1-1-1957

Employment and underemployment of rural people in the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia

William H. Metzler

Ward F. Porter

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wv_agricultural_and_forestry_experiment_station_bulletins

Digital Commons Citation

Metzler, William H. and Porter, Ward F., "Employment and underemployment of rural people in the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia" (1957). *West Virginia Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station Bulletins*. 404.
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wv_agricultural_and_forestry_experiment_station_bulletins/389

This Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access by the Davis College of Agriculture, Natural Resources And Design at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station Bulletins by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

EMPLOYMENT and UNDEREMPLOYMENT **of RURAL PEOPLE in the UPPER** **ONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA**

BULLETIN 404

JUNE, 1957

VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writers gratefully acknowledge the contributions of many individuals to this report. Among those to whom they are particularly indebted are fellow members of the project committee: W. W. Armentrout of the West Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, and O. J. Scoville, Joe R. Motheral, R. B. Glasgow, and J. V. McElveen of the Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture. These individuals, together with James H. Clarke, Norman Nybroten, and George E. Toben of the West Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, have contributed much in the way of advice and constructive criticism throughout the survey.

Credit is also due Leo Fishman of the College of Commerce, West Virginia University, and C. J. Parsons and Brumback Stephens of the West Virginia Department of Employment Security, who provided valuable information on the economic situation in the Upper Monongahela Valley and the State as a whole.

For statistical advice and services, the writers are indebted to Mrs. Justine Foglesong of the West Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station. Also acknowledged are the services of A. J. Ludwig, formerly of West Virginia University, who supervised machine tabulations, and those of Earl Houseman of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, who set up the sample design.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, AND HOME ECONOMICS
H. R. VARNEY, DIRECTOR
MORGANTOWN

**Employment and Underemployment
Of Rural People In
The Upper Monongahela Valley,
West Virginia**

**By
William H. Metzler
and
Ward F. Porter**

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL
EXPERIMENT STATION
Morgantown**

**In Cooperation with
Agricultural Research Service
United States Department of Agriculture
Production Economics Research Branch**

Contents

SUMMARY	v
INTRODUCTION	1
ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS	2
THE UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY	4
PEOPLE AND FARMS IN THE VALLEY	7
HOUSEHOLDS AND WORKERS IN THE SAMPLE GROUP	12
HOUSEHOLD SIZE	15
AGE	16
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	16
VOCATIONAL TRAINING	17
LEVEL OF LIVING	18
COMPARISON WITH OTHER SURVEYS	19
ACTIVITIES AND OCCUPATIONS OF OPEN-COUNTRY	
PEOPLE IN THE VALLEY	19
HOUSEHOLD STATUS AND CHIEF ACTIVITY	21
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT	22
EMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS	
IN THE VALLEY	25
METHOD OF ESTIMATING EMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOY-	
MENT	26
TOTAL DAYS WORKED PER PERSON	27
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT AS RELATED TO TYPE OF WORK AND	
TYPE OF WORKER	30
EMPLOYMENT ON THE HOME FARM	32
FARM-WAGE WORK	34
NON FARM EMPLOYMENT	34
INCOMES OF HOUSEHOLDS AND OF WORKERS IN THE	
VALLEY	37
INDIVIDUAL EARNINGS	43
WORK EXPERIENCE, 1946-1954	45
YOUTH WHO HAVE LEFT HOME	49
MAJOR ACTIVITY BEFORE LEAVING, AFTER LEAVING, AND AT THE	
TIME OF THE SURVEY	51
METHOD OF FINDING OUT ABOUT FIRST JOB	53
VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF YOUTH WHO HAD LEFT HOME	53
WHERE THEY ARE NOW	55

WORK AWAY FROM HOME.....	56
WORKERS WHO HAD RETURNED HOME.....	57
AVAILABILITY FOR EMPLOYMENT.....	58
WORK PREFERENCES	60
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION	60
WILLINGNESS TO LEAVE HOME.....	61
WILLINGNESS TO MOVE FAMILY.....	62
EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR WORK.....	62
COMPARISON WITH OTHER SURVEYS.....	63
CONCLUSION	64
APPENDIX	67
CLASSIFICATION AND TERMINOLOGY.....	67

Summary

A CONTINUED slump in coal-mining employment has brought attention to the problem of inadequate work opportunities for rural people in coal-mining areas of West Virginia. These areas ordinarily have limited agricultural resources; hence occupational adjustments largely will have to be along nonfarm lines.

A field study was made of 875 households in the open-country area of the Upper Monongahela Valley in July, 1954. The Upper Monongahela Valley was chosen as being roughly typical of the State as a whole.

Although one-third of the households interviewed were located on farms, agriculture was a supplemental rather than a primary source of income for most of them. Only 5 percent of the households in the area depended on agriculture alone.

Forty percent of the households in the area were those of workers in the mines, factories, stores, and other nonfarm places of employment who relied solely on nonfarm work as a means of support.

Fourteen percent of the households relied for their support solely on nonwork sources of income; i.e., royalties, rents, social security, retirement funds, public assistance.

The remaining 41 percent had income from several of these sources. Most frequently, nonfarm work was the major source, with farming or nonwork income as supplementary.

Of the 2,287 persons in the sample households who were 14 years old or over, 59 percent had done some work during the 12 months preceding the survey. One-third of them had worked as much as 100 days.

Average length of employment for all persons who worked during the year was 154 days—185 days for males and 92 for females. Workers whose main employment was in agriculture worked for an average of 63 days, whereas those whose main employment was in nonfarm work were employed for an average of 201 days. This difference is partially due to the fact that two-thirds of the nonfarm workers were males between 24 and 64 years of age, whereas two-thirds of the farm workers were women and youths. Yet underemployment was also common among adult male workers on farms.

Evidence of underemployment among open-country people include the following:

- (1) An unusually high proportion of nonworkers.

Percentage of nonworkers

	Upper Monongahela Valley	United States
Among all persons 14 years old or over.....	41	36
Among males 14 years old and over	18	14
Among females 14 years old and over	64	57

- (2) Short-term or no employment among women and youth.
Only 11 percent of the women worked as long as 100 days during the previous year, yet 28 percent of them were neither housewives nor in school.
Only 35 percent of the sons 14 to 24 years old worked as long as 100 days, yet 53 percent of them were not in school.
- (3) Inadequate employment in agriculture.
Males 25 to 64 years old, who worked on the home farm only, worked for an average of 130 days during the previous 12 months.
- (4) Inadequate employment among service workers.
Females 25 to 64 years old employed in service work were employed for an average of 93 days during the preceding year.
- (5) Some underemployment in coal mining.
Males 25 to 64 years old employed in coal mining worked for an average of 177 days during the preceding year.

The foregoing selected data point toward age, sex, and occupational groups in the Valley which were especially subject to underemployment.

Of the total income of households in the Valley, 80 percent came from nonfarm employment, 14 percent from nonwork sources, and 6 percent from farm operation or farm wages.

Average income of open-country households in the Valley was \$2,675. Approximately one-fourth of these households had incomes of less than \$1,000; one-fourth had incomes of over \$3,000.

Average earnings per worker who engaged in each type of work may be summarized as follows:

	For the year	Per day worked
Worked on home farm	\$132	\$2.25
Farm-wage work	259	4.21
Nonfarm work	2,206	11.85

These averages again are affected by the high proportion of women and children engaged in farm work.

A total of 401 youths had left the 875 survey homes during the previous 8 years—197 males and 204 females. Half of the young women went into housekeeping when they left home. Most of the remainder

went into nonfarm work. More than one-third of the young men went into the armed forces. Over one-half went into nonfarm work. Only three became farm operators and two became hired farm workers. Sixty percent of the youth left their home counties; 37 percent left the State. Sixty-nine members of these households (mostly youth) had returned home during the previous year. Half of these stated that they returned because their work gave out.

One hundred and three persons were working away from home at the time of the survey but were still reported as members of the household. Usually they returned home each weekend or at less frequent intervals.

A majority of the nonfarm workers had more than 8 years' experience in nonfarm work. New entrants into nonfarm employment were most numerous in the periods 1946-1947 and 1952-1953.

Sixteen percent of the workers 14 years old and over were reported as available for employment. More than 40 percent of these people had done some work during the survey week but were still interested in other employment. Approximately 90 percent of the persons available for employment preferred nonfarm work. Two-thirds of those preferring nonfarm work were willing to leave home to take a job and three-fourths of those who were heads of households were willing to move their families. Only 3 out of 37 workers interested in doing farm work were willing to leave home.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

Employment and Underemployment Of Rural People in the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia

William H. Metzler and Ward F. Porter*

Introduction

THIS is the second of a series of publications which deal with the employment problem of rural people in the Upper Monongahela Valley of West Virginia. The first was a report on rural people in the Valley who were available for employment.¹ Approximately 16 percent of the people of working age in the Valley were reported as being in this group, and more than 90 percent of them desired nonfarm employment. The present report describes the working population in the rural areas of the Valley and examines the extent to which underemployment exists among them. The third report will deal with the potentialities for more complete employment of these people through expansion and improvement of their farming operations.

All three reports are based on data obtained in field interviews of families living in the open country area of the Valley. A randomized sample of the families in the area was selected for interview. (See Appendix for Sampling Method.) All families in the sample were asked to give detailed data in regard to farming operations and work performed off the farm during the previous 12 months. These data provided the basis for calculating the number of days of work for each person in each household.

The survey was made during the slump in coal-mining employment which became acute in the early part of 1954. The demand for coal had been dropping for several years and mine employees were gradually shifting to other lines of work. In 1954, however, displaced workers were not able to find other employment, and many who had obtained jobs in other industrial areas had been laid off and were returning to West Virginia.

*William H. Metzler, Agricultural Economist, Production Economics Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Ward F. Porter, Extension Analyst, Teaching Methods Research Branch, Division of Research and Training, Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

¹Availability for Employment of Rural People in the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia, by Ward F. Porter and William H. Metzler, West Virginia University Agr. Expt. Sta. Bull. 591, June, 1956.

Since that time there has been some recovery in the coal industry, but there has been no corresponding increase in employment. Increased production has been achieved through greater use of mechanized equipment. The trend is expected to be in the direction of even more mechanization; hence there is need for some major occupational readjustments among the working population.

Occupational readjustment might conceivably come through (1) expansion of farming operations, (2) movement of workers out of the area to more thriving industrial areas, (3) movement of industry into the area or development of new industries in order to take advantage of the surplus labor supply, or (4) some combination of these methods involving more intensive utilization of both farm and nonfarm resources.

The development of any readjustment program would be aided by an accurate knowledge of the characteristics of the people involved, their age and sex composition, educational and occupational background, the extent to which they are unemployed or underemployed, and their availability for other kinds of employment. It would also be aided by accurate data concerning the agriculture of the area, and the extent to which underemployment might be taken care of by an expansion of agricultural operations. In addition, an inventory of the undeveloped industrial and commercial resources of the area should reveal potentials for new lines of activity.

The main objective of the present report is to provide information in regard to the population of working age—characteristics, occupations, and employment. Only incidental attention will be given to the physical resources of the area.

Economic Backgrounds

Survey operations were limited to the Upper Monongahela Valley, as it was felt that this area was typical of economic and employment conditions in the State as a whole. A detailed comparison of the economic situation in the State and in the Valley was made in the first report in this series.² The major items in this comparison are shown in Table 1 and will not be repeated here. A few of the highlights of the economic situation can be listed as follows:

Pressure of population on the economic resources of the State at their present level of development is great. Farming is so limited by rough topography, dense coverage of timber, and soil conditions that the residents depend largely on nonfarm employment for a livelihood.

²Ibid, pp. 1-16.

TABLE 1. COMPARATIVE DATA ON RURALITY OF POPULATION, INDUSTRY
CLASSIFICATION OF WORKERS, AND CLASS OF FARMS, UPPER
MONONGAHELA VALLEY AND STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, 1950.*

GROUP	UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY	WEST VIRGINIA
	Percent	Percent
People: By residence.....	100.0	100.0
Urban.....	36.3	34.6
Rural-nonfarm.....	41.5	44.9
Rural-farm.....	22.2	20.5
Workers: By industry.....	100.0	100.0
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries.....	9.7	9.9
Mining.....	21.9	21.4
Construction.....	5.1	5.1
Manufacturing.....	17.2	18.9
Transp., communication, public utilities.....	8.4	8.5
Wholesale and retail trade.....	15.4	15.4
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	1.5	1.6
Business and repair services.....	2.0	1.8
Personal services.....	4.8	4.8
Entertainment and recreation.....	.7	.8
Professional and related services.....	9.0	7.6
Public administration.....	2.5	2.6
Other.....	1.8	1.6
Farms: By class.....	100.0**	100.0
Commercial.....	27.6	28.6
\$25,000 and over gross sales.....	.1	.5
10,000-24,999 " ".....	1.0	1.4
5,000- 9,999 " ".....	2.0	2.5
2,500- 4,999 " ".....	1.2	1.6
1,200- 2,199 " ".....	8.2	8.0
250- 1,199 " ".....	12.1	11.8
Other.....	72.4	71.1
Part-time.....	21.0	17.6
Residential.....	51.4	53.8

* Data from Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. II, Part 48*, and *U. S. Census of Agriculture, 1950, Vol. I*.

** Percentages based on number of farms and farm operators.

† The classification of farms is as follows: Commercial (1) all farms with a value of sales of farm products amounting to \$1,200 or more, plus (2) those farms with a value of sales of \$250 to \$1,199 where the operator worked off the farm less than 100 days and total family income from nonfarm sources was less than the value of all products sold. Part-time farms are those in the \$250 to \$1,199 gross sales bracket when either the operator worked off the farm for more than 100 days or total nonfarm income for all members of the family was greater than the value of farm products sold. Residential farms are those with a total value of sales of less than \$250.

Nonfarm employment in West Virginia has been on the decline for several years. In 1948 there were 544,000³ nonagricultural employees in the State. In 1954 there were only 465,000. Much of this decrease was associated with a decline in employment in the bituminous coal industry, a drop from 132,000 to 71,000 workers during the same period.

³W. Va. Dept. of Employment Security and U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Nonagricultural Employment in W. Va., Annual Averages, 1948-1954*. Charleston, W. Va., Jan., 1955.

Between April, 1950, and July, 1954, West Virginia had a loss in population of 59,000 persons, or 2.9 percent.⁴ This is only a partial readjustment to reduced employment opportunities. During 1954, however, there was a return of workers to the State as employment was curtailed in other States.

The future of employment in the bituminous coal industry in the State is difficult to forecast. Substitution of petroleum and natural gas for fuel and power and of machinery for hand labor in the mines may be expected to continue. On the other hand, the aluminum and atomic power industries are creating new demands for coal and may help increase the market for it. This will not necessarily create an increase in employment. Competition from atomic sources of power probably is several decades away and its impact is not now predictable.

The Upper Monongahela Valley

The Upper Monongahela Valley comprises 10 counties immediately south of the Pennsylvania border: Monongalia, Preston, Marion, Harrison, Taylor, Barbour, Tucker, Lewis, Upshur, and Randolph. Its land area is 4,444 square miles, almost equivalent to that of Connecticut. In spite of its rough terrain the Valley is densely populated. Census figures show a population of 368,654 in 1950, an average density of 82.9 persons per square mile.⁵

The topography of most of the area varies from rough to hilly and mountainous. Topographic engineers classify it as a "ridges and valleys" area. Valley areas between the mountains are of limited size but have been cleared for farming. Cultivated acreages frequently extend up hill-sides with very steep slopes and create problems of erosion. The steeper and more mountainous areas are still covered by timber, and sawmilling is an important industry. In 1950, 58 percent of the land area in the Valley was in farms, but only 9 percent was in harvested crops. By 1954 only 52 percent of the land was in farms and only 8 percent was harvested cropland.⁶

The number of farms in the Valley decreased from 16,965 in 1950 to 13,987 in 1954. Average size remained about the same, about 97 acres. Most of the acreage was not farmed intensively; in 1954 only 15 percent of the farm land was classified as harvested cropland, an average of only 16 acres per farm. Total value of sales of farm products was \$14,349,458 in 1949, an average of \$846 per farm.

⁴Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Series P-25*, No. 104, Oct. 25, 1954.

