

THE  
ECONOMIC & SOCIAL  
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

---

Rural Household Budget  
—Feasibility Study

SILE SHEEHY  
R. O'CONNOR

---

MAY, 1971

PAPER NO. 61

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
COUNCIL 1970 - 71

- \*G. O'BRIEN, D.LITT., LITT.D.,  
President of the Institute and Chairman of the Council.
- T. J. BARRINGTON,  
Director, Institute of Public Administration.
- \*J. P. BEDDY, D.ECON.SC., LL.D. (H.G.)  
Chairman, The Industrial Credit Co. Ltd.
- R. D. C. BLACK, PH.D.,  
Professor, Department of Economics, The Queen's University, Belfast.
- \*F. B. CHUBB, M.A., D.PHIL.,  
Professor, Department of Political Science, Trinity College, Dublin.
- VERY REV. D. CREGAN, C.M.,  
President, St. Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra, Dublin.
- G. DEAN, M.D., F.R.C.P.,  
Director, Medico-Social Research Board.
- REV. PETER DEMPSEY, O.F.M.CAP., M.A., PH.D., D.D.,  
Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University College, Cork.
- \*M. P. FOGARTY, M.A., D.POL.SOC.SC. (Louvain),  
Director of the Institute.
- N. J. GIBSON, B.SC. (EGON.), PH.D.,  
Professor, Department of Economics, The New University of Ulster, Coleraine.
- \*W. A. HONOHAN, M.A., F.I.A.,  
Secretary, Department of Social Welfare.
- \*REV. JAMES KAVANAGH, M.A., S.T.L.,  
Professor, Department of Social Science, University College, Dublin.
- IVOR KENNY, M.A.,  
Director, Irish Management Institute.
- T. P. LINEHAN, B.E., B.SC.,  
Director, Central Statistics Office.
- P. LYNCH, M.A.,  
Chairman, Medico-Social Research Board.
- CHARLES MCCARTHY, B.L.,  
Chairman, Human Sciences Committee.
- \*M. D. MCCARTHY, M.A., PH.D., D.SC.,  
President, University College, Cork.
- J. J. McELLIGOTT, M.A., LL.D.,  
Past President of the Institute.
- G. A. MEAGHER, B.COMM., D.P.A.,  
Deputy Secretary, Department of Local Government.
- \*J. F. MEENAN, M.A., B.L.,  
Professor of Political Economy, University College, Dublin.
- \*C. H. MURRAY,  
Secretary, Department of Finance.
- J. C. NAGLE, M.COMM.,  
Secretary, Department of Agriculture.
- D. NEVIN,  
Assistant General Secretary, Irish Congress of Trade Unions.
- RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR J. NEWMAN, M.A., D.PH.,  
President, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
- TADHG O CEARBHAILL,  
Secretary, Department of Labour.
- REV. E. F. O'DOHERTY, M.A., B.D., PH.D.,  
Professor, Department of Logic and Psychology, University College, Dublin.
- D. P. O'MAHONY, M.A., PH.D., B.L.,  
Professor, Department of Economics, University College, Cork.
- LABHRAS O'NUALLAIN, D.ECON.SC.,  
Professor of Economics, University College, Galway.
- \*W. J. L. RYAN, M.A., PH.D.,  
Professor of Political Economy, Trinity College, Dublin.
- P. G. SHERRY, M.SC., PH.D.,  
Federation of Irish Industries.
- T. WALSH, D.SC.,  
Director, An Foras Talúntais.
- \*T. K. WHITAKER, M.SC. (EGON.), D.ECON.SC.,  
Governor, Central Bank of Ireland.
- \*Members of Executive Committee.

*Copies of this paper may be obtained from The Economic and Social Research Institute,  
4 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, price £0.75 a copy.*

Rural Household Budget  
—Feasibility Study

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions made by Mr C. Quinn and Miss B. McGennis who were mainly responsible for conducting the field-work in connection with this study and to Misses N. Gannon, K. O'Higgins and T. O'Donoghue who helped out with this work at various times. We also wish to acknowledge the contributions of Mr B. Whelan, Mr T. O'Connell and Mrs K. McGrail who rendered invaluable help in preparing the data for publication.

