

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In 1950, there were 5.7 million rural-farm occupied dwelling units in the United States. This is a decrease of nearly 20 percent since 1940. The decrease is due, in part, to a change in the definition of a farm and to a change in the rural-urban classification. These conceptual changes only increase the magnitude of the indicated decline. The actual decline is reflected in the inventory of occupied farm dwelling units in two ways: (1) Migration from farms resulting in vacant units, and (2) changes in the use of farm units from farm to nonfarm.

Table C.--DECREASE IN DWELLING UNITS, 1940 to 1950, BY TENURE AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Data based on complete enumeration; data in remaining tables based on sample)

Tenure and color	1950	1940	Percent decrease
All occupied units..	5,721,022	7,106,559	-19.5
Owner.....	3,758,320	3,782,727	- 0.6
White.....	3,539,026	3,551,037	- 0.3
Nonwhite.....	219,294	231,690	- 5.4
Renter and rent-free....	1,962,702	3,323,832	-41.0
White.....	1,521,979	2,550,922	-40.3
Nonwhite.....	440,723	772,910	-43.0

Over three-fifths of the occupied farm dwelling units were occupied by owners, one-fifth by renters, and the remaining one-fifth were occupied rent-free or in exchange for goods or services.<sup>1</sup> Although the number of owners remained nearly constant at the two census dates, the number of renter and rent-free units has decreased over 40 percent. During this period, owners also left the farm, but a general shift in tenure from renters to owners tended to counterbalance the losses in the owner group.

The decrease in the number of nonwhite households since 1940 was twice as great proportionately as among the white households. The decrease in farm units occupied by white households occurred

<sup>1</sup> As indicated in the definition of farm renter-occupied and rent-free units (page XVI), the classification "renter," which should have included only those units for which cash rent was paid, actually included units for which the rent represented a share of the crop or livestock produced on the farm. The "renter" and "rent-free" groups are shown separately in this volume. In other Housing volumes, the classification "renter" includes both cash-rent and rent-free units.

only in the combined classification of renter and rent-free units. Among the units occupied by nonwhite households, the decrease was significant among owners as well as among renter and rent-free units. Even though there was a substantial decrease in the number of nonwhite households on farms, the proportion of farm units occupied by nonwhite households was still greater than the proportion of nonfarm units so occupied (12 percent and 8 percent, respectively).

Nearly three-fourths of the white farm households lived in owner-occupied units. The nonwhite households were much more evenly divided among the three tenure groups, with slightly more of the units in the rent-free group than in either of the other tenure groups. White households outnumbered nonwhite households by eight to one. By tenure, almost all of the owner units were occupied by white households although only two-thirds of the rent-free units were occupied by white households.<sup>2</sup>

Table D.--TENURE AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Tenure and color	Number	Percent
All occupied units.....	5,659,600	100.0
Owner.....	3,701,900	65.4
White.....	3,482,400	61.5
Nonwhite.....	219,500	3.9
Renter.....	1,083,800	19.1
White.....	914,000	16.2
Nonwhite.....	169,700	3.0
Rent-free.....	873,900	15.4
White.....	599,300	10.6
Nonwhite.....	274,600	4.9

### INVENTORY

Farm and nonfarm distribution.--The total number of dwelling units enumerated in the 1950 Census of Housing was 45,983,400, of which 29,569,100 were urban and 16,414,300 were rural units. The rural dwelling units consisted of 10,056,400 nonfarm units

<sup>2</sup> In tables D to M, total figures may include dwelling units for which a particular item was not reported. Absolute figures were rounded independently. Percentages were based on total reporting; no adjustment was made to force the distribution to add to 100 percent.

and 6,357,900 farm units; of the farm units, 5,721,000 were occupied. This report is based on a sample of occupied farm housing. The difference between the total shown in this volume of 5,659,600 and the complete count of 5,721,000 is due to sampling variability and to processing errors. (See section on "Reliability of data," p. XX.)

Regional distribution.--Half the rural-farm dwelling units were located in the South and a little over three-tenths in the North Central Region. Each of the other two regions accounted for approximately one-tenth of the rural-farm units.