⁵U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Population*, Vol. I, 1950.

⁶U. S. Bureau of the Census, *1954 Census of Agriculture*. Preliminary release on West Virginia. Census data for both 1950 and 1954 are used in this report. The 1950 census data cover population, occupations, and agriculture, as well as employment. In 1954, data are available only for agriculture, manufacturing, and employment.

FIGURE 1. Economic conditions in the Valley (shaded area) are generally typical of those in the State as a whole.

The value of the major types of farm produce sold in 1953 was as follows:

Livestock	\$5,379,085
Dairy products	3,667,068
Poultry and poultry products	2,165,514

As to type of farm, approximately 10 percent were classified in the 1954 Census of Agriculture as dairy farms, and 13 percent as livestock farms. Seventy-one percent were classed as miscellaneous and unclassifiable. These were largely the part-time and residential farms that miners and other nonfarm workers operated in their spare time.

According to the 1954 Census, only 8.2 percent of the farms in the Valley had gross sales of more than \$2,500. Another 9 percent had gross sales of between \$1,200 and \$2,500. Approximately half the farms in

the Valley had gross sales of less than \$250. Most of the latter were simply supplementary sources of income to workers or to retirees whose major support came from other sources.

The agricultural base for support of the population therefore is very meager, and recent trends have been in the direction of even less intensive farming. The prospects for competitive commercial agriculture and live-at-home farming, however, are likely to differ. The ability to compete commercially is quite limited, but this limitation may not apply strictly to live-at-home efforts.

Manufacturing is a much more important source of income to the Valley. In 1954 there were 444 manufacturing plants in the Valley which employed about 18,000 workers. The total value added by manufacture in these plants was close to \$120,000,000.⁷

Among the more important industries in the Valley are sawmilling, and the stone, clay, and glass industries. Recently the chemical industry has come into the area and has added to local payrolls. Although industrial employment has been increasing slowly, it declined briefly during the slump in coal mining.⁸ In spite of the hilly terrain, railroad and highway transportation to the area is good. It is also favorably located for fuel, power, and manpower resources, so there are good potentialities for further industrial development.

The chief source of income for the Valley has been the mining of bituminous coal. There are a few large mining operations in the area but most of the mines are small. Some are small strip mines which use little labor and operate only on an irregular basis. Total employment in the mines in the Valley in April, 1950, was 25,513 persons.

The bituminous coal industry in West Virginia reached its peak in 1947, with a total production of 173,654,000 tons. By 1954 production was down to 116,000,000 tons.⁹ Employment has dropped much more rapidly than production and by 1955 was down to half the 1948 figure. Recent employment figures for West Virginia and the major industrial centers in the sample area are as follows:¹⁰

⁷U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Manufactures, 1954*, preliminary report on West Virginia.

⁸Employment data for the major industrial centers in the Valley—Morgantown, Fairmont, and Clarksburg—are available only for the last several years. They indicate that the manufacturing employment in those centers was as follows: April 1953, 15,290; April 1954, 14,210; April 1955, 15,020. *Labor Market Digest, Clarksburg, Fairmont, and Morgantown, Labor Market Areas*, West Virginia State Employment Service, Charleston, W. Va.

⁹The status of the bituminous coal industry in the United States in 1954 has been summarized as follows: At the turn of the century coal provided 90 percent of the nation's energy supply; today, it supplies around 30 percent. Some 2,400 bituminous coal mines have closed in the last 3 years. The price of coal is below the 1948 level yet wages and other costs have increased. A substantial part of the coal industry is operating at a loss. See "Coal's Problem," *Nations Business*, November, 1954; "Coal in Trouble" by Martin Parkman, *Editorial Research Reports*, November, 1954. For the West Virginia situation, see statements of Leo Fishman, Professor of Economics and Finance, West Virginia University, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report January 27, 1955. Also, *Proceedings on the Commercial and Economic Health of the Bituminous Coal Industry*. West Virginia University College of Commerce, Bulletin Series 54, No. 7-1, November, 1953.

¹⁰Data from West Virginia Employment Trends and Labor Market Digest, Clarksburg, Fairmont, and Morgantown Labor Market Areas, published monthly. West Virginia State Employment Service, Charleston, West Virginia.

FIGURE 2. Mining and agriculture exist side by side in the open-country areas of West Virginia.

COAL MINING EMPLOYMENT

	April 1952	April 1953	April 1954	April 1955
West Virginia	114,900	92,100	70,700	67,200
Morgantown area	5,450	4,520	3,080	2,810
Fairmont area	6,460	5,410	4,630	3,970
Clarksburg area	°	2,900	2,400	2,250

° Data not available.

Employment opportunities in the area have been shrinking more rapidly than the population. Increases in manufacturing employment have been inadequate to offset the declines in mining and agriculture. Outmigration as a solution to the situation is limited by the strong attachment of the people in the Valley to their home environment. Hence a surplus working population may exist there for some time. Meanwhile, local civic and commercial groups are working to attract enterprises from outside the area and to develop enterprises locally.

People and Farms in the Valley

The people living in the Upper Monongahela Valley are largely rural even though they are nonagricultural. One-third are classified in

the 1950 Census as urban and are concentrated in the industrial and mining centers that spread across the western and northern parts of the Valley. The eastern and southern parts of the area are less densely settled and a higher percentage of the people live in small towns or in the open country. Two-thirds of the rural people in the Valley are classified in the Census as nonfarm. Some of these people live in small towns or villages but many live out in the open country—often on holdings of 10, 20, 30 or even 50 or 100 acres but they do not do enough farming to qualify as farmers under the Census definition.¹¹ Either the slope of the land is too great, the terrain too rugged, or the timber growth too heavy to permit profitable agricultural effort.

Total population of the Valley was 357,113 persons in 1940 and 368,654 in 1950. Total population change was not great but there was a pronounced shift of people from the rural to the more urban counties. This was in keeping with the industrial growth in the Valley during the World War II period.

Workers in the Valley were classified by occupation in the 1950 Census as follows:

	Percent
Agriculture	9.6
Farm operators	5.9
Farm laborers	1.3
Unpaid family workers	2.4
Mining	21.9
Manufacturing	17.2
Trade, retail and wholesale	15.4
Other nonfarm	35.9

Especially significant is the fact that fewer than 6 percent of the workers in the area reported themselves as farm operators. An additional 3.7 percent were either farm laborers or unpaid farm family workers.

These figures are in contrast to Census data on residence of the population, which show that 22 percent of the population in the Valley lived on farms. In other words, many people who reported their occupation as miner, factory worker, or other nonfarm worker lived on places classified as farms. On the other hand, many other nonfarm workers also lived out in the open country but on acreages that did not in 1950 meet the Census requirements for a farm.

The distinction between "farm" and "nonfarm" for the acreages in this area therefore is not one of occupation but of residence. Most of the "farm" families had a few more chickens or a better cow than their

¹¹In the 1950 Census, places of 3 or more acres were counted as farms if the value of agricultural products, exclusive of home gardens, amounted to \$150 or more. Places of less than 3 acres were counted as farms when the value of sales of farm products amounted to \$150 or more.

FIGURE 3. The small West Virginia farm typically has a few head of livestock and small acreages in hay and grain.

neighbors who were classified as "nonfarm." The same family might easily shift between the "farm" and "nonfarm" classification from year to year depending on the yield of their crops or how well their hens lay.

The foregoing discussion indicates that the farming operations of most residents of the area are supplementary to their nonfarm activities. According to the 1954 Census of Agriculture the nonfarm incomes of 52 percent of the "farm" households in the Valley exceeded the value of farm products sold. Likewise almost 60 percent of the "farmers" worked off their farms in 1949, and about 45 percent worked off their farms for more than 100 days. Even those "farmers" who did not work off their farms were often retired or disabled people whose main source of support was a pension or public assistance payments.

Consequently it is not surprising that approximately half of the 17,000 farms in the Valley were classified in the Census as residential, that is, with less than \$250 worth of farm produce sold from them during the preceding year (Table 1).¹² An additional 21 percent of the farms

¹²Residential farms are those on which the value of farm sales amounted to less than \$250. Commercial farms include (1) those with sales of farm products of \$1,200 or more, and (2) those with sales of \$250-\$1,199 on which the operator worked off the farm less than 100 days in the year and also household income from nonfarm sources was less than the value of all farm sales. Part-time farms include only those with a value of sales of farm products of \$250 to \$1,199 on which either (1) the operator reported 100 or more days of work off the farm or (2) the nonfarm income of all members of the household was greater than the value of farm products sold.

FIGURE 4. Equipment in a marginal operation of this type is brought up to date very slowly and labor is used at varying rates of efficiency.

were classified as part-time. These also are small, reporting less than \$1,200 in sales, and the operator either worked off the farm more than 100 days or the nonfarm income of members of the household was greater than the total value of farm products sold. For the most part the residents on both these types of farms were nonfarm workers who did a small amount of farming on the side.

Hence, in 1954 only 30 percent of the farms in the Valley were classified as commercial. Half or more of the households on these farms had incomes primarily from agriculture. Almost half came within the class of farms with sales of from \$250 to \$1,199 on which both (1) the operator worked off the farm less than 100 days during the preceding year and (2) household income from nonfarm sources was less than the value of all farm sales. The rest of the farms, almost 15 percent of the total, had gross sales of farm products of \$1,200 or more. Operators of some of those farms had nonfarm activities and incomes that were greater than their farming operations.

Agriculture occupies a minor role in the economy of the Valley. The welfare of its growing population depends largely on the expansion and

FIGURE 5. Some small-scale farms in West Virginia still use traditional methods of haying.

maintenance of industrial employment. Workers use farming to supplement their nonfarm activities, but this is not extensive enough to provide much of a cushion in times of industrial slowdown or individual unemployment.

On an age basis, the population in the Upper Monongahela Valley differs from that of the United States generally in that a somewhat larger percentage of the people are in the young- and the old-age brackets. The percentages from the 1950 Census were as follows:

	United States	Upper Monongahela Valley
Under 24 years old	41.6	45.5
25-64 year old	50.3	46.0
65 years and over	8.1	8.5

This means that a higher proportion of the population in the Valley are young people who are entering or ready to enter the labor force. Whether they will make their work contribution locally or elsewhere in the United States depends on the development of employment opportunities in their home area. The smaller proportion of adults probably reflects the effect of migration from the Valley.

Households and Workers In the Sample Group

This survey was designed to ascertain the extent of employment and underemployment of open-country rural people. Households in cities and in towns or villages of more than 100 population were excluded from the sample. The open-country people were largely nonagricultural, but adequate coverage was obtained for both the agricultural and the non-agricultural groups in the population. A randomized sample of households that would be representative of open-country people in the Valley was drawn on an area segment basis.

The results of the survey apply specifically to open-country households in the Valley. However, since all nonfarm groups in the Valley are dependent on the same mines, mills, and other employment outlets as the workers in this sample, the nonfarm aspects of the findings also apply rather closely to the more urban sector of the population in the Valley.

FIGURE 6. Work in sawmilling operations has been very steady during this period of rapid building construction.

Information was obtained in the field survey in regard to 875 households which contained 3,418 people. A 12-month employment record was obtained for all persons 14 years old or over in those households. This covered all work on the home farm or in the home business as well as work for other people. There were 2,287 persons in this age group, of whom 1,331 had done some work during the preceding 12 months.

On the same basis of classification as used in the 1954 Census of Agriculture (see page 9), 36 percent of the sample households were located on tracts of land that would qualify as farms (Table 2). Furthermore, one-half of the farms they lived on were classified as residential, 21 percent as part-time, and 24 percent as commercial. These percentages correspond very closely to the proportions reported for the Valley by the 1954 Census of Agriculture. Many of the other households were on fairly large acreages which did not have enough agricultural production to qualify as farms.

TABLE 2. TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD, BY RESIDENCE AND SOURCE OF INCOME.
UPPER MONONGAHELIA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.*

GROUP	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE	PERSONS
	HOUSEHOLDS	OF HOUSEHOLDS	OVER 14 YEARS OLD
	Number	Percent	Number
All households	875	100	2,287
By residence			
Farm	316	36	900
Commercial	73	8	186
Part-time	68	8	225
Residential	158	18	445
Unclassified	17	2	41
Nonfarm	559	64	1,387
By income sources†			
Agriculture only	41	5	101
Nonfarm work only	355	41	917
Nonwork only**	123	14	211
Agr. plus nonfarm work			
Mainly agriculture	31	4	91
Mainly nonfarm	81	9	236
Nonfarm plus nonwork			
Mainly nonfarm work	175	20	502
Mainly nonwork	28	3	88
Other and no report	38	4	108

* Data in this and the following tables are drawn directly from a sample of 875 households in the Valley but should apply to the population of the Valley as a whole. See Appendix for sampling method.

† As between farm, nonfarm work and nonwork sources.

** Nonwork households are those which had received most of their income from nonwork sources, e. g., rents, royalties, Social Security, public assistance, unemployment insurance. Some of these households had income from nonwork sources only, others had farm or nonfarm work as a minor source of income.

FIGURE 7. Some farmers use the most up-to-date practices in strip cropping and soil conservation.

Any classification on a farm-nonfarm basis of the places on which these people lived calls for some explanation. Some places were definitely farms, others were simply the homes of nonfarm workers and had no agricultural activities. The majority of the places, however, were the homes of one or more nonfarm workers on which a small amount of home production was also carried on. Home gardens were of varying sizes, but gardens did not qualify a place as a farm. A small flock of chickens or a cow might qualify a place of more than 3 acres as a farm but would not affect the classification of a similar place of less than 3 acres unless milk or eggs were sold.

On the basis of income, only 5 percent of the households relied on agriculture alone. About 40 percent of them had income from nonfarm work alone and another 14 percent from nonwork sources only. The remaining 41 percent had income from two or more of these sources. Thirteen percent had income from both nonfarm work and the sale of farm produces. In such cases the nonfarm income was usually the more important source.

The term "nonwork income" has been used to designate income from royalties, rent, insurance, etc., as distinguished from income derived from

wages, salaries, fees, or profits. Some households subsisted on nonwork income alone. There were 123 households of this type in the survey group. Their income came from two sources—first, from capital investment, such as rents, royalties, and interest; and second, from insurance, retirement, or relief funds, such as Social Security payments, unemployment insurance, retirement funds, workmen's compensation, and State relief. In addition to the households which subsisted on nonwork sources alone, there were 200 households which received nonwork funds of some type in addition to their other sources of income.

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Large households were not characteristic of the Valley. They usually consisted of 2, 3, or 4 persons, with the average being 3.9. Since this survey deals with employment, data were obtained only in regard to persons classified as being in the labor force, that is, 14 years old and over. There was an average of 2.6 of these persons per household. The number did not vary greatly with the occupation of the household head (Table 3). Nonwork households, however, were smaller. Two-thirds of these had only 1 or 2 persons old enough to be in the labor force, and these persons often were too old to engage in regular employment.

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER PER HOUSEHOLD, BY INDUSTRY AND LEVEL OF LIVING, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

INDUSTRY AND LEVEL OF LIVING	TOTAL REPORTED		HOUSEHOLDS WITH A STATED NUMBER OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER *						
	HOUSE- HOLDS	PERSONS 14 & OVER	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 OR MORE
	Number	Number							
Total	875	2,287	67	454	195	96	47	11	5
Chief income source									
Farm operation	57	140	3	32	17	3	2		
Farm labor	18	52	..	10	3	3	1	1	
Mining	170	466	..	95	41	21	10	2	1
Manufacturing	169	481	3	87	40	20	14	4	1
Business and Professional	81	211	2	49	17	7	4	2	
Other nonfarm work	155	401	7	90	29	21	6	1	1
Nonwork**	178	405	45	76	32	16	7	1	1
Other and no report	47	129	7	15	16	5	3		1
Level of living†									
High	287	738	2	156	66	33	11	4	
Medium	344	902	22	187	70	39	26	1	2
Low	243	615	43	111	59	21	13	3	2

* Labor force status is calculated only for persons 14 years old and over.

** Nonwork households are those whose major source of income is from other sources than earnings, e. g., rents, royalties, Social Security, retirement funds.

† For explanation of level of living classification see page 20.