While responsibility for the content of this paper is entirely ours, the authors are indebted to Dr S. J. Sheehy, University College, Dublin and Mr D. Murphy, Central Statistics Office for their valuable comments. We wish to thank also Institute colleagues, Professor M. P. Fogarty (Director), Dr R. C. Geary, Professor B. Hutchinson, Mr T. J. Baker, Dr K. A. Kennedy and Dr M. Ross for comments on earlier drafts.

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Preface	4
Introduction	5
Methodology	6
Results of Survey	17
Conclusions and Suggestions	33
Summary	38
Appendix A	42
Appendix B	48

## PREFACE

*This is a study of the method by which a full-scale rural household budget inquiry might be made in Ireland. The households supplying data were selected to illustrate the technical problems of carrying out such a survey, and are not representative of the rural population of Ireland. The results presented therefore must not be taken as an authoritative and representative account of rural standards of living. That must wait until a full-scale survey is carried out.*

## *Rural Household Budget—Feasibility Study*

SILE SHEEHY\*

R. O'CONNOR

---

### INTRODUCTION

THE consumer price index in Ireland is based on household budget inquiries carried out in urban areas only. Such an index is very useful for many purposes but it would be desirable to have in addition a rural price index together with an overall index reflecting expenditure patterns in both rural and urban areas. In order to establish the weighting system for such indices, it would be necessary to carry out rural household budget inquiries on a scale not so far attempted in this country. Such surveys could of course be used to obtain information on many facets of rural life other than family expenditure. In particular, they could be used to obtain income data for rural households including information on non-farm income and its sources.

In Britain the Family Expenditure Survey,<sup>1</sup> which has been in continuous operation since 1957, covers all types of households both urban and rural. It has provided regular data about the earnings of both manual and white-collar workers as well as providing a basis for annual revision of the weighting of the Retail Price Index.

Before a large-scale rural household budget inquiry is carried out, it is desirable to undertake experimental studies to establish methodology and to

<sup>1</sup>Department of Employment and Productivity: *Family Expenditure Survey Report, 1957-1968*, HMSO, London, 1969.

\*Mrs. Sile Sheehy was a Temporary Assistant Research Officer with the Economic and Social Research Institute and Professor R. O'Connor is a Research Professor. This paper has been accepted for publication by the Institute. The authors are responsible for the contents of the paper including the views expressed therein.

isolate the problems which are likely to arise. One such experimental study<sup>2</sup> was carried out by one of the authors in 1964/65 and yielded valuable information on the methods to be used and on the difficulties associated with this type of investigation. This study, which was carried out on 275 farm households, obtained information on housing, household amenities and equipment, as well as on shopping habits and expenditure patterns in the households. As each of the farm households included in the survey was drawn from the sample of farms used by An Foras Talúntais in its Farm Management Survey, data on farm incomes were available from this source. The problem of having to record farm incomes as part of the household budget inquiry did not therefore arise and no information was provided on the difficulties facing an interviewer in collecting this and various other income data as part of such an inquiry.

The present study was undertaken to investigate the methods of obtaining comprehensive income and expenditure information in a single survey from individual rural households. With this objective in mind and taking account of the funds available, it was decided to carry out the investigation on about 100 rural households in different parts of the country. It should be emphasised that a sample of this size while sufficient for testing methodology is not intended to give accurate results and accordingly the results given must be taken as being of an illustrative nature rather than as accurately representing rural income and expenditure levels.

In this study, the households co-operated in (a) an expenditure survey involving the recording of detailed household accounts for a period of two weeks as well as giving information on expenditure by interview, (b) a survey to determine farm income, farm expenditure and household consumption of own farm produce for one year, and (c) an investigation to determine non-farm income from all sources, such as off-farm employment, dividends and pensions from at home or abroad, social welfare and other benefits, emigrants' remittances, etc. It was anticipated that it would be difficult to obtain all this information in one survey. In particular it was not known how income recording would affect the survey as a whole.

## METHODOLOGY

### *The Sample*

The counties in which the survey was done were arbitrarily selected to represent different types of farming and different social conditions so that the full spectrum of farming conditions could be experienced and any special problems located. The counties and the conditions they were considered to represent were as follows:—

<sup>2</sup>O'Neill, Sile: "An Experiment in Family Farm Expenditure Surveys in Ireland", *Irish Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology*, p. 35, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1969.