This regional distribution is an important factor to be considered when analyzing the characteristics of rural-farm housing of the United States. Since farm housing in the South represents such a large part of the total, the characteristics for the United States reflect the situation in the South more so than in any other region.

Relation of number of farm dwelling units to number of farms.--The number of occupied farm dwelling units in this volume is greater than the number of farms shown in the 1950 Census of Agriculture. The ratio of 1.05 occupied dwelling units for each farm results from the presence on many farms of extra houses for hired workers or tenants. This ratio expresses a net rather than a gross difference. There were farms included in the Census of Agriculture on which there were no dwelling units. There were more owner farms than there were owner-occupied dwelling units and fewer tenant farms than renter and rent-free dwelling units. The extra owner farms may be accounted for by farms on which there are no dwelling units. The number of tenant farms would be expected to be less than the number of dwelling units occupied by renters or rent-free since nearly all the extra houses on farms were of these two tenure classes.

Statistics in the Census of Agriculture show that the number of farms for which cash rent was paid is less than half as large as the number of renter-occupied units shown in this volume, and that the number of farms for which no cash rent was paid is over one-sixth larger than the number of units shown in this volume as rent-free. Examination of the Census of Agriculture reports for the United States and selected economic subregions indicates that when share-tenant farms are included with the farms for which cash rent was paid, the sum of these two more nearly approximates the number of renter-occupied units in this report. The remaining number of tenant farms is considerably less than the number of dwelling units occupied rent-free. This is a normal relationship since the extra houses on farms are generally occupied rent-free.

#### SIZE OF FARM HOUSE IN RELATION TO OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

The owner-occupied rural-farm house, as measured by number of rooms, was larger than either renter or rent-free farm houses. The median number of rooms for owner-occupied units was 5.6, whereas the medians for renter and rent-free units were 4.8 and 4.0 rooms, respectively.

Units occupied by nonwhite households were considerably smaller than the farm units occupied

by white households. The medians for nonwhite households were 4.4 rooms for owner-occupied, 3.7 rooms for renter-occupied, and 3.6 rooms for units occupied rent-free.

Year built.--Of the occupied farm dwelling units standing in 1950, a little more than half had been built over 30 years ago. The larger units, those having five rooms or more, were generally older than the units with less than five rooms. The proportions of farm dwelling units built in 1919 or earlier were highly correlated with the number of rooms; the units with seven rooms or more had the largest proportion, the 5- and 6-room units next, and so on down to the 1- and 2-room units. Proportions of farm units reported as built in the decade 1940 to 1950 were in reverse order, with 31 percent of the 1- and 2-room units and only 5 percent of the units with seven rooms or more built in that period.

The direct correlation between number of rooms and age of farm dwelling units may be attributed to several factors. More than half of the units built since 1944 had less than five rooms; of the older homes still in the inventory, most of them had five rooms or more. Furthermore, the 1- and 2-room units may disappear from the inventory more rapidly than do the larger units. In some instances the 1- and 2-room units are built as a temporary means of shelter, particularly in the warmer sections of the country, and are converted later to larger units or to nonhousing uses or are demolished due to obsolescence.

The distributions by year built and number of rooms of owner-occupied units are like the distributions of renter and rent-free units in that the bulk of the large units were 20 years old or over. However, there are differences in the magnitude of these proportions. Since it is less likely that a new unit will be built for tenant occupancy, there were relatively more old houses in the renter groups than in the owner groups. Ninety-four percent of the renter and rent-free units with seven rooms or more were at least 20 years old, while 86 percent of the owner units were that old. Of those with five or six rooms, 79 percent of the renter-occupied and rent-free units and 65 percent of the owner-occupied units were built in 1929 or earlier. About the same magnitude of differences exist between the smaller owner and the smaller renter and rent-free units.