AGE

The age composition of the population displays the characteristics of a group from which young people have been leaving in order to obtain their livelihood elsewhere. A smaller proportion of the people are in the middle-aged group than in the nation at large and a larger proportion are in the groups under 24 and over 65 years of age (Table 4). The deficiency of young adult male workers is somewhat greater than of female workers. Apparently young men have been under more pressure to find employment elsewhere.

TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER WHO WERE IN SELECTED AGE GROUPS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA AND THE UNITED STATES,* 1954.

AGE GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER IN EACH AGE GROUP					
	ALL PEOPLE		MALES		FEMALES	
	UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY SAMPLE†	UNITED STATES	UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY SAMPLE	UNITED STATES	UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY SAMPLE	UNITED STATES
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
All Groups**	100	100	100	100	100	100
14-24	23	19	23	18	23	20
25-34	18	21	16	21	20	21
35-44	20	20	19	20	20	19
45-54	14	16	15	17	13	16
55-64	11	12	12	13	11	12
65 and over	14	12	15	11	13	12

* Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports *Estimates of the Population of the United States, by Age, Color, and Sex July 1, 1950 to 1955*, Sept. 1955.

† Open-country residents in Upper Monongahela Valley.

** Persons in this table limited to those of labor force age. They constituted 33 per cent of all persons in the sample area. Persons in this age group constituted 29 percent of the population of the United States in 1954.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

The most common level of educational attainment of the people in the labor force is completion of grade school (8 grades) or slightly above. Forty-two percent, however, have had some high school or college training (Table 5). On the other hand, one-fourth did not complete grade school.

There was one outstanding aspect of the educational attainment of this group of people, namely, the great improvement in educational level of the people in the younger age groups.

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER WHO HAD COMPLETED A SPECIFIED NUMBER OF GRADES IN SCHOOL, BY AGE, SEX, AND INDUSTRY GROUP, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

GROUP	TOTAL PERSONS REPORTING		PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WHOSE HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED WAS							
			ELEMENTARY SCHOOL			HIGH SCHOOL		COLLEGE		
			0-3 YEARS	4-7 YEARS	8 YEARS	1-3 YEARS	4 YEARS	1-3 YEARS	4-OR MORE	
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
All persons.....	2,252*	100	6	22	30	20	16	4	2	
By age and sex										
Male.....	1,114	100	8	23	31	18	14	4	2	
14-24.....	261	100	2	21	17	37	19	4	**	
25-64.....	686	100	7	21	36	14	14	5	3	
65 and over.....	167	100	21	35	36	3	3	1	1	
Female.....	1,138	100	5	21	29	21	18	4	2	
14-24.....	267	100	1	9	15	46	24	4	1	
25-64.....	726	100	4	22	33	16	19	4	2	
65 and over.....	145	100	16	39	32	6	5	1	1	
By chief income source										
Agriculture.....	190	100	9	22	39	12	12	4	2	
Mining.....	458	100	6	23	33	23	13	2		
Manufacturing.....	475	100	6	20	28	23	19	3	1	
Business and Professional.....	211	100	2	16	23	25	23	9	2	
Other nonfarm.....	398	100	2	12	29	20	24	7	6	
Nonwork†.....	396	100	15	37	28	11	7	1	1	
Other and no report.....	124	100	3	22	31	23	15	3	3	

* 35 persons did not report.

** Less than 0.5 percent.

Comparative data for the United States: Less than high school education, 47 percent; high school: 1-3 years, 21 percent; 4 years, 22 percent; college: 1-3 years, 7 percent; 4 years, 4 percent. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, October, 1952.

† Nonwork households are those whose major income was from nonwork sources, e. g., rents, royalties, Social Security, retirement funds.

In the age group 14-24, 60 percent of the young men and 75 percent of the young women had some education beyond grade school. At the other extreme, only 8 percent of the men and 11 percent of the women over 65 had any education beyond grade school.

Only 20 percent of the people in the nonwork households had continued their education past grade school. This is closely associated with the fact that many of them were in the older age groups.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The people in this area had many skills along industrial lines. Their employment in mines, mills, and factories attested to that fact. In addi-

tion, some had taken special training to qualify for a particular vocation, as shown in Table 6. Those workers who had learned on the job, or had taken safety courses or other special classes, are not included in the tabulation.

TABLE 6. PERSONS WITH SPECIAL VOCATIONAL TRAINING, BY SEX AND SOURCE AND TYPE OF TRAINING, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

TYPE AND SOURCE OF TRAINING	TOTAL PERSONS	MALE	FEMALE
	Number	Number	Number
Type of training			
Mechanical.....	37	36	1
Industrial.....	15	15	..
Commercial.....	37	10	27
Construction.....	6	6	..
Handicraft.....	11	10	1
Agricultural.....	43	41	2
Teacher.....	18	9	9
Other.....	34	19	15
Total.....	201*	146*	55
Source of training			
Armed forces.....	12	12	..
Vocational school.....	17	14	3
G. I. training.....	39	39	..
On the job classes.....	20	17	3
High school.....	65	42	23
Other school.....	40	17	23
Other.....	9	6	3
Total.....	202	147	55

* One worker did not report type of training.

More workers had taken courses in vocational agriculture than any other single type, but almost as many had taken courses along commercial or mechanical lines. Some of these courses were taken in high school, and others in business college or night school. More than 50 of the young men had taken special vocational training either in connection with the armed forces or veterans programs.

LEVEL OF LIVING

Households in the Valley generally had rather modest levels of living. A rough scale to measure relative level of living was developed on the basis of possession of the following items: electric lights, water piped in home, electric or gas refrigerator, deep freeze unit or locker rental, power washing machine, automobile or truck, flush toilet, kitchen sink, telephone, daily newspaper. Average score for the households covered

by the survey was possession of 6 of the 10 items listed. The items that were most frequently lacking were deep freeze unit, flush toilet, telephone, and daily newspaper.

Eight percent of the households had all 10 of the items, whereas 4 percent had only one of them. A total of 28 percent had from 1 to 4 of the items and were classed in the "low" level-of-living group, 39 percent had from 5 to 7 of the items and were included in the medium level-of-living group. The top 33 percent had from 8 to 10 of the items.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER SURVEYS

Comparison will be made at several points in this report with results of surveys made in two other "labor surplus" areas, eastern Kentucky and southeastern Oklahoma. These results are reported in *Rural Manpower in Eastern Kentucky* by Robert E. Galloway and *A Study of Rural Manpower in Southeastern Oklahoma* by James O. Tarver.¹³ In all three areas, agriculture, coal mining, sawmilling, and miscellaneous industries are important elements in the local economy. The area in West Virginia is the most highly industrialized, with relatively fewer open country people depending on agriculture.

	Percentage of open-country households that engage in farming	Percentage of male heads who did nonfarm work
Upper Monongahela Valley, W. Va.	36	72
Southeastern Oklahoma	54	54
Eastern Kentucky	60	46

The Oklahoma area has been the home base for a large number of migratory workers. In 1952 an estimated 12,000 workers left the area for seasonal work. This was only half as many as had been leaving prior to the heavy labor demands which accompanied the Korean conflict. Migrants were not numerous in the Kentucky and West Virginia areas.

Activities and Occupations of Open-Country People in the Valley

The people in the survey area were typically "hill folks." They expressed a preference to stay in their rugged surroundings even if it meant some sacrifice in income and economic status. Accordingly there were numerous youth and other people living in the households in the area who ordinarily might be expected to leave home to make their own

¹³Kentucky Agr. Expt. Sta. Bull. 627, June, 1953, and Oklahoma A & M College Technical Bull. T-56, Sept. 1955.

living. Economic circumstances, however, were causing some people to recheck the values of living in the Valley against economic potentialities elsewhere.

Each person interviewed was asked to classify all members of the household 14 years old and over according to their major activity during the preceding 12 months. Ordinarily this was done without difficulty. Grown sons and daughters still at home and not working constituted the most difficult group to classify. There was a tendency not to report them as unemployed unless they were actively looking for work. Some were reported, instead, as unpaid family workers, others as keeping house, and a few as unemployed but not looking for work, depending on the circumstances of the particular case. They constitute a fringe group of people who have had difficulty in starting out for themselves, either due to the slack local employment situation or to other circumstances.

Other people who presented some difficulty in classification were the retired and disabled. Some were both retired and disabled. Others who were retired or partially disabled still did a good deal of farm work and reported as farm operators.

People in the two foregoing classifications constituted a significant proportion of all persons covered in the survey. They account in part for the small proportion, 42.8 percent, of the persons 14 years old and over who can be classified as being mainly in the labor force. (See Table 7).¹⁴

A total of 74 percent of the males and 12 percent of the females reported working or looking for work as their major activity during the previous year. These percentages are directly comparable with the results of special surveys made in eastern Kentucky and southeast Oklahoma, which are also "labor surplus areas."¹⁵ The percentage of workers 14 years old and over mainly in the labor force for the three areas is as follows:

	Percentage who were mainly in labor force		
	West Virginia	Kentucky	Oklahoma
All workers _____	43	40	40
Male _____	74	*	68
Female _____	12	*	10

*78 percent of the male heads and 19 percent of the other people reported they were mainly in the labor force during the previous year.

¹⁴See monthly issues of *Current Population Reports, Labor Force*, U. S. Bureau of the Census. Persons in the labor force include those 14 years old and over who were (1) employed during the survey week, including members of the armed forces, and (2) unemployed and looking for work. This latter group includes workers who were not looking for work because (1) they were temporarily ill, or (2) were temporarily laid off, or (3) they believed no work was available.

¹⁵See *Rural Manpower in Eastern Kentucky* by Robert E. Galloway, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 627, June, 1955, and *A Study of Rural Manpower in Southeastern Oklahoma* by James D. Tarver, Oklahoma A & M College Technical Bull. T-56, Sept., 1955.

TABLE 7. MAJOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER DURING THE 12 MONTHS PRECEDING THE SURVEY, BY SEX AND FAMILY STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MAJOR ACTIVITY	TOTAL PERSONS	MALE			FEMALE			
		HEADS	SONS	OTHERS	HEADS*	WIVES	DAUGHTERS	OTHERS
	Number	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
All persons.....	2,287	792	262	76	83	730	238	106
Mainly active in the labor force.....	978	681	113	41	16	70	44	13
Operate farm.....	148	128	4	1	5	10	..	..
Farm wage work.....	23	17	5	1	..	..	..	..
Nonfarm employment.....	641	460	54	27	10	51	30	9
Nonfarm business or prof.....	53	42	1	2	..	5	3	..
Armed forces.....	24	5	15	3	..	..	..	1
Unpaid family work.....	35	2	14	4	..	4	8	3
Looking for work.....	54	27	20	3	1	..	3	..
Mainly not active in labor force.....	1,309	111	149	35	67	660	194	93
Going to school.....	283	..	134	14	..	..	125	10
Keeping house.....	830	1	1	..	54	654	63	57
Retired.....	67	54	..	9	..	..	..	4
Totally disabled.....	61	22	3	8	8	5	3	12
Partially disabled.....	51	25	4	4	5	1	3	9
Not employed and not looking for work†.....	17	9	7	..	..	..	..	1

* Includes both single women living by themselves and wives whose husbands had died, been divorced, or had left home.

† People who gave this reply had sufficient resources at the time of the interview that they did not need employment immediately.

The greater industrial development in West Virginia probably accounts for its higher percentage of persons in the labor force.

HOUSEHOLD STATUS AND CHIEF ACTIVITY

The activity most frequently reported for heads of households was some type of nonfarm employment. For approximately two-thirds of the male heads of households, nonfarm work, business or profession, was their major activity (Table 7). One-sixth gave operating a farm as their major activity; 1 out of 8 were either retired or disabled. A small number were unemployed for the greater part of the year.

The wives of heads of households ordinarily were not in the labor market but spent the major part of their time keeping house. Ninety percent of them reported housekeeping as their major activity, and fewer than 8 percent reported any nonfarm employment.

Female heads of households had activity patterns similar to those of wives except that more of them were active in the labor force. Only

65 percent gave housekeeping as their major activity, while a comparatively high percentage gave farm operation and nonfarm employment. A greater incidence of disability, 16 percent as compared to 1 percent for wives, probably is associated to some extent with the fact that State relief payments are made only to heads of households who are disabled.

About half of the sons and daughters 14 years old and over were in school. One-fourth of the daughters 14 and over spent their time at home helping with the housework. Only 15 percent had obtained employment in nonfarm work. Some of the sons had spent most of their time in the armed forces, but about 20 percent were engaged chiefly in nonfarm work. About 8 percent had spent the major part of the year looking for work.

In addition to members of the immediate family, the respondents reported on more distant relatives and nonrelatives in the household. About one-fourth of these people were retired or disabled and another 15 percent were children in school. Half of the women among this group spent their time in housework, and about 40 percent of the males spent their time in nonfarm work.

The fact that 135 women other than wives and female heads of households reported either keeping house or unpaid family work as their major activity points to a potential group of underemployed or unemployed women. These women continued to live with parents or other relatives in exchange for assistance in housekeeping.

When the activity patterns of the entire sample of workers are observed on an age and sex basis, the high proportion of farm operators in the older age groups becomes apparent. More than one-third were 65 years old or over (Table 8). Only 2 of 148 farm operators were under 25 years old. Moreover, a considerable amount of disability showed up among men less than 65 years old. Almost half of the (totally or partially) disabled males were under 65 years old. Disability of women under 65 was much less common.

TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

All persons who did any work during the previous 12 months were classified according to both industry and occupation. This group includes many more persons than those who gave farm or nonfarm work as their major activity during the year. These were largely school children and housewives and were especially numerous in the field of agriculture. Instead of 171 persons who said their major activity had been in farm operations or hired farm labor, 437 now appear as having done more work in agriculture than at any other occupation (Table 9). The number of workers who did nonfarm work did not increase as much, due largely to

TABLE 8. MAJOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER DURING THE 12 MONTHS PRECEDING THE SURVEY, BY SEX AND AGE, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MAJOR ACTIVITY	TOTAL PERSONS	MALE			FEMALE		
		14-24	25-64	65 AND OVER	14-24	25-64	65 AND OVER
	Number	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
All persons.....	2,287	263	694	173	268	735	154
Mainly in the labor force.....	978	105	651	79	36	104	3
Operate farm.....	148	2	75	56		13	2
Farm wage work.....	23	6	16	1			
Nonfarm work.....	641	50	477	14	24	76	
Nonfarm business or prof.....	53	2	40	3		8	
Armed forces.....	24	15	8		1		
Unpaid family work.....	35	10	6	4	8	6	1
Looking for work.....	54	20	29	1	3	1	
Mainly not in labor force.....	1,309	158	43	94	232	631	151
Going to school.....	283	148			135		
Keeping house.....	830	1		1	95	620	113
Retired.....	67		4	59			4
Totally disabled.....	61		16	17	1	4	23
Partially disabled.....	51	3	13	17	1	6	11
Not employed and not looking.....	17	6	10			1	

less employment of housewives and students. An exception was in the number employed in small stores, shops, and other businesses which were sometimes conducted as family enterprises.

The data indicate that many more wives than husbands were employed in agriculture. Many of the male heads of households who operated farms and also had nonfarm jobs reported their nonfarm employment as being their major occupation; hence they were classified in some nonfarm-work category.

A third of all the persons who worked had their major employment in agriculture, about 15 percent in mining, and a like percentage in business and in miscellaneous types of manufacturing.

The foregoing situation must be kept in mind when the individual workers are classified on the basis of length of employment and amount of income. On the basis of employment alone, one-third of all persons who worked had their major employment in agriculture. But almost two-thirds of the workers in agriculture worked on the home farm only and received no pay. Their amount of farm work ordinarily was not great. Hence they do not appear at all in income tables and appear only at the low end of length-of-employment tabulations.

TABLE 9. INDUSTRY ENGAGED IN BY WORKERS IN THE UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA,
BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS, JULY, 1954.

SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS	TOTAL PERSONS OVER 14	TOTAL PERSONS EMPLOYED	INDUSTRY*									
			MINING	SAW- MILLS	OTHER MFG.	TRANSP. & SHIP- PING	GOVERN- MENT	AGRI- CULTURE	CONSTRU- TION	PROF. CLERICAL	BUSI- NESS	SERVICE WORK
All persons.....	2,287	1,309†	199	66	182	51	89	437	58	29	153	45
Heads.....												
Male.....	792	695	176	48	113	44	54	115	55	9	78	3
Female.....	83	26	..	..	2	..	7	10	..	..	1	6
Wives.....	730	254	1	..	18	1	16	171	..	8	24	15
Children.....	500	262	15	14	37	5	9	114	2	10	39	17
Sons.....	262	159	15	14	26	4	6	71	2	..	18	3
Daughters.....	238	103	..	..	11	1	3	43	..	10	21	14
Other persons.....	182	72	7	4	12	1	3	27	1	2	11	4
Male.....	76	45	7	4	12	1	1	13	1	1	5	..
Female.....	106	27	..	..	..	..	2	14	..	1	6	4

* The industrial and occupational classifications used in this report are adapted from the U. S. Census. The adaptations vary so as to present groupings that are the most meaningful. See Appendix for details of these classifications.

† Does not include 33 persons who did not give complete information as to industry.

The workers reported on had a wide variety of work experience and skill. Some operated businesses of their own, others were managers, superintendents, or foremen. Many more were skilled workers in the establishments in which they were employed (Table 10). Workers in the mines, for example, were sometimes skilled carpenters, mechanics, electricians, or engineers. Workers in other business or manufacturing establishments likewise often reported specialized skills and experience. Hence the residents of this area are not a group of farmers unfamiliar with the skills called for in present-day industrial operations. Ordinarily their skill in agriculture may be more limited than along nonfarm lines of work.

TABLE 10. SKILLED AND UNSKILLED WORKERS, BY INDUSTRY, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

INDUSTRY AND OCCUPATION	ALL WORKERS	OPERATOR MANAGER FOREMAN	CRAFTSMAN OR SKILLED WORKER	OTHER WORKER
	Number	Number	Number	Number
All workers	995	220	453	322
Agriculture	171	148		23*
Mining	191	8	90	93
Sawmilling	61	7	22	32
Other manufacturing	173	12	90	71
Transportation	49	7	31	11
Government	83	2	68	13
Construction	54		51	
Professional, clerical				
Medical	5		5	
Engineer	8		8	
Stenographer, typist, etc.	12		12	
Telephone operator	5		5	
Trade	110	36	68	6
Service work	43			43

* Data presented show farm operators and farm-wage workers only. They do not include 266 unpaid workers on farms. Unpaid workers along other lines are also omitted.

Employment and Underemployment of Workers in the Valley

Irregular and seasonal employment has been a problem in coal mining areas for many years. Development of mining operations has brought about a decrease in the number and size of farms.¹⁶ Students of this problem recommended 20 years ago that miners live on subsistence farms and that woodworking and other seasonal industries be established to offset the seasonality in coal mining employment.

¹⁶*Economic and Social Problems and Conditions of the Southern Appalachians* by the Bureau of Agr. Economics, Bureau of Home Economics and Forest Service, USDA, Miscellaneous Publication No. 205, January, 1935.

In areas with good agricultural resources, it is practical for mining and other industrial workers to supplement their nonfarm work by engaging in part-time farming. In many coal mining areas, however, poor soil and rugged terrain limit profitable agricultural operations.

The present situation may be more serious, however, than seasonal changes. If mechanization of mining operations continues, miners are likely to need more than supplementary employment in agriculture. Either new industries will have to be developed in the area or the workers will have to leave.

Underemployment in the Upper Monongahela Valley is by no means solely a mining or an industrial problem. Even the commercial farms in the Valley are in a somewhat marginal position. They compete with large, well-financed farms in the more fertile areas of the nation. Few of the Valley farmers are able to do this to advantage. They find it desirable to seek supplementary employment in order to have an adequate income. Since mining employment is undependable, a combination of farm and nonfarm work may still fall short of affording complete economic security unless new and more stable industries locate in the area.

METHOD OF ESTIMATING EMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT

As effort was made to ascertain how many days each person 14 years old and over had worked during the 12 months preceding the interview. In regard to hired farm or nonfarm employment, each respondent reported the number of days worked by each member of the household. Days of work on the home farm constituted a more difficult problem. Farmers had less identifiable bases on which to make a statement of days worked by each member of the household. Hence a special procedure was developed for estimating days of work on the home farm.

People who lived on acreages that qualify as farms under the Census definition were asked to give the number of acres in each crop grown, the number of all types of livestock, the types of machinery used, and the total amount of product for each of their enterprises.¹⁷ Each farm respondent was also asked to estimate what percentage of the total amount of work on the farm had been done by each member of the household. Data were available at West Virginia University on the amount of labor required for all farming operations in the State at different levels of technology. From these, total man-hour equivalents were computed for each farm covered in the survey. Total man hours for the enterprise were divided between the members of the household according to the percentage estimates made by the farmer. This procedure provided the

¹⁷Days of work on acreages that did not qualify as farms were not asked for. In only a few cases were these of any real importance.

number of days of farm work done by each member of the farm household during the previous year.

It is difficult to establish a norm for full or adequate employment as contrasted with underemployment. Such a norm would vary with the age and physical capacity of the worker. It would also vary with sex and status in the household. Underemployment is not entirely a matter of days worked but also exists when there is underutilization of a worker's skills and abilities, e.g. when a skilled engineer or electrician is regularly employed at digging ditches, washing cars, or other unskilled or semi-skilled work. Some studies have arbitrarily set 180 days as the norm for adequate employment.¹⁸ No such precise yardstick will be applied in this survey. The determination of underemployment is still quite rough and will be spoken of only in general terms. The schoolteacher teaching 170 days in the year probably is adequately employed as the term "full employment" is commonly used. Some small store and filling station operators with small numbers of customers appeared to be greatly underemployed even though they reported working 365 days in the year.

Farm operators were not given an opportunity to make a similar overstatement of the actual number of days worked. Their work-time was figured on the basis of the actual amount of time normally required to perform the operations on their farms. Hence a more reliable measure of the employment of farm people is provided than of operators of non-farm businesses.

TOTAL DAYS WORKED PER PERSON

Of the 2,287 persons 14 years old and over covered by the survey, 1,342, or 59 percent, had done some work during the previous 12 months (Table 11). This figure compares with the 43 percent previously mentioned who had reported some type of farm or nonfarm work as their major activity. Therefore, 16 percent of the workers were primarily housewives, students, or retired or disabled persons.

The number of nonworkers, 41 percent, runs above that for the nation generally but is not quite as high as in some of the surplus labor areas of the country.¹⁹ Direct comparison can be made with the data from surveys made in eastern Kentucky and southeastern Oklahoma.²⁰ The figures are as follows:

¹⁸ See *Rural Manpower in Eastern Kentucky* by Robert E. Galloway, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 627, June, 1955, and *A Study of Rural Manpower in Southeastern Oklahoma* by James D. Tarver, Oklahoma A & M College Technical Bull. T-56, Sept., 1955.

¹⁹ *Work Experience in 1955*, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-50 No. 65, Feb., 1956.

²⁰ *Study of Rural Manpower in Southeastern Oklahoma* by James D. Tarver, Oklahoma A & M College Technical Bull. T-56 and *Rural Manpower in Eastern Kentucky* by Robert E. Galloway, Kentucky Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 627.

TABLE 11. NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO WORKED A STATED NUMBER OF DAYS DURING THE PRECEDING 12 MONTHS, BY CHIEF ACTIVITY, SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

CHIEF ACTIVITY, SEX, AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS	TOTAL PERSONS	NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE WHO DO NOT WORK		NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED								AVERAGE DAYS WORKED*
		Number	%	Total	1-99 DAYS		100-199 DAYS		200 DAYS OR MORE			
					Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
All persons.....	2,278	945	41	1,342	523	39	279	21	540	40	154	
Mainly in labor force.....		2	1	146	61	42	43	29	42	29	139	
Farm operation.....	148	1	4	22	4	18	7	32	11	50	202	
Farm wage work.....	23	1	**	638	24	4	168	26	446	70	232	
Nonfarm wage work.....	641	3	5	50	2	4	10	20	38	76	258	
Nonfarm bus. & prof.....	53	3		8	6	75	2	25	...	**	69	
Armed forces.....	24	16	67	31	18	58	11	36	2	6	104	
Unpaid family work.....	35	4	11	41	35	85	6	15	...	...	66	
Looking for work.....	54	13	24									
Mainly not in the labor force.....		159	56	124	117	94	7	6	...	...	44	
Going to school.....	283	602	72	228	212	93	15	7	1	**	43	
Keeping house.....	830	67	72	19	14	74	5	26	...	...	70	
Retired.....	61	58	95	3	1	33	2	67	...	...	92	
Totally disabled.....	51	28	55	23	20	87	3	13	...	...	40	
Partially disabled.....		8	47	9	9	100	...	...	...	...	47	
Not employed and not looking.....	17											
Male.....	1,130	199	18	931	236	25	225	21	470	51	185	
Head.....	792	80	10	712	108	15	187	26	417	59	207	
Sons.....	262	92	35	170	110	65	25	15	35	20	101	
Other.....	76	27	35	49	18	37	13	26	18	37	158	
Female.....	1,157	746	64	411	287	70	54	13	70	17	92	
Head.....	83	57	69	26	15	58	4	15	7	27	117	
Wives.....	730	65	65	254	181	71	40	16	33	13	86	
Daughters.....	238	134	56	101	71	68	8	8	25	24	100	
Other.....	106	79	74	27	20	74	2	7	5	19	97	

* Average for those who worked only.
 ** Less than 0.5 percent.

Percentage in labor force who had no
remunerative work during the last
12 months.

	Upper Monon- gahela Valley	Eastern Kentucky	South- eastern Oklahoma	United States
All persons over 14	41	43	48	37
Male	18	°	20	14
Female	64	°	79	57

*11 percent of male heads of households had done no work.

Nonworkers included 10 percent of the heads of households, one-third of the other males in the households, and two-thirds of the females. Almost two-thirds of the nonworkers reported keeping house as their major activity during the year, 17 percent more were school youth, and 14 percent were retired or disabled people. Of the 34 other people in the survey group who had done no work during the previous 12 months, 16 had been in the armed forces for at least part of the year.

Forty-one percent of the people 14 years old and over had engaged in no remunerative employment during the year, and an additional 23 percent of them had worked for less than 100 days. Only one-third of the people 14 years old and over worked for as many as 100 days.

The small amount of employment of women is significant. Two-thirds of the women over 14 did no remunerative work during the year; an additional 25 percent worked for less than 100 days. Only 11 percent worked for 100 days or more during the year. These data indicate that there are relatively few employment outlets for women in the area.

The people who worked had an average of 154 days of work during the preceding year. Males averaged 185 days, and females, 92. The outstanding difference, other than that on the basis of sex, was between farm and non-farm workers. Farm workers worked for an average of only 139 days,²¹ and nonfarm wage workers averaged 232 days, and persons engaged in business or professional work 258 days. It is significant that people who were primarily farm-wage workers averaged considerably more employment than those who were mainly farm operators.²²

Unpaid family workers averaged 104 days of work. As in the case of farm-wage workers, this group does not include persons whose chief

²¹Note that the classification by chief activity drops out most workers who spent only a short period of time at a particular line of work. Hence only 148 of the 316 farm operators are reported in this classification. The remainder gave nonfarm employment, retired, disabled, etc. as their major activity. This also applies to farm-wage workers, nonfarm workers and other groups in the chief activity classification.

²²It should be noted that many temporary farm-wage workers were not included in the farm-wage work category because their main activity was that of student, housewife, etc. They, along with many of the unpaid family workers, were out of the labor force during most of the year.

activity was attending school, keeping house, retirement, or disability. Housewives and school youth averaged about 44 days of work, or about the time needed to help during the rush season on the farm. Disabled and retired people reported averages from 28 to 58 days, depending on their state of disability.

It is interesting that 41 percent of the male heads of households had less than 200 days of employment. These people ordinarily were breadwinners, and 200 days represent about the minimum length of employment that such a person can have and still fulfill his responsibilities to his family. In general, however, short-time workers were largely secondary workers in these households.

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT AS RELATED TO TYPE OF WORK AND TYPE OF WORKER

The persons who did some work during the previous 12 months were classified occupationally in two ways: (1) by their various combinations of farm and nonfarm work, and (2) by the particular industry or occupation at which they worked for the longest time. Total number of persons reported on the two classifications vary slightly because of a few of the workers had so little or such varied employment as not to be classifiable by industry. These were dropped from the industrial classification.

Persons who worked on the home farm only were least well employed (Table 12). They averaged 58 days of work during the preceding 12 months. Two-thirds of them worked for less than 50 days—only 8 percent worked more than 150 days. As will be shown in a subsequent table, the number of days worked was small largely because of the age and sex composition of this group of workers.

Employment at farm-wage work, when examined in terms of all farm-wage workers irrespective of their major activity, proves to be quite irregular. Those persons who did farm-wage work only had an average of 99 days of work during the year, and only one-fourth of them worked for more than 150 days.

Workers who combined work on the home farm with farm-wage work were also underemployed. They worked for an average of only 120 days. Only one-third of them worked for more than 150 days. Apparently these people were only marginal farm workers and did not have steady employment even with the additional work they obtained on other farms.

The length and regularity of employment varied markedly for nonfarm employment. Workers who engaged in nonfarm work only had an average of 198 days of work during the year. Those who combined farm operation with nonfarm employment averaged 232 days. And those who

TABLE 12. DAYS WORKED DURING THE PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS AS RELATED TO THE TYPE OF WORK DONE BY WORKERS IN UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

TYPE OF WORK DONE*	WORKERS REPORTED		PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED A STATED NUMBER OF DAYS						AVERAGE DAYS WORKED
			UNDER 50 DAYS	50-99	100-149	150-199	200-249	250 AND OVER	
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Days
All workers.	1,342	100	27	12	9	11	14	27	154
Home farm only	394	100	66	17	9	3	2	3	57
Farm wage work only	42	100	52	17	5	5	10	11	96
Nonfarm work only...	602	100	10	9	10	15	21	35	195
Home farm and farm wage work	39	100	29	35	2	12	8	11	117
Home farm and nonfarm work	211	100	3	4	10	14	19	50	226
Farm wage and nonfarm work	33	100	10	13	17	26	15	19	177
Home farm, farm wage, and nonfarm work	21	100	5	11	10	16	16	12	208
All industries†	1,309	100	27	12	9	11	14	27	154
Agriculture	437	100	63	19	8	4	2	1	63
Mining	199	100	2	8	15	23	28	21	196
Sawmilling	66	100	3	4	11	14	11	21	209
Other Manufacturing	182	100	9	6	7	15	19	41	208
Trans. and shipping	51	100	4		14	10	19	53	231
Government	89	100	3	2	5	35	13	42	218
Construction	58	100	7	8	12	12	21	40	203
Prof., clerical	29	100	7	10	4	10	21	48	216
Trade	153	100	11	13	8	1	8	53	202
Service work	45	100	12	27	7	9		15	98
Nonfarm industries	872	100	8	8	10	16	20	38	201

* During the 12 months preceding the interview.

† Major industry during the 12 months preceding the interview. Does not include 28 people who were not readily classifiable. Data include all employment, both farm and nonfarm.

combined farm operation with nonfarm work and in addition did some farm-wage work averaged 214 days. From one-half to over two-thirds of the people in these three groups worked for 200 days or more. Short-term workers were not numerous in this group. Only 10 percent worked for less than 50 days and 29 percent for less than 150 days.

Workers who combined nonfarm employment with farm-wage work ordinarily did not fare as well. They averaged only 178 days of employment, and only one-third worked for as many as 200 days. Probably workers who combine farm-wage work with nonfarm employment are a more marginal group than those who can spend full time at nonfarm work.

Furthermore, seasonal farm-wage work and nonfarm employment do not always dovetail smoothly.

When workers are classified by the industry at which they worked longest during the previous 12 months, the smaller amount of employment of those who engaged chiefly in agriculture stands out prominently. Such workers averaged only 63 days of work as compared to 200 for miners and an even larger number of days for other types of nonfarm workers. Only the service workers, with an average of 101 days, can be compared with people in agriculture. Yet the employment of these workers, largely women who worked at unskilled jobs on an irregular basis, was much greater than that of the farm workers.