Cork/Limerick	..	dairying and pigs
Meath/Westmeath	..	dry cattle raising
Wexford	.. ..	tillage and mixed farming
Cavan	.. ..	mixed general farming
Clare	.. ..	do.
West Donegal	..	poor farming/fishing
West Galway	..	Gaeltacht fishing area, with little farming.

Two adjacent District Electoral Divisions (DEDs) were arbitrarily selected within each of these areas and as far as possible eight holdings were drawn at random from each DED, one being from each of the following eight size groups:\*

$\frac{1}{4}$	—	1 acre
1	—	5 acres
5	—	10 acres
10	—	15 acres
15	—	30 acres
30	—	50 acres
50	—	100 acres
		100 acres and over.

The intention of this exercise was to locate the practical problems that would arise on different sized holdings, the giving of a representative coverage being of secondary importance. The sample was drawn in the Central Statistics Office from the 1965 Agricultural Enumeration Books.

A total of 138 households were approached to obtain a final sample of 105 co-operating households. Of the 33 households which did not co-operate, 17 were unavailable either because of wrong address or vacant dwellings; 4 because of illness; 9 actual refusals and a further 3 households discontinued during the survey.

Because of the method of selection an assumption that the sample is representative of rural households in the State would be invalid. In preparing for the survey it was felt that there might be considerable difficulty in obtaining information on items of non-farm income such as social welfare payments and emigrants' remittances. As these payments are likely to occur more frequently in the underdeveloped regions these areas were deliberately over-sampled. Some good farming areas were also selected for comparison but despite this it is considered that on the whole the sample is biased towards the lower income households.

\*Though the holdings were selected on the basis of the total area of land owned, they were subsequently classified on the basis of the area actually farmed. Hence, a farmer taking or letting land might be classified in a group different from that from which he was selected.

*Conduct of the Survey*

Fieldwork commenced in December 1968 and continued until February 1970. Two female interviewers collected the data on household expenditure and non-farm income. One male interviewer (farm surveyor) dealt with the farm income by making estimates of it at one visit on very small holdings or by keeping simple accounts on the larger farms in the sample. The problems encountered in obtaining farm incomes are discussed in some detail later under "Farm Income Records".

Each householder was canvassed by letter and this was followed within a week by a visit from one of the interviewers. The purpose of the inquiry was explained at this visit, complete confidentiality was assured and co-operation was sought from each income recipient present. If all income recipients were not present an appointment was made for a time when the absent members would be available.

The survey commenced when all income recipients had agreed to co-operate. The subsequent procedure varied somewhat depending on whether the farm surveyor or female interviewers made the initial contact. If contact was made by the female interviewers details of household composition and annual fixed items of expenditure were obtained immediately, with details of non-farm income being obtained at the second visit. The farm surveyor called very shortly afterwards to estimate the farm income or where this was not possible to commence the farm recording. If the farm surveyor made the initial contact he estimated the farm income or commenced the recording and explained that the female interviewers would call later to record expenditure and non-farm income. In most cases it was the farm surveyor who called first. All households were visited by him before the end of April 1969 but it was the middle of June 1969 before the female interviewers could make their first visit to some households. Seventy-four households completed farm account books and though all of these households were visited by the farm surveyor for various purposes on at least four occasions quite a number among the seventy-four had so little farming activity that their farm income could have been and indeed was obtained at one visit. Some households were involved in businesses other than farming, e.g. shop, garage, etc. and incomes arising from these businesses were recorded by the female interviewers at their second visit to the household.

The female interviewers spent about two and a half weeks in a region covering about sixteen households. They made at least four visits to each household during this time and in some cases, they had to make extra visits to obtain all the data required. The extra visits were usually necessary in order to meet a member of the household who was absent at an earlier visit. Each housewife and each income recipient in co-operating households was paid £1 gratuity on completion of a set of schedules. On returning to the office at the end of 2½ weeks field work the interviewers spent the remainder of the three weeks scrutinising the results and seeing that the completed schedules for each

household were in order. In a large-scale survey this scrutiny would be done in the interviewers' field headquarters and hence it can be taken that in the study it took three weeks to complete the recording of expenditure and non-farm income in 16 households.