Farm dwelling units occupied by nonwhite households in 1950 generally had fewer rooms and were not as old as units occupied by white households. Two-thirds of the nonwhite-occupied farm units had no more than four rooms. Less than two-fifths of the units were built before 1920. The small units, those with one and two rooms, are relatively short-lived particularly in the South and therefore, the proportion of new units was large. Sixty-nine percent of the 1- and 2-room units and 63 percent of the 3- and 4-room units were built before 1920.

Fifty-six percent of the dwelling units built for nonwhite occupancy since 1939 were owner-occupied. The new owner-occupied units represented nearly one-third of all nonwhite owner-occupied dwelling units. In contrast, among the nonwhite renter and rent-free units a little over one-tenth were built between 1940 and 1950. A number of factors have

## FARM HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

contributed to the relatively large proportions of new nonwhite owner-occupied units. An important factor was the increase in farm income which made it possible for nonwhite owners to build new dwelling units or to move to better farms already equipped with newer dwelling units. In many areas, the availability of off-farm employment also contributed to the family income and the ability to provide better housing. Some stimulus to new farm housing has resulted from various aid programs designed to encourage farm ownership.

The impact of the larger and newer houses is especially evident among the nonwhite owner-occupied

units. Nearly half of the owner units had five rooms or more while less than one-fourth of the renter and rent-free units were that large. Since 1944, proportionately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as many small units and 4 times as many large units were built for the nonwhite owner group as for the other tenure groups. Units built before 1920 and with less than five rooms represented only 29 percent of all nonwhite owner units of that size as compared with 38 percent for the nonwhite renter and rent-free units. Among the large units occupied by nonwhite households, one-third of the owner units and more than half of the renter and rent-free units were built in 1919 or earlier.

Table E.--ROOMS AND YEAR BUILT, BY TENURE, FOR ALL OCCUPIED AND NONWHITE-OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Year built and tenure	All occupied units					Nonwhite-occupied units				
	Total	1 and 2 rooms	3 and 4 rooms	5 and 6 rooms	7 rooms or more	Total	1 and 2 rooms	3 and 4 rooms	5 and 6 rooms	7 rooms or more
<b>TOTAL</b>										
Total dwelling units.	5,659,600	301,700	1,721,400	2,059,500	1,458,000	663,800	83,100	365,600	167,500	31,100
Percent Distribution										
Total reporting.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1945 or later.....	10	23	13	10	3	11	14	10	12	11
1940 to 1944.....	5	8	7	6	2	6	6	6	7	6
1930 to 1939.....	15	23	20	15	7	21	24	22	19	14
1920 to 1929.....	16	18	20	16	11	24	24	26	20	17
1919 or earlier.....	54	29	40	53	77	38	31	37	41	52
<b>OWNER</b>										
Total dwelling units.	3,701,900	125,000	896,300	1,492,800	1,113,500	219,500	19,900	89,900	83,500	19,600
Percent Distribution										
Total reporting.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1945 or later.....	12	32	17	12	4	19	28	17	20	16
1940 to 1944.....	6	9	9	7	2	10	10	11	11	7
1930 to 1939.....	14	20	19	16	7	21	23	22	21	17
1920 to 1929.....	15	13	17	16	12	19	16	20	18	18
1919 or earlier.....	53	25	38	49	74	31	23	30	30	42
<b>RENTER AND RENT-FREE</b>										
Total dwelling units.	1,957,700	176,700	825,100	566,600	344,500	444,400	63,200	275,700	84,000	11,500
Percent Distribution										
Total reporting.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1945 or later.....	7	17	9	5	1	7	10	7	5	4
1940 to 1944.....	4	7	5	3	1	4	5	4	3	3
1930 to 1939.....	15	25	20	12	4	21	25	22	17	8
1920 to 1929.....	19	21	23	17	9	26	27	28	23	16
1919 or earlier.....	54	31	42	62	85	42	33	39	52	70

Condition and plumbing facilities.--More than four out of five of the occupied farm dwelling units were not dilapidated, but only a quarter of the units had all plumbing facilities, i. e., hot and cold running water, private flush toilet and bath. Half of the not dilapidated farm units and substantially all of the dilapidated units had no plumbing facilities.