It should be noted that these data are for total days of employment and do not necessarily mean, for example, that miners worked 200 days at mining. Some did a little subsistence farming on the side, others may have engaged in more than one type of nonfarm work.

EMPLOYMENT ON THE HOME FARM

There were 665 people who did some work on their home farms. Of these, 394 did no other work. The remainder either engaged in nonfarm work or were employed on other farms, or both. As indicated in Table 13, it was those people who had worked on the home farm only who had the shortest period of employment, 58 days, during the previous year.

The greater frequency of short-term employment among workers in agriculture was partly due to the larger proportion of the workers on farms who were women, children, or old persons. The higher proportion can be presented as follows:

	Nonfarm workers	All workers on home farm	Worked on home farm only
Percentage of workers who were women	19	39	60
Percentage of workers who were youth—14-24 yrs. old	15	20	21
Percentage of workers who were aged—65 yrs. old and over	4	16	24
Percentage of workers who were able-bodied adults—24 to 64 yrs. old	81	64	60
Percentage of workers who were able-bodied males—(adult) 24 to 64 yrs. old	67	36	12

Yet this factor accounts for only part of the difference. Adult male workers on farms worked substantially less than those who were employed

TABLE 13. DAYS OF WORK ON THE HOME FARM BY (1) THOSE WHO WORKED ON THE FARM ONLY, AND (2) ALL PERSONS WHO DID SOME WORK ON THE HOME FARM, BY AGE AND SEX, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

AGE AND SEX	NUMBER WORKERS REPORT- ING	PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED A STATED NUMBER OF DAYS					AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS WORKED
		UNDER 50	50-99	100-149	150-199	200 AND OVER	
Worked on home farm only.....	394	66	17	9	3	5	58
Male							
14-24.....	46	78	15	5	2	..	40
25-64.....	49	20	16	29	12	23	130
65 and over.....	63	38	32	14	8	8	85
Female							
14-24.....	36	92	8	..	..	..	29
25-64.....	167	79	14	5	1	1	39
65 and over.....	33	76	21	3	..	..	39
All workers on home farm.....	665	62	20	10	4	4	61*
Male							
14-24.....	91	79	13	5	2	1	42
25-64.....	239	42	26	17	7	8	85
65 and over.....	77	38	31	14	6	11	87
Female							
14-24.....	40	90	10	..	..	..	30
25-64.....	186	79	14	5	1	1	40
65 and over.....	32	81	16	3	..	..	36

* Days of work on the home farm only.

in nonfarm occupations. The percentage of male workers 24 to 64 years old who had given amounts of employment are as follows:

Days worked	Nonfarm work only Percent	Work on home farm only Percent
Under 100	13	36
100-149	13	29
150-199	16	12
200 and over	58	13

The average number of days worked by the nonfarm males 25 to 64 years old was 205, whereas those who worked only on the home farm averaged 130. This constitutes an average difference of 75 days or almost 3 months

per worker. A comparison can be made for the other age and sex groups in terms of average days worked as follows:

	Average number of days worked	
	Work on home farm only	Nonfarm work only
Males 14-24 years old	40	136
Males 25-64 years old	130	205
Males 65 and over	85	145
Females 14-24 years old	29	146
Females 25-64 years old	39	178
Females 65 years old or over	39	42

FARM-WAGE WORK

Farm-wage work was a relatively unimportant source of employment in this area. It served as a supplementary source of income, but only a few people reported it as their major type of work. A total of 184 people had done some farm work for wages during the previous year, but of those, only 42 gave it as their sole employment (Table 14). Half of the 42 persons were less than 25 years old. Evidently young people use farm-wage work as a stepping stone to other types of employment.

In terms of length of employment, farm-wage workers were of two distinct types. Two-thirds were short-term or seasonal workers who worked for 50 days or less. Another group were regular farm workers who were employed for 150 days or longer. A few of these worked on dairy or livestock farms and had continuous employment during the year.

NONFARM EMPLOYMENT

Of the 877 persons who engaged in nonfarm employment, almost 70 percent did no agricultural work either on the home place or as hired farm workers. Most of the remainder did some work on the home place, and a few engaged in hired farm employment for part of the year. Although the amount of farm work done by these people was not large, it served as a significant supplement to their other employment. It increased the total average days of employment for the nonfarm workers by 15 days, from 186 to 201. Attention will first be given to the number of days of nonfarm work, then to total days of work by the same group of workers.

As indicated in the discussion on work on the home farm, the non-farm workers were largely adult males. The adult males averaged 202 days of nonfarm work, but 26 percent of them worked for less than 150 days (Table 15). Workers under 25 years of age and over 64 were much more irregular in their employment. More than half of them worked for less than 150 days.

TABLE 14. DAYS OF WORK AT FARM-WAGE WORK DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS BY (1) WORKERS WHO DID FARM-WAGE WORK ONLY AND (2) BY ALL WORKERS WHO DID ANY FARM WORK, BY AGE AND SEX, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

AGE AND SEX	NUMBER WORKERS REPORT- ING	PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED A STATED NUMBER OF DAYS						AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OF WORK
		UNDER 50	50-99	100-199	150-199	200-249	250 AND OVER	
	Workers	%	%	%	%	%	%	Days
Workers who did farm wage work only	42	50	19	5	5	12	9	97
Male								
14-24	20	55	35	10				16
25-64	14	29	7		14	28	21	179
65 and over	4	50				25	25	139
Female	4	100						21
All farm wage workers	134	66	13	6	5	4	6	69
Male								
14-24	55	73	18	5	4			45
25-64	63	57	11	8	8	7	9	90
65 and over	11	73				9	18	93
Female	5	100						25

Only 42 percent of the miners and only 40 percent of those employed by public agencies worked for 200 days or more. In contrast, over two-thirds of the workers in transportation and shipping and in professional, technical, and clerical work were employed for 200 days or more.

Probably it is total employment of these workers rather than merely their nonfarm work that is important. At least it will provide a better picture of underemployment. The additional amount of employment afforded by farm work varied from one industry to another. The average number of days added was as follows:

Mining	19 days	Construction	15 days
Sawmilling	25 days	Prof., Clerical	0 days
Other mfg.	8 days	Business	7 days
Trans. & shipping	8 days	Service work	3 days
Government	24 days		

More than half the nonfarm workers were employed for a total of 200 days or longer. Workers with less than 200 days employment included 84 percent of the service workers, 59 percent of the public employees.

TABLE 15. LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT AT NONFARM WORK DURING THE PRECEDING 12 MONTHS, BY AGE, SEX, AND INDUSTRY, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

AGE, SEX AND INDUSTRY	TOTAL PERSONS REPORTED ON		PERCENTAGE WHO WORKED A STATED NUMBER OF DAYS AT NONFARM WORK				AVERAGE DAYS WORKED AT NONFARM WORK
			UNDER 100	100-149	150-199	200 AND OVER	
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	Days
All workers.....	877	100	21	12	16	51	186
Age and sex							
Male.....	707	100	17	14	15	54	191
14-24.....	88	100	45	10	13	32	134
25-64.....	587	100	13	13	16	58	202
65 and over.....	32	100	35	28	6	31	144
Female.....	170	100	35	6	21	38	164
14-24.....	47	100	49	6	4	41	144
25-64.....	120	100	28	7	27	38	174
65 and over.....	3	100	100	..	..	..	42
Industry							
Mining.....	204	100	14	19	25	42	177
Sawmilling.....	66	100	14	14	14	58	184
Other manufacturing.....	182	100	18	10	14	58	196
Trans. and shipping.....	51	100	8	14	10	68	223
Government.....	89	100	12	9	39	40	194
Construction.....	58	100	23	16	10	51	188
Prof., clerical.....	29	100	17	4	10	69	216
Trade.....	153	100	29	9	4	58	195
Service work.....	45	100	70	5	9	16	95

and 58 percent of the miners (Table 16). It included less than one-third of the workers in transportation and shipping, and professional, technical, and clerical work.

Thirty-eight of the 45 people who engaged in service work had less than 200 days of work. They were largely women, and only one-fifth were heads of households. Yet their work was so irregular as to suggest that there was considerable underemployment among them.

For employees in mines the evidence of underemployment is more positive. Among the 96 workers who were employed for less than 200 days, 82 were heads of households. Half of these had worked for less than 150 days. Employment in other types of industry besides mining was also somewhat irregular but did not affect quite as high a proportion of heads of households.

TABLE 16. NUMBER OF NONFARM WORKERS WITH LIMITED EMPLOYMENT DURING THE PRECEDING 12 MONTHS, BY INDUSTRY AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

INDUSTRY	TOTAL NONFARM WORKERS IN SURVEY	WORKERS WITH		HEADS OF HOUSE- HOLDS WITH		WORKERS WITH
		LESS THAN 200 DAYS OF TOTAL EMPLOY- MENT	LESS THAN 100 DAYS OF TOTAL EMPLOY- MENT	LESS THAN 200 DAYS OF TOTAL EMPLOY- MENT	LESS THAN 100 DAYS OF TOTAL EMPLOY- MENT	LESS THAN 200 DAYS OF NONFARM WORK
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
All workers.....	877	368	145	204	51	428
Mining.....	204	96	20	82	15	119
Sawmilling.....	66	21	5	12	1	27
Other manufacturing.....	182	67	27	37	14	75
Trans. and shipping.....	51	14	2	11	1	16
Government.....	80	40	5	17		53
Construction.....	58	23	9	20	6	28
Prof., clerical.....	29	9	5	1		9
Trade.....	153	60	41	16	8	63
Service work.....	45	38	31	8	6	38

Incomes of Households and of Workers in the Valley

Although incomes of the open-country people in the Upper Monongahela Valley were modest, they came from a wide variety of sources. In the typical household the major source of income was the earnings of the head of the household from nonfarm employment. In about one-third of the households a second nonfarm worker also added to the family revenue. About half the households supplemented their incomes by some agricultural production.²³ These activities usually were the production of milk, eggs, and vegetables for home consumption. A majority of the households had income from nonwork sources.²⁴ Frequently this was in the form of rents, or royalties or other returns from coal mining, but equally common were payments from social security, unemployment insurance, retirement funds, or some other type of group benefit. Only a few households had income from hired farm work.

The income situation of households engaged in agriculture on a commercial basis did not vary greatly from the foregoing pattern. Only

²³Value of farm products have been added into total household income only when the acreage lived on qualified as a "farm," i.e., when \$150 worth of products was produced on places of 3 acres or more or \$150 worth of produce was sold on places of less than 3 acres. Hence the number of households with some agricultural products is larger than the data indicate.

²⁴Miscellaneous returns to a household, such as rent, interest, public assistance, social security, etc., proved to be a most significant source of household support and have been lumped together for want of a better term under the heading "Nonwork Income." Households dependent primarily on this type of support have been labeled "Nonwork Households."

40 of the 73 commercial farm households depended on farming alone. The rest, along with the 226 households on part-time and residential farms, had incomes from nonfarm sources.

The households were classified by chief source of income, and only 75, or 8.6 percent, received more income from agriculture than from other sources. A total of 170 households, or 19 percent, had mining as their chief source, and another 19 percent, manufacturing (Table 17). Over 20 percent received their major income from nonwork sources.

Of the households with farming as their chief sources of income, approximately two-thirds had total incomes of less than \$1,000. Only 12 of the 75 households of this type had incomes of over \$2,000.

A rather comparable situation existed among the nonwork households. More than half of them had incomes of less than \$1,000. Only 30 of the 178 households of this type had incomes of over \$2,000.

Households in these two groups—farming and nonwork—account for most of the low income households in the area (151 out of 201 households with incomes under \$1,000). A total of 10 mining, 9 manufacturing, and 3 business households, and 28 households with incomes from miscellaneous sources were also in the under-\$1,000 group.

Only 93, or 11 percent, of the households had incomes of more than \$5,000. All but 5 of these households had their chief source of income from nonfarm work.

The aggregate income of the 875 sample households in the Valley during the preceding 12 months amounted to somewhat more than \$2,000,000. It can be subdivided between major sources as follows:

	Number of Households Reporting	Total Income	Average per Household Reporting	Average For All Households
Home farm income	313	\$ 87,797	\$ 290	\$ 100
Farm wage work	109	33,972	312	39
Nonfarm work	656	1,888,162	2,878	2,158
Nonwork sources	505	331,160	656	378
All households		2,341,091		2,675

Income from agriculture, including both work on the home farm and that received in the form of wages for labor, amounted to less than 6 percent of the total. Income from operation of the home farm alone amounted to slightly more than 4 percent. These small percentages are partially due to a poor crop year in 1953 when yields were cut down by a shortage of rainfall. Surprisingly, income from nonwork sources, 14 percent of the total, was much greater than that from agricultural sources.

The fact that these people received 94 percent of their incomes from nonfarm sources indicates their great dependence on industrial prosperity.

TABLE 17. INCOME ANALYSIS OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

HOUSEHOLD INCOME GROUP	HOUSEHOLDS BY CHIEF SOURCE OF INCOME									
	TOTAL Households Reporting	Farming	NONFARM WORK					None- Work	OTHER* AND NO Report	AVERAGE Income Per Household
			Mining	Mfg.	Bus. & Prof.	Other				
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Under \$500	88	28	2	2	2	1	48	2	260	
500-1,000	113	22	8	7	1	9	53	13	692	
1,000-1,500	151	12	30	34	7	18	17	6	1,508	
2,000-2,500	192	7	45	57	16	13	18	6	2,116	
3,000-3,500	119	1	35	27	29	38	8	8	3,372	
4,000-4,500	86	1	30	21	13	18	1	3	4,275	
5,000-5,500	39		11	8	5	11	1	1	5,126	
6,000-6,500	14		1	2	2	5	1		6,317	
7,000 and over	40	1	5	11	6	9	3	5	8,839	
TOTAL	875	75	170	169	81	155	178	17	2,675	

* Includes households with several approximately equal sources of income which made it impossible to classify by chief source.

Agriculture serves as an income supplement and helps to reduce living costs, but for most families it does not provide a major cushion against industrial adversity. Unemployment benefits, royalties, interest, social security payments, and other types of nonwork income provide the greatest assistance in the event of loss of jobs or other industrial mishaps.

Income from nonwork sources is second in importance to income from nonfarm wages and salaries. The number of households drawing the major types of nonwork income is shown in Table 18. The figures indicate that about half of the farm operator families received either rent, royalties, or interest payments. Ordinarily they were not recipients of social security, unemployment insurance, retirement or other types of public or group payments. Royalty payments to farmers by mining companies that had leased their mineral rights were quite common but usually were small.

The extent to which the incomes of mining, manufacturing, and other non-farm households, except the business and professional, were buttressed by unemployment insurance benefits is most significant. Almost one-third (31 percent) of the miners' households and 28 percent of those of workers engaged in manufacturing had received this type of income supplement. Many of these households also received income from social security, workmen's compensation, and retirement funds.

Households in which nonwork incomes were the largest source of funds frequently received more than one type of nonwork income; 277 different sources were reported for 178 households in this group. Social security payments or retirement funds were mentioned most frequently. Approximately one-third of these households reported receiving income from either one or the other. A somewhat smaller proportion received funds from state relief or from interest payments.

Nonwork income served in many households as a supplement to other sources of revenue. Nonwork incomes, however, were usually low, and were responsible along with agriculture for the low level of incomes in the Valley.

A comparison of the households in regard to type of farm and sources of income provides a more exact idea of which households are in a marginal economic position. In such a comparison, residents on commercial farms show up largely in the under \$1,000 and \$1,000-2,000 income groups (Table 19). Households on part-time farms were in a much better position, due largely to their earnings from nonfarm sources.²⁵ Two-thirds of them were in the group receiving from \$1,000 to \$4,000. Most of the other third received over \$4,000. Households on residential farms were

²⁵The classification into commercial, part-time, and residential farms is that used in the 1950 Census. For a definition of each type see Appendix.

