky..... | 200,981 | 85,152 | 137,986 | 175,258 | 63,601 | 52,766 | 872 | 747 | 382 |
| Tennessee..... | 200,905 | 83,690 | 140,671 | 169,095 | 58,342 | 53,302 | 842 | 697 | 379 |
| Alabama..... | 207,963 | 95,093 | 115,781 | 187,340 | 63,668 | 48,514 | 901 | 670 | 419 |
| Mississippi..... | 211,140 | 55,715 | 54,690 | 163,531 | 31,846 | 20,771 | 775 | 572 | 380 |
| WEST SOUTH CENTRAL..... | 822,740 | 378,132 | 652,227 | 703,568 | 244,302 | 268,639 | 855 | 646 | 412 |
| Arkansas..... | 181,995 | 59,357 | 64,072 | 156,322 | 38,077 | 26,412 | 859 | 641 | 412 |
| Louisiana..... | 124,460 | 73,287 | 139,788 | 107,204 | 47,396 | 54,613 | 861 | 647 | 391 |
| Oklahoma..... | 152,150 | 83,787 | 116,109 | 141,839 | 59,046 | 51,693 | 932 | 705 | 445 |
| Texas..... | 364,135 | 161,701 | 332,258 | 298,203 | 99,783 | 135,921 | 819 | 617 | 409 |
| MOUNTAIN..... | 181,640 | 167,096 | 247,419 | 161,774 | 120,294 | 114,746 | 891 | 720 | 464 |
| Montana..... | 36,520 | 27,553 | 36,546 | 31,885 | 18,629 | 16,858 | 873 | 676 | 461 |
| Idaho..... | 30,898 | 19,856 | 22,790 | 28,307 | 14,109 | 12,120 | 916 | 711 | 532 |
| Wyoming..... | 11,013 | 12,752 | 11,928 | 8,813 | 8,082 | 5,629 | 800 | 634 | 472 |
| Colorado..... | 42,409 | 37,947 | 94,819 | 35,357 | 26,041 | 35,060 | 834 | 686 | 376 |
| New Mexico..... | 24,299 | 22,990 | 13,137 | 21,925 | 17,846 | 6,628 | 902 | 776 | 505 |
| Arizona..... | 14,034 | 21,657 | 24,829 | 12,610 | 15,678 | 12,519 | 899 | 724 | 504 |
| Utah..... | 20,119 | 16,518 | 40,168 | 21,133 | 15,982 | 24,280 | 1,050 | 968 | 604 |
| Nevada..... | 2,348 | 7,823 | 3,202 | 1,744 | 3,927 | 1,072 | 742 | 502 | 335 |
| PACIFIC..... | 159,762 | 188,930 | 741,807 | 106,141 | 108,318 | 259,020 | 664 | 573 | 349 |
| Washington..... | 43,362 | 55,092 | 158,334 | 30,412 | 34,635 | 61,387 | 701 | 629 | 398 |
| Oregon..... | 33,643 | 30,686 | 83,896 | 22,421 | 18,368 | 30,529 | 666 | 599 | 364 |
| California..... | 82,757 | 103,152 | 499,577 | 53,308 | 55,315 | 167,104 | 644 | 536 | 334 |

¹Truesdell, Leon E., Farm Population of the United States, 1920, Census Monograph VI, pp. 186-215.
²District of Columbia included. Not shown separately.

FARM TENANCY

It has been quite widely assumed that farm tenants have more children than farm owners. In order to see if we could get any light on this matter we used the per cent of farmers, both native and foreign born, who were tenants as one of the variables in our problem. If we examine the data in Table 31, columns C and K we see that in the Northeast and the far West where the ratios of children are lowest the percentages of tenancy are low. In the South where the ratios of children are highest the percentages of tenancy are quite high, but not as high as in the Middle West where the ratios of children are only moderately high. This applies to the white population only. Thus though there appears to be some relation between these two factors in the native population, it seems quite doubtful whether much emphasis should be placed upon it.

Here again, as so often, when the foreign born are considered there does not appear to be any appreciable connection between the particular social condition examined and the ratio of children. This is readily understandable if our assumption of the essential rurality of practically all the foreign born is sound.

VILLAGE POPULATION

By way of summary it may be interesting to examine Table 33 a little more carefully. In comparing the States with regard to ratios of children in the farm and village populations, we find much the same differences in the ratios of children as in the native white rural population in Table 31. The highest ratios of children in the farm population are found in Utah and North Dakota, although when the States are considered by groups the Southern States stand at the top. The Southern States are followed rather closely by the Mountain States and these by the Middle West while the Northeast and the far West have the lowest ratios. Practically the same order prevails in the village population; and in all but three States—New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—the ratio of children is considerably lower here than on the farms. Indeed, the ratio of children on the farms of the United States averages almost one-fourth greater than in the villages. This is a significant fact and is just exactly what we would expect if it is the degree of rurality that is the chief determinant of the ratio of children at the present time. Certainly no one can seriously doubt that the ratios of children in the rural population would be distributed about as they actually are between the States and between the villages and the farm population if one were to do this on the basis of the degree of urban influence present in different sections of the country and in different classes of the population.

As has been contended elsewhere it seems that one of the chief factors in determining the outlook on life of the rural population is that it is isolated from many of the influences of the city making for a low birth rate and that it does not have as much contraceptive information as the city population. But, obviously, there are considerable differences between rural communities in this respect. Utah with a ratio of 1,050 children on the farms has almost twice the ratio of New Hampshire with 555, and the Pacific States with 664 are far behind the South Atlantic States with 911. There is certainly no evidence that such differences are due to any inherent differences, in the fecundity of these populations. They must be accounted for on the basis of the differences in the social conditions surrounding the rural people in these different localities. The chief differences, we find, are in the extent to which the rural community remains isolated and in the factors which make the raising of children less arduous in the country than in the city. We shall go into this matter in more detail in the following chapter.