Nearly all of the larger and three-fourths of the smaller owner-occupied units were not dilapidated. Similarly, among the renter-occupied and rent-free groups relatively more of the large dwelling units were not dilapidated than of the small units. Relative to nonfarm housing, a considerably smaller proportion of units in all the tenure groups were equipped

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

with all plumbing facilities; also, a very substantial proportion of the units had no plumbing facilities.

With respect to plumbing facilities, the large dwelling units occupied rent-free were proportionately of somewhat better quality than the large renter-occupied units. The rent-free units generally com-

prised not only the relatively poor housing associated with sharecropping and housing for farm laborers, but also the extra units on farms that were occupied by relatives of the farm operator, such as retired parents. Units in the latter group were usually in good condition and thus tended to raise the average quality of all rent-free units.

Table F.--CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES AND KITCHEN SINK, BY TENURE AND ROOMS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Condition and plumbing facilities and kitchen sink	Total occupied dwelling units	Percent distribution										
		Total	Owner			Renter			Rent-free			Non-white-occupied units
			Total	1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more	Total	1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more	Total	1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more	
Total.....	5,659,600	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<b>CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES<sup>1</sup></b>												
Total reporting.....	5,502,800	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Not dilapidated.....	4,540,900	83	88	76	92	76	62	87	69	61	82	54
All facilities.....	1,318,800	24	29	12	36	14	7	21	13	6	24	2
Some facilities.....	983,500	18	20	15	22	16	11	20	13	10	18	4
No facilities.....	2,238,500	41	39	50	34	46	45	46	43	45	40	48
Dilapidated.....	962,000	17	12	24	8	24	38	13	31	39	18	46
All or some facilities	122,400	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2
No facilities.....	839,600	15	10	22	6	22	35	11	28	37	16	45
<b>KITCHEN SINK<sup>2</sup></b>												
Total reporting condition and plumbing	5,502,800	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
With running water.....	2,424,700	44	51	29	60	32	20	43	29	18	45	7
No running water.....	3,078,100	56	49	71	40	68	80	57	71	82	55	93
With kitchen sink.....	750,500	14	14	12	15	16	8	22	9	6	14	3
No kitchen sink or not reporting sink.....	2,327,600	42	35	59	25	52	72	35	62	76	41	90

<sup>1</sup> Units with all plumbing facilities have all of the following facilities inside the structure: private flush toilet, private bath, and hot and cold running water. Units with no facilities have no private flush toilet, no private bath, and no running water inside the structure.

<sup>2</sup> Tabulation restricted to units with no running water inside structure.

Substantially all (98 percent) of the farm dwelling units occupied by nonwhite households were either dilapidated or lacked some plumbing facilities. About half the units occupied by nonwhite households were not dilapidated as compared with four out of five units occupied by white households. There was some increase between 1940 and 1950 in the percent of nonwhite-occupied units having plumbing facilities; for example, 2 percent of the nonwhite units on rural farms in 1940 had running water in the dwelling unit whereas 7 percent of the units had running water in 1950.

**Kitchen sink.**--While large proportions of occupied farm dwelling units had no running water, some of these units did have a hand pump in the kitchen. Units with such arrangements for providing water normally also have a kitchen sink.

Only one-fourth of the farm units without running water inside the structure had a kitchen sink. In all the tenure groups, greater proportions of the larger units had a kitchen sink but no running water. The renter group with 5 rooms or more had the largest proportion of such units; the rent-free 1- to 4-room units had the smallest proportion.

Units occupied by nonwhite households were less likely to have a kitchen sink than were those occupied by white households. Ninety-three percent had no running water and only about 3 percent had a kitchen sink.

**Cooking fuel.**--Wood continued to be the principal fuel used for cooking. For both owners and renters, it accounted for over 35 percent of all fuels while over half the units occupied rent-free used wood. There

## FARM HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

was considerable difference in use between the several sizes of houses. The smaller homes reported wood much more frequently than the larger homes.