TABLE 18. NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS WHICH RECEIVED DESIGNATED TYPES OF NONWORK INCOME, BY CHIEF SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

CHIEF SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOMES		NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH A GIVEN TYPE OF NONWORK INCOME*									
Total Households of Source of Income	No.	RENT AND ROYALTY	INTEREST	UNEMPLOYED INS.	SOCIAL SECURITY	WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	STATE RELIEF	RETIREMENT FUNDS	CHILDREN'S AID	Other	
		No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Farm operation	57	8	26	..	..	1	..	2	1	1	
Farm labor	18	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Mining	170	10	8	53	18	5	1	4	1	3	
Manufacturing	169	13	11	47	13	8	4	10	2	8	
Business & Prof	81	11	9	8	5	2	..	6	..	6	
Other nonfarm	155	13	16	25	6	3	..	8	2	6	
Nonwork	178	21	41	18	61	1	41	56	12	17	
Other†	47	7	12	7	5	1	2	5	3	4	
TOTAL	875	86	126	159	111	24	51	91	21	45	
Percent of all households	100	10	14	18	13	2	6	10	2	5	

* Some households had more than one type of nonwork income; others had none; hence no effort has been made to compile household totals.
† Households which could not be classified in one specific income group.

TABLE 19. PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH INCOMES OF STATED AMOUNTS, BY RESIDENCE, INCOME SOURCE, INDUSTRY GROUP, AND LEVEL OF LIVING, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD	TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS REPORTING		PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH INCOME							
			UNDER \$1,000	1,000-1,999	2,000-2,999	3,000-3,999	4,000-4,999	5,000-5,999	6,000-6,999	7,000 & OVER
	Number	Pct.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All households.....	875	100	22	18	21	17	10	6	4	2
By residence*										
Nonfarm.....	559	100	20	17	22	17	10	6	4	4
Farm.....	299	100	24	19	21	16	10	6	4	..
Commercial.....	73	100	45	19	15	6	6	4	5	..
Part-time.....	68	100	6	26	18	21	10	10	9	..
Residential.....	158	100	24	16	25	18	11	5	1	..
By income type**										
Agriculture only.....	40	100	77	8	8	5	2	..	..	..
Nonfarm work only.....	355	100	6	12	27	27	15	9	4	..
Nonwork only.....	123	100	68	22	7	2	..	1	..	..
Agriculture nonfarm work										
Mainly agriculture.....	35	100	54	26	11	6	..	..	3	..
Mainly nonfarm work.....	81	100	19	37	21	10	7	2	4	..
Nonfarm work-non-work										
Mainly nonfarm work.....	174	100	7	16	30	16	13	8	10	..
Mainly nonwork.....	29	100	28	38	17	10	..	..	7	..
Other†.....	38	100	5	8	3	13	13	..	..	58
By chief income source										
Agriculture.....	75	100	68	15	10	5	..	..	2	..
Mining.....	170	100	6	18	26	20	18	9	3	..
Manufacturing.....	169	100	5	20	34	16	12	6	7	..
Business & prof.....	81	100	3	9	20	36	16	9	7	..
Other nonfarm work.....	155	100	8	12	28	24	12	10	6	..
Nonwork.....	178	100	57	26	10	4	..	1	2	..
Other†.....	47	100	10	15	2	11	11	2	2	47
By level of living††										
High.....	275	100	6	11	19	22	17	12	10	3
Medium.....	344	100	21	18	24	20	9	5	2	1
Low.....	256	100	40	24	20	7	3	1	1	4

* 17 households not reported on by residence. For definition of the various types of farms see Appendix.

** As between farm, nonfarm, and nonwork sources.

† Income from 2 or more almost-equal sources.

†† See page 23 for discussion of level of living.

in an intermediate position; 40 percent had incomes of less than \$2,000; another 40 percent had incomes of \$2,000 to \$4,000.

If the households are divided into three major groups according to source of income, close association between agriculture and low income becomes quite evident. Three-fourths of the households that relied entirely on farming for a livelihood had incomes of less than \$1,000. By comparison, only 6 percent of the households that depended on nonfarm

work had incomes of less than \$1,000; 70 percent had incomes from \$2,000 to \$5,000. Nonwork households were in an income position similar to that of farm households.²⁶ Households with incomes partly from farming and partly from nonfarm sources were not as well off as those who had income from nonfarm work only. It was members of households with modest farm or nonfarm incomes who most frequently relied on income from both sources.

Incomes of miners' households ranged only slightly below those for nonfarm homes generally. Business and professional households had some income advantage but their incomes were also quite modest. More than half of them were in the range of \$2,000 to \$4,000.

There was a high correlation between size of income and level of living. Two-thirds of the people with a low level of living had incomes of less than \$2,000 as compared to one-sixth of those with high levels of living. Level of living as measured in this survey was based on the possession of such items as electric lights, refrigerator, electric washing machine, automobile, and telephone.²⁷

It has already been noted that marginal agricultural enterprises together with limited nonwork sources of income accounted for a large proportion of the low incomes among the households in the Valley. A related factor is that low-income households averaged consistently smaller in size and had fewer members with work incomes than those in a more fortunate financial position (Table 20). Households at the bottom of the income scale averaged only 2.3 persons and had only .3 persons with work income; that is, only 1 out of 3 had a person who had farm or non-farm earnings. Those at the top averaged 5.1 persons and had an average of 2.2 breadwinners.

The comparison is not entirely perfect because all earnings in farm households were ascribed to the head of the household rather than being divided among all the members who did any farmwork. However, the low-income households were generally so small that there were few potential workers in them. Many consisted only of 1 or 2 aged persons. Many of these people were subsisting entirely on retirement funds, social security payments, or similar income. On the other hand, some of the newly established households of two or three persons were also at the low end of the employment and income scale.

INDIVIDUAL EARNINGS

It is difficult to present incomes for all persons in the area on an individual basis. Incomes of farm households might be divided between workers in the farm household on the same basis that was used to allot

²⁶See Appendix for definition of nonwork households.

²⁷See page 18 for complete list of items used in level-of-living index.

TABLE 20. SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD AND NUMBER OF WORKERS PER HOUSEHOLD
BY INCOME GROUPS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY,
WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

INCOME GROUP	HOUSE- HOLDS IN EACH INCOME GROUP	PERCENT- AGE OF ALL HOUSE- HOLDS	AVERAGE PERSONS PER HOUSE- HOLD	AVERAGE BREAD- WINNERS PER HOUSE- HOLD
	Number	Percent	Number	Number
All households.....	875	100	3.9	1.1
Up to \$500.....	88	10	2.3	.3
500-999.....	113	12	3.2	.5
1,000-1,999.....	154	18	4.1	1.0
2,000-2,999.....	192	22	4.0	1.2
3,000-3,999.....	149	17	4.2	1.3
4,000-4,999.....	86	10	4.7	1.5
5,000-5,999.....	39	4	4.3	1.6
6,000-6,999.....	14	2	4.1	1.6
7,000 and over.....	40	5	5.1	2.2

the hours of work. However, this procedure would still not provide an accurate picture because income from nonwork sources was also obtained on a household rather than an individual basis, making two types of income that are not subject to division between individuals. Some broad averages can be presented, however, which will convey an impression of comparative individual earnings at farm and nonfarm employment. These are as follows:

	Total persons	Average earnings²⁸	Average earn- ings per day
Work on home farm	665	\$ 132	\$ 2.25
Farm wage work	131	259	4.21
Nonfarm work	855	2,206	11.85 ²⁹

This comparison is affected by the fact that two-thirds of the workers on the home farm were women, youth, or old people, as compared to only one-third of those in nonfarm employment. However, the difference in returns is so great that the tendency of workers to leave farming and go into nonfarm employment can easily be understood. The movement

²⁸Total earnings from each type of work divided by total number of persons, paid and unpaid, who did any work of that type.

²⁹These figures compare with 1954 data for West Virginia in regard to earnings of coal miners and other nonfarm workers as follows:

	<i>Coal Mining</i>	<i>Manufacturing</i>
Earnings per hour.....	\$ 2.51	\$ 1.83
Earnings per week.....	91.87	70.64

Data from *Annual Average Hours and Earnings of Production Workers in Manufacturing and Bituminous Coal Mining in West Virginia*, West Virginia Department of Employment Security, in Cooperation with U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

would probably be even heavier if adequate opportunities for nonfarm employment were available.

Sex, age, and household status were important factors in the level of earnings of these people. Earnings of young men and of those over 65 were far below those of males in the more productive age group (Table 21). More than half of them were in the group earning less than \$1,000, as compared to only 11 percent of the males 25 to 64 years old. More than half of the productive-age males were in the \$2,000 to \$4,000 income brackets and 20 percent more made over \$4,000. Age differences were even more important in the case of female workers; 60 percent of the young women (under 24) were in the under-\$1,000 group as compared to 47 percent of the young men.

Differences in income on the basis of household status are also important. Two-thirds of the male heads of households earned more than \$2,000 as compared to 60 percent of the other adult males and only 25 percent of the sons. Very few male heads of households earned less than \$1,000, but more than 50 percent of the working sons did so. About half of the female workers had earnings of less than \$1,000. Surprisingly, female heads of households had lower earnings than the wives who worked. Twenty-eight percent of the wives earned more than \$2,000 as compared to only 12 percent of the female heads.

Work Experience, 1946-1954

Although the workers in the survey had their homes in the open county, 80 percent had done some nonfarm work during the preceding 8 years. The experience of about half this group had been largely along industrial lines; for the others it was largely in business, government employment, or transportation and shipping. Most of these workers, therefore, differ from the hillside farmers who live in some mountainous rural areas. Most of them are skilled or semiskilled workers with some proficiency along industrial lines.

All respondents were asked to indicate whether they or any members of their households had engaged in any nonfarm work between 1946 and the date of the interview. For persons who had done such work, data were obtained on specific years of employment and the type of nonfarm work they had done for the longest time. A total of 1,049 persons reported some nonfarm work experience. In general, those engaged in nonfarm employment at the time of the interview were also those who had a background of nonfarm work. Approximately one-fifth of those with nonfarm experience were unemployed, disabled, or retired at the time of the interview.

TABLE 2L. PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUALS WHO EARNED SPECIFIED AMOUNTS AT NONFARM WORK DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS, BY SEX, AGE, AND FAMILY STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

SEX, AGE, AND FAMILY STATUS		TOTAL PERSONS OVER 14		TOTAL PERSONS WITH NONFARM EARNINGS		PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WITH NONFARM EARNINGS WHO MADE							
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	\$100- 499	500- 999	1,000- 1,999	2,000- 2,999	3,000- 3,999	4,000- 4,999	5,000 & OVER	
						Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	
All workers													
Male		1,130	100	689	100	10	9	20	24	21	10	6	
14-24		263	80	100	36	19	26	14	14	5	..	..	
25-64		694	577	100	5	6	19	27	27	24	12	7	
65 and over		173	32	100	35	22	19	9	9	6	3	6	
Female		1,157	166	100	37	14	14	25	14	10	..	..	
14-24		266	44	100	45	16	16	32	7	..	..	..	
25-64		737	119	100	33	14	14	23	17	13	..	..	
65 and over		154	3	100	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Male		1,130	689	100	10	9	20	24	24	21	10	6	
Heads		792	573	100	6	8	19	19	25	23	11	8	
Sons		262	84	100	38	14	23	14	10	1	1	..	
Other males		76	32	100	6	15	15	19	34	13	13	..	
Female		1,157	166	100	37	14	14	25	14	10	..	..	
Heads		83	16	100	50	13	13	25	6	6	..	..	
Wives		730	80	100	31	15	26	25	13	15	..	..	
Daughters		238	10	100	50	10	30	10	10	..	..	..	
Other		106	2	100	..	..	50	..	50	..	..	..	

It had been anticipated that the study would show that the number engaged in nonfarm employment would (1) gradually increase from 1946 on as additional young people entered the labor force, and (2) vary noticeably with general economic and employment conditions in the area. In general these expectations were borne out. The number engaged in nonfarm work reached a peak in 1953 when 855 people were engaged in this type of employment, an increase of almost one-fourth over 1946 (Table 22). Almost all of this increase occurred from 1946 to 1947 and from 1952 to 1953. Presumably the gain in the years from 1946 to 1947 was associated with the return of servicemen to civilian employment after World War II, and the second gain with the industrial upswing that accompanied the Korean conflict.

TABLE 22. NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO ENGAGED IN NONFARM WORK, 1946-1954, BY SEX, HOUSEHOLD STATUS, AND RESIDENCE, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

GROUP	PERSONS ENGAGED IN NONFARM WORK BY YEARS								
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
All workers.....	No. 697	No. 738	No. 742	No. 756	No. 758	No. 777	No. 787	No. 855	No. 816
By sex & household status									
Males.....	615	641	645	653	650	658	654	693	659
Heads.....	573	593	592	594	590	590	581	585	552
Sons.....	18	23	27	34	35	41	46	77	77
Other.....	24	25	26	25	25	27	27	31	30
Females.....	82	97	97	103	108	119	133	162	157
Heads.....	9	11	9	11	11	9	12	13	16
Wives.....	54	63	63	64	63	69	74	83	77
Daughters.....	16	20	20	23	27	33	37	54	54
Other.....	3	3	5	5	7	8	10	12	10
Residence (1954).....	697	738	742	756	758	777	787	855	816
Nonfarm.....	466	500	502	511	507	524	529	570	546
Farm.....	231	238	240	245	251	253	258	285	270

By 1954 the number in nonfarm employment had dropped from 855 to 816. This decrease reflects the growing unemployment in coal mining and other industries in the area.

When the employment records of these people are classified according to status in the household, we find that male heads of households ordinarily have a long record of nonfarm employment and other members have done nonfarm work for a much shorter period of time. The number of male heads of households who were employed at nonfarm work did not change much from 1946 to 1953, but then dropped by 5 percent from

1953 to 1954. By way of contrast, only 18 of the sons in the reporting households were employed at nonfarm work in 1946, whereas 77 were employed in both 1953 and 1954. The increase in employment of these people was rather gradual except for a very pronounced rise between 1952 and 1953.

The number of wives who worked increased by about 50 percent during the 1946 to 1953 period and decreased about 5 percent from 1953 to 1954. These changes were almost entirely among wives from nonfarm households.

Only 15 daughters were employed in 1946, but there was a gradual increase in the ensuing years and a big upswing from 1952 to 1953. By that time 54 were employed at some type of nonfarm work. The same number were employed in 1954.

Apparently 1953 afforded exceptional opportunities for young people to enter into employment. Then in 1954 when employment was cut back it was the older workers, both men and women, who were dropped.

The major nonfarm experience of one-fourth of these workers was in coal mining; for an equal proportion it was in sawmilling and miscellaneous types of manufacturing (Table 23). One of 6 workers had some experience in retail or wholesale business. Others had a background of work in transportation, public service, or skilled craftsmanship.

At the time of the survey, approximately one-third of the workers who had nonfarm experience were living on farms. The others had not

TABLE 23. NONFARM INDUSTRY WORKED IN FOR THE LONGEST TIME, 1946-1954, BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS AND RESIDENCE, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

INDUSTRY	TOTAL PERSONS REPORTING	WORKERS BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS				WORKERS BY RESIDENCE (1954)	
		HEADS	WIVES	CHILDREN	OTHER	FARM	NONFARM
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
All workers.....	1,034*	663	131	186	54	343	691
Mining.....	255	207	1	32	15	78	177
Sawmilling.....	83	60	..	17	6	32	51
Other manufacturing.....	189	115	24	44	6	69	120
Trans. & shipping.....	74	61	2	7	4	22	52
Government.....	96	63	21	9	3	46	50
Construction.....	61	59	..	1	1	16	45
Prof. & clerical.....	39	9	19	9	2	7	32
Trade.....	183	76	44	51	12	62	121
Service work.....	54	13	20	16	5	11	43

* 15 people omitted because of incomplete data.

carried on sufficient agricultural production to be classified as living on farms. A higher proportion of government employees rated as farmers than those in any other occupational group.

Youth Who Have Left Home

When local employment opportunities are inadequate, many young people find it necessary to leave home in order to become self-supporting. Movement of young people from West Virginia to commercial and industrial centers in adjacent states has almost become traditional. An attempt to examine this was made by asking the persons contacted in the field survey to report on all persons who had left their households during the previous 5 years; that is, since the close of World War II. These reports were limited to members of the immediate family, as adequate information was generally lacking in regard to other persons.