### *Types of Information Collected*

The following types of data were collected:

1. Information on household members—relationship to head of household, age, etc.
2. Annual fixed expenditure such as rates, rent, etc.
3. Expenditure on items purchased on a day to day basis, e.g. food, cigarettes, cleaning materials, newspapers, etc.
4. Consumption of home-produced food.
5. Irregular large expenses such as household durables, clothing and footwear, house repairs, etc.
6. Regular personal expenditure such as holidays, licences, motor tax and insurance, etc.
7. Details of income and deductions from income.

The definitions used in collecting and classifying this information are given in Appendix B.

### *Description of Schedules*

In the 1965-66 Urban Household Budget Inquiry (H.B.I.) carried out by the Central Statistics Office the various income and expenditure data were collected in three questionnaires, copies of which are published in the Report of the Inquiry.<sup>3</sup> Similar type data on expenditure and non-farm income were collected in the present inquiry but in this case it was found convenient to use six schedules.

The reasons for using the extra schedules might be summarised as follows:

1. Somewhat more data on incomes and occupations were collected in this survey than in the H.B.I.
2. In the present survey data on irregular large expenses were collected every three months and so a separate schedule was required for these items.
3. Shorter schedules tend to give more flexibility to the interviewer than longer ones, i.e. two short schedules can often be fitted into a respondent's timetable more easily than one long one. Also short schedules are not as tiresome to complete as long ones since a break can be taken between them.

<sup>3</sup>Household Budget Inquiry, 1965-66, pp. 195 *et seq.*, compiled by C.S.O.—Stationery Office, Dublin, August 1969, Prl 266.

In addition to the expenditure and non-farm income schedules a farm account book was used in the present study to collect information on farm income and expenditure on the larger holdings while a single page income and expenditure "Farm Income Schedule" was used for recording data on very small holdings.

A list of the schedules used together with a brief description of each is given below, but readers interested in further details may obtain copies on application to the ESRI.

The schedules used were as follows:

1. Annual Fixed Charges Schedule.
2. Seven Day Schedule.
3. Irregular Large Expenses Schedule.
4. Schedule for Recall Visits.
5. Regular Personal Expenditure Schedule.
6. Personal Income Schedule.
7. Farm Account Book and Farm Income Schedule.

#### *Annual Fixed Charges Schedule*

This schedule was completed by one of the female interviewers on her first visit. The following information was obtained from the head of the household.

1. A complete list of household members, as defined in Appendix B, together with details of sex, age, marital status, whether an income recipient and/or spender, and type of school being attended.
2. Information on whether the dwelling was owned or rented.
3. Details of annual fixed charges such as rent, rates, water charges, insurance, gas, electricity, telephone and the proportion of these which should be charged as farm or business expenses.

Little difficulty was encountered in completing this schedule though the allocation of some expenses between household and farm or business was not always easy. These allocations were made by the householder after discussion with the interviewer.

#### *Seven Day Schedule*

At the first visit, recording was also commenced of the day-to-day expenditure on all household goods and services. Each income recipient was asked to keep a daily record of all expenditure occurring for two consecutive seven-day periods, in a seven day schedule. Day-to-day items of farm or business expenses were excluded at a later stage if they were entered here. Provision was made in the schedule for the recording of the consumption of own farm produce by the housewife on a daily basis over the fourteen day period. Home produced fuel was accounted for in the farm records because daily measurements of this

item were not feasible for the housewife. (The problems encountered in recording household consumption of own produce are discussed in more detail later).

The households were visited on at least three other occasions during the two seven-day periods in connection with other items of expenditure and non-farm income. Checks were made at these visits to see that the seven-day schedules were being kept satisfactorily and any problems that arose were dealt with on these visits. The completed schedules were scrutinised before being collected at the end of each of the seven-day periods.