Bottled gas was second in importance among the cooking fuels. The larger homes, particularly those that were renter or rent-free, had installed this fuel system more frequently than the smaller homes.

The use of electricity as the principal fuel in the farm house has expanded considerably during the last decade. Although only 15 percent of all farm units were using electricity for cooking, two-thirds of those using it were owner-occupied units having five rooms or more. In the large owner-occupied units, electricity ranked second in importance. Due to the relative

importance of bottled gas in renter and rent-free units, electricity ranked third for all farm dwelling units.

**Heating fuel.**--Central heating was used by less than 20 percent of all farm units. The importance of the various fuels used for heating differs between units with central and those with noncentral heating systems. In units with noncentral heating, wood was the principal fuel and coal was second in importance for all types of tenure and for both large and small units. For units with central heating, coal was the principal fuel used.

When all units are combined without regard to the method of heating, over half of all the small units used wood; while in all the larger units, except those occupied rent-free, coal was the principal fuel. Liquid fuel, including fuel oil and kerosene, was third in importance in both large and small dwelling units.

Table G.--TYPE OF COOKING AND HEATING FUEL, BY TENURE AND ROOMS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Cooking and heating fuel	Total occupied dwelling units	Percent distribution						
		Total	Owner		Renter		Rent-free	
			1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more	1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more	1 to 4 rooms	5 rooms or more
<b>COOKING FUEL</b>								
Total.....	5,659,600	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Coal.....	691,300	12	13	14	9	14	7	11
Wood.....	2,172,600	38	47	30	55	28	60	39
Bottled gas.....	1,008,300	18	14	20	11	27	9	20
Electricity.....	871,400	15	10	22	5	15	4	14
Other, none, or not reported..	915,800	16	16	14	20	16	19	15
<b>HEATING FUEL</b>								
Total reporting heating equipment.....	5,452,800	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Central heating.....	995,800	18	7	28	5	20	3	17
Coal.....	590,600	11	3	16	2	13	1	10
Wood.....	116,700	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
Liquid fuel.....	164,700	3	1	5	1	3	1	3
Other or not reported.....	123,800	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
Noncentral heating.....	4,457,000	82	93	72	95	80	97	83
Coal.....	1,086,300	20	22	21	17	22	15	19
Wood.....	2,099,500	39	49	28	58	28	63	40
Liquid fuel.....	682,800	13	11	12	11	21	10	14
Other or not reported.....	588,500	11	12	11	9	10	9	10

**Persons per room.**--The number of persons per room is an indicator of occupancy density or crowding. Rural-farm units in 1950 tended to have more persons per room than rural-nonfarm dwelling units.

Using as a measure of crowding the presence of more than one person per room, only 16 percent of the owner-occupied farm units could be considered as crowded. Nearly 7 out of 10 owner units with less than five rooms and about 9 out of 10 with five rooms or more were not crowded. In the larger renter and

rent-free units, the percentages having more than one person per room were considerably larger than for owner-occupied units with the same number of rooms. Likewise, there was more crowding in the smaller renter or rent-free units than in owner units.

Units occupied by nonwhite households showed a greater tendency toward crowding. About half their units were crowded; and, as among the units occupied by white households, crowding was more common in units having one to four rooms.

Table H.--PERSONS PER ROOM, BY TENURE AND ROOMS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Tenure and rooms	Percent of units reporting--	
	1.00 or less persons per room	1.01 or more persons per room
<b>ALL OCCUPIED UNITS</b>		
Owner.....	84	16
1 to 4 rooms.....	66	34
5 rooms or more.....	91	9
Renter.....	71	29
1 to 4 rooms.....	52	48
5 rooms or more.....	86	14
Rent-free.....	62	38
1 to 4 rooms.....	51	49
5 rooms or more.....	78	22
<b>NONWHITE-OCCUPIED UNITS</b>		
Total.....	51	49
1 to 4 rooms.....	47	53
5 rooms or more.....	60	40

**Age of head of household.**--The age composition of various types of households differed significantly. For the largest group of farm households (82 percent), those consisting of a male head with wife present and without nonrelatives (lodgers), the median age of head was 46 years. In other households with a male head, the median age of the head was 54 years. In households with a female head, very few were under 45 years of age; the median age was 60 years.