Analysis of these reports was somewhat complicated by the varied situations typical of persons who leave home. On one hand are the young women who leave to get married and go into housekeeping for themselves. Then there are the sons who marry and leave home but who merely change their domicile and not their employment. A third typical group is made up of those who enter the armed forces. It is a fourth group that is of the greatest interest for this study; namely, those who leave home to find employment.

Members of two of these groups can be identified rather easily. Slightly more than half of the young women went into housekeeping when they left home and almost one-third of the young men went into the armed forces. Members of the other two groups are difficult to separate, but since almost two-thirds of the young men went outside their home county, the number that went to new jobs evidently was quite high.

Young men and young women were about equally numerous in the total of 401 persons who left during the 8-year period (Table 24). Movement was somewhat greater from farm than from nonfarm households. One person had left from each 1.8 farm households during this period as compared to 1 per 2.5 nonfarm households. This difference is on the basis of farm or nonfarm residence only. It is further accentuated when the households are classified by their major source of income. The rate of departure from agricultural households, including both farm operation and farm labor, was 1 person per 1.5 households; mining, 1 person per 2.2 households; manufacturing, 1 person per 2.3 households; and other nonfarm, 1 person per 2.9 households. Other types of households, largely those with nonwork incomes but including some that had incomes from a variety of sources, had a departure rate of 1 person per 2 households.

TABLE 24. PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS BY YEAR, SEX, RESIDENCE, AND TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

YEAR LEFT HOME	ALL PERSONS REPORTED	SEX		HOUSEHOLD RESIDENCE		MAJOR SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
		MALE	FEMALE	FARM	NONFARM	AGRI-CULTURE	MINING	MAN-UFACTURING	OTHER NONFARM	OTHER*
		Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
1946.....	24	15	9	12	12	3	2	2	8	9
1947.....	34	17	17	10	24	5	9	5	5	10
1948.....	33	18	15	16	17	7	8	5	4	9
1949.....	38	19	19	10	28	3	4	9	7	15
1950.....	54	25	29	19	35	4	8	12	10	20
1951.....	49	20	29	22	27	6	12	11	6	14
1952.....	58	30	28	28	30	8	13	10	13	14
1953.....	63	29	34	32	31	11	14	14	15	9
1954.....	42	23	19	25	17	3	9	6	14	19
Total.....	395†	196	199	174	221	50	79	74	82	110

* Largely households with nonwork income but also includes households with incomes from diverse sources.

† 6 persons who left did not supply complete information and have been omitted from this table.

MAJOR ACTIVITY BEFORE LEAVING, AFTER LEAVING, AND AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

Although the departure rate was highest in farm households, very few of the youth had engaged in farm operation or hired farm work as their major activity before leaving home (Table 25). A large proportion had shifted over to nonfarm employment while still at home. More than half of the young men and almost one-third of the young women were doing some type of nonfarm work at the time they left. School attendance was their next most common activity. Almost half of the young women had been in school just before leaving (39 percent) as compared to one-fifth of the young men. Unpaid family work was also particularly common among the young women; 26 percent had been engaged in it or in keeping house as compared to 8 percent of the young men. A higher percentage of the young men were reported as being unemployed.

TABLE 25. MAJOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS, (1) BEFORE LEAVING, (2) AFTER LEAVING, AND (3) AT THE PRESENT TIME, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MAJOR ACTIVITY OF YOUTH LEAVING HOME	MALES			FEMALES		
	YEAR BEFORE LEFT HOME	AFTER LEAVING	AT TIME OF SURVEY	YEAR BEFORE LEFT HOME	AFTER LEAVIN	AT TIME OF SURVEY
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Farm operation.....	2	3	3			
Unpaid family work.....	16			14		
Farm wage work.....	9	2	2	5	1	1
Nonfarm work.....	105	110	105	62	82	61
Coal mining.....	24	16	15			
Other nonfarm.....	81	94	90	62	82	61
Student.....	40	3	3	80	15	13
Keeping house.....				39	101	126
Unemployed.....	13	5	20	1	1	3
Armed forces.....	11	74	59		1	
Other.....	1		2			
Total.....	197	197	191*	201	204	204

* 3 persons did not supply complete information.

A comparison of the major activity of these people before they left home with that after they left and with that in which they were engaged at the time of the survey indicates several major trends. More than half of the young women had left home to take up housekeeping and an additional 10 percent had married after a few years of nonfarm employment. Although 40 percent of the young women had been in nonfarm employ-

ment after leaving home, one-fourth of this group had quit their jobs and were keeping house at the time of the survey.

The employment shifts of the young men are obscured by the fact that more than one-third of them (38 percent) left to go into the armed forces and 30 percent of the total were in the military service at the time of the survey. Although 105 young men were in nonfarm work before leaving home and 110 after leaving, as many as one-third of the original 105 may have gone to military service. If so, their places must have been taken by additional young men who left home to go into nonfarm employment.

Ten percent of the young men were reported as unemployed at the time of the survey. This evidences a real decline in economic opportunity, especially since only 6.5 percent were reported as unemployed during the time before they left home.

When the activities of the young people before leaving home were examined for differences on the basis of residence, the outstanding difference was in the proportion who had engaged in unpaid family work. Fifteen percent of the youth in farm households had unpaid work as their major activity during the year preceding the interviews, as compared to only 2 percent from the nonfarm households. (Table 26). The major activity of the young people, both in farm and nonfarm households, had been nonfarm work for 36 percent of those on farms and 47 percent of those in nonfarm homes. Thirty percent of those on farms and 29 percent of those in nonfarm households had been in school.

As might be expected, there was a significant shift of youth on farms to nonfarm employment. When allowance is made for the movement out of nonfarm work into the armed forces, the number of farm youth who went into nonfarm employment probably doubles. The number of nonfarm youth in nonfarm employment did not change. Hence, when allowance is made for those who went from nonfarm work into the armed forces, it appears that from one-third to one-fourth of the nonfarm youth entered nonfarm employment when they left home.

The households the young people left were also classified on the basis of chief source of total household income (Table 27). Nonfarm employment was common among youth in the agricultural households before they left home. Thirty-four percent had this type of employment as compared with 16 percent in farm-wage work and 2 percent in farm operation. A total of 40 percent of the youth from nonfarm work households engaged in nonfarm employment before leaving home; and 50 percent of those from nonwork and miscellaneous households did likewise. The major immediate shifts of the youth on leaving home were into nonfarm employment, into the armed forces, and into keeping house.

TABLE 26. MAJOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS, (1) BEFORE LEAVING, (2) AFTER LEAVING, AND (3) AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY, BY RESIDENCE OF HOUSEHOLD, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MAJOR ACTIVITY OF YOUTH LEAVING HOME	HOUSEHOLD RESIDENCE					
	FARM			NONFARM		
	YEAR BEFORE LEFT HOME	AFTER LEAVING	AT TIME OF SURVEY	YEAR BEFORE LEFT HOME	AFTER LEAVING	AT TIME OF SURVEY
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Farm operation.....	2	2	2		1	1
Unpaid family work.....	25			4		
Farm wage work.....	3	2	2	11	1	1
Nonfarm work.....	60	81	73	106	105	89
Coal mining.....	7	5	7	17	11	8
Other nonfarm.....	53	76	66	89	94	81
Student.....	50	8	6	61	10	10
Keeping house.....	18	41	54	20	61	68
Unemployed.....	4	2	4	13	4	18
Armed forces.....	6	32	26	5	42	42
Other.....				1		2
TOTAL.....	168	168	167	224	224	221

This was true whether the major source of income was from agriculture, mining, manufacturing, or other type of activity.

METHOD OF FINDING OUT ABOUT FIRST JOB

When any of these persons had left the household during the preceding 18 months, the respondents were asked how those that left had learned about their first job away from home. In some cases, they had departed without having heard about a job (Table 28).

Information about a job was most commonly received from relatives or friends. This type of contact was important for both young men and young women and for those in all types of households.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF YOUTH WHO HAD LEFT HOME

One-third of the young men and one-fourth of the young women who had left home had some type of vocational training (Table 29). The advantage of the young men in this respect came through training received in the armed forces and in G. I. classes.

The most common type of training received by the young women was in commercial courses in high school or in business college. Among

TABLE 27. MAJOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS, (1) BEFORE LEAVING, (2) AFTER LEAVING, AND (3) AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MAJOR ACTIVITY OF YOUTH LEAVING HOME		MAJOR SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME																
		AGRICULTURE			MINING			MANUFACTURING			OTHER NONFARM			OTHER*				
		BE- FORE LEAV- ING	AF- TER LEAV- ING	AT TIME OF SUR- VEY	BE- FORE LEAV- ING	AF- TER LEAV- ING	AT TIME OF SUR- VEY	BE- FORE LEAV- ING	AF- TER LEAV- ING	AT TIME OF SUR- VEY	BE- FORE LEAV- ING	AF- TER LEAV- ING	AT TIME OF SUR- VEY	BE- FORE LEAV- ING	AF- TER LEAV- ING	AT TIME OF SUR- VEY		
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.		
Farm operation.....	1	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	2	2		
Unpaid family work.....	8	..	..	2	..	..	..	8	..	..	7	..	..	5	..	..		
Farm wage work.....	8	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	..	1	1	..	..	3	..	..		
Nonfarm work.....	17	26	22	34	40	34	31	37	29	30	30	37	35	55	52	46		
Coal Mining.....	1	1	1	9	10	7	2	2	1	1	..	..	1	12	4	5		
Other nonfarm.....	16	25	21	25	30	27	29	36	28	28	30	37	34	43	48	41		
Student.....	13	3	2	29	3	2	21	..	..	..	28	7	6	29	5	6		
Keeping house.....	3	11	15	7	22	28	8	24	28	28	9	20	25	12	27	30		
Unemployed.....	..	1	2	3	..	4	5	5	2	2	3	1	2	6	4	12		
Armed forces.....	..	7	7	1	15	12	..	14	13	13	..	19	15	..	20	12		
Other.....	..	..	..	5	..	..	1	..	1	1	5	..	1	..	..	..		
TOTAL.....	50	50	50	82	82	81†	75	75	74†	84	84	84	84	110	110	108‡		

* Largely households with nonwork income but also includes households with incomes from diverse sources.

† No report as to present employment of 4 persons.

TABLE 28. METHOD OF FINDING OUT ABOUT JOB AWAY FROM HOME, BY PERSONS WHO LEFT DURING 1953 AND 1954, BY SEX, RESIDENCE, AND TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

METHOD	ALL PER- SONS	SEX		RESIDENCE		MAJOR SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
		MALE	FE- MALE	FARM	NON- FARM	AGRI- CUL- TURE	MIN- ING	MANU- FAC- TURING	OTHER NON- FARM	OTHER*
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Newspaper.	2		2	1	1			1	1	
Private employment agency	1	1			1					1
Relatives or friends	29	15	14	16	13	5	6	4	10	4
Other sources	2	1	1	2			1	1		
Did not hear about job.	48	11	37	27	21	5	12	8	12	11
Armed forces.	23	23		11	12	4	4	6	5	4
Total.	105	51	54	57	48	14	23	20	28	20

* Largely households with nonwork income but also includes households with incomes from diverse sources.

the young men, there was a major discrepancy between the type of training received and the type of vocation entered. Twenty-four persons had vocational agriculture courses, usually in high school, but only 3 had become farm operators and only 2 had become farm-wage workers.

WHERE THEY ARE NOW

Forty-one percent of the young people did not leave their home county (Table 30). The proportion remaining in the home county was especially high among young women (45 percent); among people from nonfarm homes (47 percent); among youth from coal mining families (51 percent); and among youth from families with nonwork incomes (49 percent). It was especially low among youth from manufacturing families (28 percent) and business, professional, and other nonfarm families (33 percent).

Some of the young people went to adjoining counties in West Virginia or to other parts of the State. This, however, was less common than movement to an adjoining state or to some other part of the United States. Youths from the homes of manufacturing employees were particularly prone to move to other states (48 percent). Almost 10 percent of the youth were reported as being outside the United States, but nearly all of these were in the armed services.

TABLE 29. VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS, BY SEX, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

TYPE AND SOURCE OF TRAINING		ALL PERSONS WITH TRAINING	MALE	FEMALE
Type		Number	Number	Number
Mechanical.....		14	14	..
Industrial.....		6	5	1
Commercial.....		42	9	33
Construction.....		5	5	..
Handicraft.....		3	3	..
Agricultural.....		24	24	..
Teacher.....		8	2	6
Other.....		12	4	8
Total.....		114*	66	48
Source				
High School.....		48	24	24
Vocational or night school.....		6	3	3
Other school.....		20	7	13
Armed forces.....		17	17	..
G. I. classes.....		14	14	..
On the job training.....		5	1	4
Other.....		5	..	5
Total.....		115	66	49

* No data on type of training for 1 youth who left.

Work Away from Home

Since local work opportunities were limited, unemployed people were left with a three-way choice:

First, to remain at home, help with the small amount of farm work or housework to be done, and wait for an opening to occur.

Second, to leave the area entirely and look for employment in areas where jobs were more plentiful.

Third, to seek employment in areas close enough to their present homes to permit them to return at rather frequent intervals. Actually, there was no distinct dividing line between workers who had left home completely and those who were still members of the household but living away from home. The questions in the interview were worded so as to permit the respondent to decide whether the person living away from home should be classified as still in the household or as having left it. Ordinarily, husbands away from home were more likely to still be

TABLE 30. WHERE PERSONS WHO LEFT HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 8 YEARS ARE NOW LIVING, BY SEX, RESIDENCE, AND TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

WHERE LIVING NOW	ALL PERSONS WHO LEFT	SEX		RESIDENCE		MAJOR SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
		MALE	FE-MALE	FARM	NON-FARM	AGRI-CUL-TURE	MIN-ING	MANU-FAC-TURING	OTHER NON-FARM	OTHER*
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
This county.....	165	74	91	61	104	21	41	21	28	54
Adjoining county ..	27	7	20	14	13	5	6	9	1	6
Another part of State...	25	7	18	15	10	3	3	2	13	4
Adjoining State	87	40	47	42	45	14	9	21	16	29
Another part of U. S. ...	59	33	26	31	28	5	13	15	18	8
Outside U. S.	37	35	2	14	23	4	9	7	8	9
Total.....	400†	196	204	177	223	52	81	75	84	110

* Largely households with nonwork income but also includes households with incomes from various sources.

† Information about 1 person was not available.

regarded as members of the household, whereas sons or daughters were regarded as having left.

Approximately one nonfarm worker in eight came in the group regarded as still being in the household but living and working somewhere else. These people usually worked in cities in Pennsylvania or Ohio, but some were employed in Maryland, Virginia, or Washington, D. C.

Of 103 persons reported as members of the household but living away from home, more than half either stayed away continuously or returned at rare intervals (Table 31). The others had jobs close enough that they could return every week or two. Some of these people did a small amount of farming during their trips home. Workers in these groups ordinarily had been working away from home for only a few months, but one-fourth of them had been away for about a year.

Workers Who Had Returned Home

The slackening of employment in West Virginia and adjacent states in 1954 resulted in unemployment not only for local people but also for some of the workers who had taken jobs elsewhere. Many of the latter group returned home. Out of 69 workers who had returned home during the previous year, more than half were reported as being back because

TABLE 31. WORKERS WHO HAD LIVED AWAY FROM HOME DURING THE PRECEDING 12 MONTHS, BY SEX, HOUSEHOLD STATUS, AND CONTINUITY OF LIVING AWAY, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

MONTHS LIVED AWAY FROM HOME	ALL WORKERS REPORTED	SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS			WORKERS LIVED AWAY	
		MALE		FEMALE	CONTINUOUSLY	NOT CONTINUOUSLY
		HEADS	OTHERS			
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
All workers.....	103	55	21	27	61	42
1- 3 months.....	39	19	8	12	24	15
4- 6 months.....	25	13	8	4	16	9
7- 9 months.....	14	7	2	5	12	2
10-12 months.....	25	16	3	6	9	16

TABLE 32. REASONS WHY WORKERS RETURNED TO UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, BY SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

REASON FOR RETURNING	ALL WORKERS WHO RETURNED	SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS		
		MALE		FEMALE
		HEADS	OTHER	
	Number	Number	Number	Number
All workers.....	69	32	17	20
Work gave out.....	36	21	9	6
Needed at home.....	5	..	3	2
Sickness.....	4	2	..	2
Did not like it away.....	8	2	3	3
Miscellaneous.....	16	7	2	7

their work gave out (Table 32). Approximately 1 of 8 returned because they found that working, living, or other conditions away from home were unsatisfactory. A few returned because they were needed at home or because of sickness.