#### *Irregular Large Expenses Schedule*

Details of irregular large expenses were collected from each income recipient for the preceding three months at the third visit. The first seven-day schedule was also collected at this visit and the second seven-day schedule was commenced. Irregular large expenses covered both expenses of a personal and household nature. They included all fuel and power, telephone accounts, house repairs, maintenance and decoration, durable goods (such as gas or electric appliances, cars, furniture and furnishings, etc.), clothing and footwear, etc. Information on durable goods sold or traded in part against a new article was obtained. Goods purchased on hire purchase were also noted so that the proper payments could be offset against the individual items at a later time. All expenses relating to medical, dental and nursing fees in the previous three months were included, such as expenditure on optical goods, medicines got with or without prescriptions, surgical goods, etc. Payments made by cheque or banker's order for membership fees, etc. were also included. All items of less than 10 shillings in value were excluded from this schedule.

#### *Schedule for Recall Visits*

As the farm surveyor would be visiting a majority of the households in the study throughout the year in connection with the farm accounts, it was decided to have him visit all households periodically to record annual figures for irregular large expenses such as had been obtained for three months only in the previous questionnaire. Thus every household (whether or not it was keeping a farm account) was visited at three-monthly intervals and details were recorded of expenditure on these items for the preceding three months. These quarterly visits were also used to record gas, electricity and telephone expenses throughout the year even though payments on the last account received for these items had already been entered in the schedule for annual fixed charges.

#### *Regular Personal Expenditure Schedule*

Information on regular personal expenditure, e.g. licences, motor tax, insurance of all kinds, etc., were collected from each income recipient on the fourth visit. The second seven-day schedule was checked and collected at this visit also. Any items listed in this schedule that were used solely for farm or

business purposes were completely excluded, but if an item was used partly for household and partly for farm or business purposes the expense share attributable to the household only was included. This share was estimated by the person in the household most intimately connected with it. Holiday expenses during the previous year were included together with school and examination fees. Scholarships of any kind were noted and were later included as a component of income.

#### *Income Records*

Many people are reluctant to disclose their incomes and this fact results in a high rate of non-co-operation in household budget inquiries. For this reason the income data are usually obtained at an early visit and with this problem surmounted the inquiry can proceed more smoothly.

Non-farm income was recorded in this survey by the female interviewers as soon as all income recipients in the household had agreed to co-operate. This was generally done at the interviewers' second visit though sometimes it had to be postponed to a subsequent visit, if a respondent was unavailable. The farm income on all holdings could not, of course, be obtained at this time since in many cases it depended on records extending over the whole year. However, all the recording was commenced at an early visit and all the one visit estimates were made at this time also. None of the people keeping farm records dropped out during the year but if they had, an attempt would have been made to estimate annual income from the data already collected.

#### *Personal Income Schedule*

Non-farm income was recorded in a personal income schedule for each income recipient at the second visit. Details of the main and subsidiary paid occupations of each worker, whether in an agricultural or other occupation, the number of weeks worked at these occupations and the gross earned income during the previous year (or period of time most suitable for each person) were recorded. All deductions from pay in the form of income tax, social insurance contributions, life assurance, health insurance, pension fund, and trades union subscriptions were also recorded as well as information on bonuses. Every effort was made to distinguish clearly between gross and disposable incomes. Persons retired on pension from past employment were asked to give details of gross pension, deductions therefrom, and net pension for the previous twelve months. Similarly all persons were asked to give information on income accruing from interest or dividends over the past year, again distinguishing between net and gross income.

Payments from the State were also recorded. These were classified under the following headings:

1. Children's allowances.
2. Unemployment assistance or benefits.

3. Old age pension.
4. Widow's pension.
5. Disability pension.
6. Any other benefits.

As many as possible of these were verified by checking particular characteristics of the household members, e.g. children's allowances, old age pension, widow's pension, etc. Information was also collected on income from property and income from part-time work or irregular employment as well as emigrants' remittances from at home in Ireland or from abroad. Unfortunately, there was no means of cross-checking the latter figures.

There was little difficulty in recording the incomes of wage and salary earners. For self-employed persons such as small shop-keepers, etc., a few of whom were included in the sample, the recording was more difficult. In these cases, the interviewer had to obtain estimates of sales and purchases of goods, as well as any other expenses for the business in order to arrive at the income figures.

Once people had agreed to co-operate they appeared to be willing to give all the details they could recall of both earned and unearned income. Contrary to what one might expect, they did not seem to be at all wary about giving details of benefits paid by the State or emigrants' remittances, etc.