The older the head of the household, the greater the likelihood that he was an owner. About half the heads of farm households who were under 45 years of age were owners. Of those heads 65 years and over, four out of five were owners.

In common with the age distribution for heads of households in all occupied units, the units occupied by older heads of nonwhite households had larger proportions living in owner-occupied units than did the younger heads. In other ways, the nonwhite-occupied units bear little resemblance to the distributions for white-occupied units. Nearly half the units in which the head of the nonwhite household was under 45 were in the rent-free group. In most of the nonwhite groups, the proportions of units having five rooms or more were much smaller when compared with similar proportions for all occupied dwelling units.

Table J.--AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, BY TENURE AND ROOMS, FOR ALL OCCUPIED AND NONWHITE-OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Tenure and rooms	Age of head of household			Tenure and rooms	Age of head of household		
	Under 45 years	45 to 64 years	65 and over		Under 45 years	45 to 64 years	65 and over
<b>ALL OCCUPIED UNITS</b>				<b>NONWHITE-OCCUPIED UNITS</b>			
Total.....	2,469,700	2,282,200	907,700	Total.....	307,100	247,200	109,500
<b>Percent Distribution</b>				<b>Percent Distribution</b>			
Total reporting....	100	100	100	Total reporting....	100	100	100
Owner.....	51	75	81	Owner.....	22	39	51
1 to 4 rooms.....	17	19	22	1 to 4 rooms.....	12	18	27
5 rooms or more.....	34	56	59	5 rooms or more.....	9	21	24
Renter.....	27	14	10	Renter.....	29	24	19
1 to 4 rooms.....	12	6	5	1 to 4 rooms.....	23	17	15
5 rooms or more.....	15	8	4	5 rooms or more.....	6	7	4
Rent-free.....	22	11	10	Rent-free.....	49	37	30
1 to 4 rooms.....	13	7	6	1 to 4 rooms.....	40	28	25
5 rooms or more.....	8	5	3	5 rooms or more.....	9	9	5

**CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES IN RELATION TO OTHER CHARACTERISTICS**

The combination of structural condition of a dwelling unit and plumbing facilities provides a measure of the quality of housing. Rural-farm dwelling units in 1950 were very largely in the not dilapidated group, but many of the units in this group lacked some plumbing facility such as hot running water, a private flush toilet, or bath; a substantial number had no piped

running water in the structure and, therefore, no plumbing facilities.

Dilapidation was more significant among farm dwelling units (17 percent) than among rural-nonfarm dwelling units (13 percent). Within the tenure groups, a relatively small proportion of the owner-occupied units were dilapidated. The proportion of renter and rent-free units that were dilapidated was 2 and 2½ times as great, respectively, as among the owners.

FARM HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

The housing occupied by nonwhite households was of much poorer quality (46 percent dilapidated) than housing occupied by white households.

There was little variation by tenure and color in the proportions of units that were not dilapidated and without running water (no plumbing facilities); 39 percent of the owner-occupied dwelling units, 44 percent of the combined renter and rent-free units, and 48 percent of the nonwhite households were in this category.

Since 1940, piped water has been installed in many farm homes. In 1940 (although the definition of piped running water differed slightly) approximately 75 percent of all owner-occupied units and about 90 percent of all renter-occupied units had no running water in the dwelling unit.

Year built.--The condition and plumbing facilities of the units built in 1940 or later reflected better quality housing than the over-all averages. Ninety percent of these new units were not dilapidated, as compared with 83 percent for all farm units. However, newer units did not have a materially greater proportion with all plumbing facilities than did the older units.