Availability for Employment³⁰

Each respondent was asked to indicate which members of the household were available for employment at the time of the interview. This

³⁰For a more detailed discussion of people who were available for work, see *Availability for Employment of Rural People in the Upper Monongahela Valley, W. Va.*, by Ward F. Porter and William H. Metzler, West Virginia University Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 391, June, 1956.

classification was to include both those who were actively looking for a job and those who were available for work but were not actively looking for a job at the time of the survey. A total of 381 persons, or 16 percent of those 14 years old and over, were reported as available for work. Approximately half of these were actively looking for work. (Table 33).

TABLE 33. CHARACTERISTICS AND WORK PREFERENCE OF PEOPLE WHO WERE AVAILABLE FOR WORK, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

GROUP	PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR WORK					
	ALL PERSONS		PERSONS ACTIVELY LOOKING FOR WORK		PERSONS NOT ACTIVELY LOOKING FOR WORK	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All persons.....	381	100	188	100	193	100
Employment during survey week:						
Employed.....	164	43	74	39	90	47
Not employed.....	217	57	114	61	103	53
Household status:						
Male heads of households.....	153	40	99	53	54	28
Other males.....	114	30	65	34	49	25
Females.....	114	30	24	13	90	47
Age and sex:						
Male.....	267	70	164	87	103	53
14-24.....	99	26	58	31	41	21
25-54.....	134	35	87	16	47	24
55 and over.....	34	9	19	10	15	8
Female.....	114	30	24	13	90	47
14-24.....	51	13	15	8	36	19
25-54.....	56	15	8	4	48	25
55 and over.....	7	2	1	1	6	3
Major employment last 12 months:						
Mining.....	64	17	42	23	22	11
Other industrial.....	70	18	47	25	23	12
Business & professional.....	34	9	17	9	17	9
Other nonfarm.....	42	11	23	12	19	10
Work on home farm.....	31	8	10	5	21	11
Farm wage work.....	22	6	10	5	12	6
No work.....	118	31	39	21	79	41
Work preference:*						
Male.....						
Prefer farm work.....	30	13	11	7	19	18
Prefer nonfarm work.....	233	87	119	93	81	82
Female.....						
Prefer farm work.....	3	3	0	0	3	1
Prefer nonfarm work.....	111	97	24	100	87	97

* No report as to work preference of 4 persons.

A number of the people available for work had been employed for at least part of the time during the week of the survey. During the tight-job situation, many were taking unskilled or fill-in jobs until more suitable employment would be available. Forty-three percent of those available had some employment during the week preceding the interview. This involved slightly more than 40 percent of those actively looking and slightly less than 50 percent of the rest of the available group.

Approximately two-thirds of the available male workers were actively seeking employment as compared to about one-fifth of the women. As noted previously, the economy offers relatively few employment opportunities for women, and it is likely that this fact may have led many of them to be less active in seeking work. Those women who were actively looking were nearly all in the younger age groups; the less active included a large number of middle-aged women. The people actively looking for work ordinarily had been unemployed for some time. More than half of them had been seeking employment for 14 weeks or more; one-fifth had been looking for 6 months or longer (Table 34). Two-thirds of the male heads of households had been looking for 14 weeks or longer. In general, the older male heads had been looking for a longer time than those who were younger. Relatively few of the women had been looking for as long as 14 weeks.

WORK PREFERENCE

The people available for employment usually had a background of nonfarm work and were interested only in nonfarm employment. Ordinarily they looked on farm work as unskilled and underpaid and were not willing to consider the possibility of taking that type of employment. Only 33 of the 381 people available for work preferred a farm job; 3 of these were women; the rest were almost equally divided between household heads and other males. One-third of the people preferring farm work were youth or women who wanted part-time work.

A few of those who were looking for nonfarm work were primarily interested in part-time employment. This was true of one-third of the females but of only 10 percent of the male workers.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Under the West Virginia-Compensation Law, insured workers are entitled to receive compensation when unemployed. Benefits are paid weekly for a 24-week period, the amount depending on the amount of contributions that had been made to the compensation fund.

Almost half of the persons looking for work had not applied for compensation. This included one-fourth of the male heads, two-thirds of the other males, and three-fourths of the females. Many of these people

TABLE 34. LENGTH OF SEARCH FOR WORK AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STATUS OF PERSONS LOOKING FOR WORK, BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE	ALL PERSONS LOOKING FOR WORK		SEX AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS					
			MALE HEADS		OTHER MALES		FEMALES	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All persons.....	188	100	99	100	65	100	24	100
Weeks spent looking for work:								
0-13.....	86	46	34	34	35	54	17	71
14-26.....	65	34	41	42	23	35	1	4
27 and over.....	37	20	24	24	7	11	6	25
Unemployment compensation status:								
Did not apply.....	86	46	26	26	42	65	18	75
Applied.....	102	54	73	74	23	35	6	25
Received none*.....	18	18	12	16	4	17	2	
Still drawing benefits.....	59	57	43	59	13	57	3	
No longer drawing, partial pay- ment†.....	7	7	5	7	1	4	1	
Full payment.....	18	18	13	18	5	22	0	

* Either ineligible or application still being processed.

† Workers who received some compensation but are now employed so are off the compensation rolls.

were not eligible for compensation. Some had been working at jobs not covered by unemployment compensation; others were coming into the labor market for the first time. Others were ineligible because although they were looking for work, they were presently engaged in some type of remunerative employment.

About one-third of the persons who were looking for work were drawing unemployment compensation at the time of the interview. Another 10 percent had already exhausted all their unemployment benefits. About 4 percent more had drawn some unemployment pay but had obtained some type of employment before they had exhausted all their benefits. Apparently the work obtained had not been what they wanted and they were still looking for other jobs.

WILLINGNESS TO LEAVE HOME

The question was asked as to whether the people available for work were willing to leave home to take employment. In general, those who wanted farm work were unwilling to go elsewhere. Only 3 expressed such a willingness. On the other hand, about two-thirds of those interested in nonfarm work were willing to leave home (Table 35). This included

TABLE 35. POTENTIAL MOBILITY OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR AND PREFERRING NONFARM WORK, BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS AND AGE, UPPER MONONGAHELA VALLEY, WEST VIRGINIA, JULY, 1954.

GROUP	INDIVIDUALS PREFERRING NONFARM WORK			FAMILY HEADS PREFERRING NONFARM WORK		
	TOTAL	WILLING TO LEAVE HOME		TOTAL	WILLING TO MOVE FAMILY	
	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Percent
All persons	344	219	64	136	101	74
Household status						
Male heads	136	93	68	136	101	74
Other males	97	81	84	...	...	...
Females	111	45	41	...	...	...
Age						
14-34	214	140	65	46	40	87
35-54	91	56	62	58	42	72
55 and over	39	23	59	32	19	59

three-fourths of those who were actively looking for work. Sixty-nine percent of the household heads and 84 percent of the other males were willing to go elsewhere. Less than half of the females were willing to leave. Young people were somewhat more willing to leave than those who were older.

The high percentage of persons who replied that they were willing to leave is surprising in view of the strong attachment many of them expressed for the area. This high rate of response may indicate several things: (1) pessimism about future employment opportunities in mining in the area; (2) an unwillingness to try farming even though it would permit them to stay in the Valley; (3) an unwillingness to accept lower incomes and a reduced level of living, or, on the other hand, (4) that replies under survey conditions, when there is no necessity to follow them up, may overstate willingness to go.

WILLINGNESS TO MOVE FAMILY

Household heads who preferred nonfarm work were asked whether they would be willing to move their families in order to take employment. Three-fourths replied that they would. The younger family heads were much more willing to move than those who were older.

Employment of Persons Available for Work

The 12-month employment record of the people available for work was highly variable. About one-third had done no work. At the other

extreme almost one-fourth had worked for 300 days or more, apparently at jobs that were underpaid or were not to their liking. The figures are as follows:

Days employed	Number of workers
No days	118
1- 99	72
100-199	59
200-299	39
300 and over	93
Total	381

The available persons who had done no work during the previous year were largely women or youth. Of the 118 persons in this group, 69 were under 25 years of age; 70 were women. Many of these apparently were looking for their first jobs.

The surprising fact about these people, however, is the large proportion who were steadily employed during the year. This probably was associated with several factors: first, the inability of a worker to choose his line of work in a labor market where jobs were scarce; and second, the preference of these people to remain in their home area as long as it was economically possible.

Four-fifths of the 263 people who had worked during the previous 12 months had been employed at nonfarm work. This includes some who had also done some farm work. The majority of these people had worked either in mining or in other industrial employment, usually at non-skilled labor. Most of those who had done farm work were unpaid family workers but some had been farm operators and others had been hired farm workers.

Twenty percent of those who had worked during the previous year had worked outside the area. These people were generally willing to leave home again to secure employment.

Comparison with Other Surveys

Precise comparison of availability for employment of workers in West Virginia with that of workers covered in the eastern Kentucky and southeastern Oklahoma surveys is not possible because of different methods of enumeration and classification.³¹ This applies particularly to the percentage of the workers who might be regarded as available for employment. A few general statements, however, can be made. Although workers in all three areas preferred nonfarm employment, this preference

³¹ See *Rural Manpower in Eastern Kentucky*, by Robert E. Galloway, Kentucky Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 627, June, 1955, and *A Study of Rural Manpower in Southeastern Oklahoma* by James D. Tarver, Oklahoma A & M College Technical Bull. T 56, Sept., 1955.

was greatest in West Virginia, probably because a higher proportion of the workers there already were in nonfarm lines of work. Opportunities in agriculture may also be somewhat more limited. Very few workers in any of the areas were willing to leave to take farm jobs, but from one-third to three-fourths were willing to leave to do nonfarm work. People on farms were much less ready to do so than those who were already in non-agricultural employment. Hence the percentage of workers willing to leave was much higher in West Virginia than in the other two states.

Conclusion

The Upper Monongahela Valley is representative of areas in which farm people have left agriculture for more profitable employment in a developing local industry. In this case, however, the local industry, coal mining, no longer needs the services of many of the workers who came to depend on it. The workers have come to depreciate farming as a source of livelihood and do not want to return to it. They prefer to remain in the Valley, but most of them state that they are willing to go elsewhere to do nonfarm work. A return to agriculture offers no solution since farming opportunities open to them would yield a very small return in comparison to the incomes to which these people have become accustomed. Any solution must be along the line of new industries in the area or an outmigration of workers to expanding industrial areas.

The few people who still remain in agriculture in the area are much less fully employed than those who have gone into industrial employment. The small farm incomes suggest that farm units are too small and that there is a lack of capital needed to produce on the most efficient basis. More nonfarm employment opportunities are needed for these people.

Live-at-home farming, even though inefficient, does constitute a valuable supplement to the incomes of many of the nonfarm workers. A subsequent report will indicate whether the efficiency of these units can be improved so as to provide more of a supplement to nonfarm workers who are seasonally unemployed.

Eighty percent of the workers have had several years of industrial or business experience, which constitutes a valuable resource in itself. They have become adjusted to regular employment and have acquired skills that are valuable for nonfarm occupations. To overcome the underemployment of farm people who have not had such nonfarm experience probably will be a larger and more difficult job than the occupational readjustment of nonfarm workers.

The development of local industries, or bringing in new ones, is much to be preferred to outmigration of the underemployed workers.

The latter means reduced home markets, reduced number of workers in relation to the number of dependents, and disruption of established home and community relationships.

Local leaders might do well to canvass the potentialities for new industries in the area. The varied local natural resources plus a reserve of manpower should furnish a basis for several lines of industrial development. Casual observation, for example, indicates excellent resources for the development of recreational activities.³² Transportation, comparative costs of production, market outlets, and similar factors will have to be weighed so as to guard against the introduction of industries which could not compete successfully with those in other areas. Special attention needs to be given to the effects of atomic-power development which may bring new shifts in industrial advantages.

³²For recommendations in regard to industrial expansion in the adjoining counties in Maryland see *Economic Development in the Cumberland, Maryland, Area*, U. S. Departments of Commerce and Labor, Washington, D. C., October, 1952.

APPENDIX

A sample was desired which would provide an accurate cross-section of the households, farm and nonfarm, in the open-country area of the Valley. Sampling on a geographic basis presented something of a problem because some areas of the Valley were sparsely settled, whereas others were densely populated in spite of the rugged terrain. Furthermore, there had been numerous population shifts since the 1950 Census which provided the most recent guide as to local densities of population.

Sampling specialists at the U. S. Department of Agriculture were asked to draw a sample that would yield from 800 to 1,000 open-country respondents. Sampling for this survey was done on a segmented—or local-area basis. A total of 86 sample segments were drawn, with each estimated to contain about 10 households. These segments covered the 10-county area in proportion to the estimated open-country population.

In drawing the sample, allowance was made for shifts in the open-country population from 1950 to the date of the survey. Allowance was also made for the expansion of urban areas.

This method provided a randomized basis for selection of households and yielded 914 households. Interviews were taken from 888 households, or 97 percent of the total households in the survey area sample group. During the analysis a few of the schedules were discarded for technical reasons.

Classifications and Terminology

In general, the classifications and terminology used in this report follow those that have been used by the Census and other statistical agencies. In a few cases, special classifications, or terms, were worked out in order to meet the particular needs of this survey.

The classifications used are as follows:

Rural	living in the open country or in settlements of less than 2,500 people. (Census.)
Open country	areas with no settlement of more than 100 people.
Farm	(1) places of 3 or more acres on which value of agricultural products, exclusive of home gardens, amounted to \$150 or more; and (2) places of less than 3 acres on which the sales of farm products amounted to \$150 or more. (Census.)
Commercial farm	(1) all farms with sales of farm products amounting to \$1,200 or more; (2) farms with sales of from \$250 to \$1,199 on which the operator worked off the farm for less than 100 days and the nonfarm income of all

	members of the family was less than the total value of farm products sold. (Census.)
Part-time farm	farms with sales of farm products of from \$250 to \$1,199 when either (1) the farm operator worked 100 days or more off the farm or (2) the nonfarm income of all members of the family was greater than the value of farm products sold. (Census.)
Residential farm	farms with sales of less than \$250. (Census.)
Labor force	all persons 14 years old or over who are either (1) employed; (2) unemployed; or (3) members of the armed forces. (Census.)
Nonwork income	income other than earnings; e.g., from rents, royalties, interest, dividends, veterans allotments, social security, unemployment insurance, public assistance.
Household	all the persons who occupy a home or dwelling unit. (Census.)
Underemployment	underutilization of a worker's time and ability either through (1) employment for less than a full working year; or (2) employment at work which does not make full use of his training and ability.
Level of living	measured in this survey by the possession of 10 selected items—electric lights, running water, telephone, daily newspaper, refrigerator, power washing machine, automobile or truck, flush toilet, kitchen sink, deep-freeze unit.
Chief income source	of households as between farm operation, farm wage work, mining, manufacturing, business or professional, other nonfarm work, and nonwork sources.
Income type	of households as between farm, nonfarm work, and nonwork sources.
Major activity	the activity at which an individual spent the greatest amount of his time during the 12 months preceding the interview. Adapted from the Census.
Industrial-occupational classification	adapted from Census to fit industries in the area. These are: Agriculture, including farm operators, farm wage workers, unpaid family workers. Mining, including managers, operatives and unskilled workers in coal mines. Sawmilling, including owners, managers, laborers. Other manufacturing, including operators and workers.

- Transportation and shipping,** includes railroad workers, truck drivers, cab drivers.
- Government,** includes local, State, and Federal workers; e.g., teachers, school bus drivers, mailmen, policemen, sheriff, and clerical workers in Government offices.
- Construction,** includes carpenters, painters, plumbers, bricklayers, electricians.
- Professional and clerical,** includes doctors, nurses, lawyers, engineers, stenographers, bookkeepers, typists.
- Trade,** includes operators, managers, sales-clerks, and laborers.
- Service work,** includes housework, janitor, cook, watchman, barber, odd-jobs workers.