A larger proportion of the new units were in the category "Not dilapidated--no facilities" than was the case for units built prior to 1940 and still in the inventory. Forty-five percent of the new units were

not dilapidated and had no running water. It would appear that despite the prevalence of electricity in the farm house, as indicated by the relatively large percentages of units that have electric lights, the traditional use of a hand pump or some means of bringing water to the house, other than by pipes, still prevails in many of the newer houses. As indicated by the tabulations of year built by number of rooms, new farm houses are not necessarily modernized homes with all plumbing facilities; many are only small units with no plumbing facilities. Most of the new units classified as "Dilapidated" represent an inadequate level of construction rather than a deteriorated condition.

Patterns of sociological and economic conditions as reflected in farm housing have not become identical with urban patterns despite the rapid technological improvements that have been made in farming methods. The relatively small proportion of both old and new farm dwelling units that have all plumbing facilities, commonly associated with nonfarm housing, support the contention that the quality of farm and nonfarm housing should not be rigidly compared. Farm houses without running water or without flush toilet or bath are part of a generally accepted social pattern in many parts of the country. Even though farm income rose during the forties, the individual farmer usually had to make a choice as to how such additional income would be spent. Many factors, such as the shortage of farm labor, tended to make the farmer place more emphasis on technological improvements in farming methods than on improvements in his housing.

Table K.--YEAR BUILT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, AND HEATING EQUIPMENT, BY CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES, FOR ALL OCCUPIED AND NONWHITE-OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Condition and plumbing facilities <sup>1</sup>	All occupied units						Nonwhite-occupied units			
	Total	Built in 1940 or later		Percent with--			Total	Percent with--		
		Number	Percent of total	Electric lights	Heating equipment			Electric lights	Heating equipment	
					Central	Non-central, with flue			Central	Non-central, with flue
Total.....	5,659,600	853,500	15	80	18	69	663,800	44	1	85
Not dilapidated.....	4,540,900	749,900	17	87	21	66	345,300	54	2	83
All facilities.....	1,318,900	236,500	18	99	49	39	12,000	99	23	51
Some facilities.....	983,300	137,700	14	95	20	66	23,100	80	4	76
No facilities.....	2,238,700	375,700	17	75	5	82	310,100	50	1	85
Dilapidated.....	961,000	86,600	9	53	3	83	297,900	32	1	85
All or some facilities.	122,400	9,800	8	86	13	70	10,300	51	5	79
No facilities.....	838,600	76,800	9	48	1	85	287,600	31	1	86

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, table F.

Electric lighting.--The relatively large percentage of units with electric lights is indicative of the wide availability of this type of technological improvement on farms. Only 32 percent of the occupied rural-farm dwelling units had electric lights in 1940, as compared with 80 percent in 1950.

Even among the units which were dilapidated, more than half had electricity, while practically all of the not dilapidated units with all plumbing facilities had electric lights. As would be expected, the number of units with electric lights was relatively smaller in the groups that lacked some plumbing facilities.

Heating equipment.--The relatively small percentage of units that had central heating equipment is indicative of a continuing tradition to use space heating devices rather than a central means of heating the whole house. However, the extent to which central heating was used in farm housing in economic subregions having severe winters is not reflected in figures for the United States as a whole.

As was the case with electric lights, the group of dwelling units which had all plumbing facilities and were not dilapidated had the greatest proportion of units with central heating, and those which had no plumbing facilities rarely had installed central heating equipment.

The space heater (noncentral heating with flue) was by far the most prevalent form of heating. Over four-fifths of the poorest homes, those without running water or dilapidated, used space heaters, while only two-fifths of the better homes with all plumbing facilities were so equipped.

The units that did not have central or space heating (with a flue) were located generally in areas where little or no heat is required. There is little

correlation between the condition of the farm home or the presence of plumbing facilities and the use of makeshift equipment (for example, oil stoves without flue). For all farm units, however, the number having makeshift equipment or not heated nearly matched the number with central heating equipment.

Type of household.--The quality of housing occupied by the four types of households differs in several respects. Although the number of farm families who had hired hands or other lodgers living with them was small, proportionately more of such households had homes with all plumbing facilities than did other household types. Units occupied by husband-wife families without lodgers were nearly always in as good condition as units occupied by households with lodgers; for the homes without lodgers there were proportionately many more with no plumbing facilities. The poorest homes were occupied by one-person households; nearly three out of four had no plumbing or were dilapidated. The quality of smaller homes may be associated with other statistics which indicate that the larger homes that can accommodate more persons are less likely to be dilapidated than smaller units.

Table L.--TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD, BY CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES, FOR ALL OCCUPIED AND NONWHITE-OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Condition and plumbing facilities <sup>1</sup>	All occupied units					Nonwhite-occupied units				
	Total	Husband-wife families, no non-relatives	Other family groups, no non-relatives	One-person households	Households with non-relatives	Total	Husband-wife families, no non-relatives	Other family groups, no non-relatives	One-person households	Households with non-relatives
Total.....	5,659,600	4,642,700	505,000	267,700	244,200	663,800	516,000	83,600	35,500	28,600
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION										
Total reporting..	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Not dilapidated.....	83	84	77	71	85	54	55	49	45	56
All facilities.....	24	25	18	14	35	2	2	2	2	4
Some facilities....	18	18	16	13	18	4	4	3	3	5
No facilities.....	41	41	43	44	32	48	50	44	41	48
Dilapidated.....	17	16	23	29	15	46	45	51	55	44

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, table F.

The distribution of nonwhite households by type of household differed very little from that of all households. Nearly four-fifths of the units occupied by nonwhite households were husband-wife families with neither lodgers nor other nonrelatives in the home; the proportion for white households was a little over four-fifths. The relative quality of housing for these several types of nonwhite households varied in about the same manner as among white households; however, proportionately many more of the units were dilapidated and very few had plumbing facilities.

Income.<sup>3</sup>--The quality of housing was highly correlated with income. Among the farm families the highest median income, \$2,540 per year, was

earned by families occupying dwelling units that were not dilapidated and had all or some plumbing facilities. At the other end of the quality scale of housing, the median income of families living in dilapidated housing was only \$890. A large proportion, 72 percent, of the lowest income families (less than \$2,000) lived in

<sup>3</sup> The statistics on income in this volume relate to the income of primary families and primary individuals occupying farm dwelling units, whereas the income tabulations in Population Volume II relate to all families and individuals, both primary and secondary. Medians and distributions shown here are therefore not directly comparable.

## FARM HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

units that lacked facilities or were dilapidated, whereas only 21 percent of the families with incomes of \$6,000 or more lived in units of this quality.

Since only 6 percent of the nonwhite families lived in units not dilapidated and with all or some facilities, and only 2 percent of all the nonwhite families had incomes of \$4,000 or more, it is to be expected that a comparison between the white- and nonwhite-occupied units has relatively little meaning. Due principally to this concentration of incomes of nonwhite families, there is less difference in the

median income between those families living in units with all facilities and those living in dilapidated units than among white families.

Income for families living in farm dwelling units cannot be readily compared with income for families in rural-nonfarm or urban housing. Farm income as reported in this volume represents only cash income while the true farm income includes the value of products produced and consumed on the farm. Similarly, between farms, there may be differences in economic level even though they report the same amount of cash income.

Table M.--INCOME IN 1949, BY CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES, FOR ALL OCCUPIED AND NONWHITE-OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950  
(Income of only primary families and individuals)

Condition and plumbing facilities <sup>1</sup>	All occupied units					Nonwhite-occupied units				
	Less than \$2,000	\$2,000 to \$3,999	\$4,000 to \$5,999	\$6,000 or more	Median income	Less than \$2,000	\$2,000 to \$3,999	\$4,000 to \$5,999	\$6,000 or more	Median income
Total.....	3,132,300	1,478,400	469,200	313,500	...	573,000	51,800	6,300	3,300	...
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION										
Total reporting.....	100	100	100	100	\$1,660	100	100	100	100	\$740
Not dilapidated:										
All or some facilities	28	54	69	79	2,540	4	14	27	37	1,210
No facilities.....	48	36	26	17	1,350	48	52	46	38	760
Dilapidated.....	24	10	6	4	890	48	35	27	25	690

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, table F.