Unfortunately the farm incomes did not relate to exactly the same period as the non-farm incomes. The farm incomes related to a year within the period December 1968 to February 1970, while the non-farm incomes related to a year within the period January 1968 to end of June 1969. The seven month period December 1968 to end of June 1969 was common to both. This lack of correspondence in the income reference period is not entirely satisfactory, particularly if an important objective of the study is to obtain figures for sources and distribution of income. Two methods of overcoming this difficulty might be considered in a large-scale study. The first method would be to spread the survey over two years carrying out the farm and non-farm income surveys the first year and the expenditure survey in the second year. This procedure would not necessarily be much more expensive than a single year survey as in either case two sets of people would have to be employed for one year only (i.e. one group of male and one group of female interviewers). In the two-year study the male interviewers who would collect all the income data could be dispensed with at the end of the first year, when the female interviewers would take over, whereas in the one-year survey the two groups would be working simultaneously.

The main disadvantage associated with this suggestion is that the data collection would be spread over a rather longer period and there would inevitably be a higher rate of fall-out than if the survey were concentrated into a single year.

The second suggestion which is the one most favoured by the authors would

be to retain a one-year survey but to spread the non-farm income collection over the survey year. This could be done in a two-cycle expenditure survey by collecting non-farm income figures at both visits. It could also be done by having the farm surveyors collect non-farm income at their periodic visits to farms throughout the year or by making special visits for this purpose.

#### *Farm Income Recording*

One of the main problems in preparing for a rural household budget study is to devise a relatively inexpensive means of estimating farm incomes. Farmers themselves have usually little idea as to their exact annual incomes and there is no point in asking them straight out for such figures. The normal method of estimating farm incomes is by having accounts kept on the farms under review, and to ensure that the accounts are being properly kept the farms are visited by a trained interviewer on a number of occasions throughout the year. At these visits questions are asked as to the various transactions which took place since the previous visit and the accounts brought up to date in this way. It is quite obvious that this is a rather time-consuming operation and is an expensive method of obtaining farm income data if the number of visits to each farm is frequent.

It is, of course, possible for a well-trained farm surveyor to make reasonably good estimates of farm income on many farms at a single visit but this procedure has its disadvantages also. The time taken to do the interviewing increases greatly with size of business and on many farms the respondent gets impatient before all the required information is obtained. In such circumstances the surveyor has little option except to hurry over the final details and terminate the interview. Arranging to come back at a later date seldom works well in these cases. After one long gruelling interview the respondent usually has had enough. Because of this problem, experienced farm surveyors do not care very much for the one visit approach to obtaining farm incomes except on very small businesses. If the business is of any fair size they prefer to pay a number of short visits throughout the year and so obtain the required information without any great strain on themselves or the respondents. It is a question therefore of finding the happy mean where costs are not too high and results are reasonably good.

Unfortunately there are no objective criteria for determining when the correct balance has been obtained, and the person responsible must play it very much by ear. Of course a lot depends on the purpose of the survey. If the objective is to obtain information on expenditure and the income data are only required for classification purposes then figures for farm income obtained at one or a few visits would suffice. In such a case the surveyor could take short cuts on the larger farms so as to keep the length of interview within bounds, i.e. not more than about one hour or so.

If on the other hand the purpose of the study is primarily to obtain income figures, then it would be wise to go over to farm accounts for the medium to



large farms. The number of visits to be undertaken on these depends on the size of the business. In the Foras Talúntais Farm Management Surveys the interviewers visit the co-operating farms six to eight times a year but at these visits they collect much more farm data than would be required in a rural household budget inquiry.\* Hence it can be expected that in the latter case fewer visits would be required.

In the survey under review a well-trained farm surveyor was employed to collect the farm income information with the initial objective of ascertaining if reasonable estimates of income could be obtained in a single visit to each holding.

For this purpose two types of income schedule were used. One was a single page "Farm Income Schedule" similar to that shown in Appendix B, and the other was the Farm Account Book used by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries in connection with the Small Farm (Incentive Bonus) Scheme.† This is a very small book of 13 pages aimed at obtaining sufficient information to determine figures for output, expenses and income for the whole farm.

The single page schedule was useful only for the very small farm businesses. For the larger business the farm account book was more satisfactory, even for a one-visit estimate. By going through the various pages of the book it was possible in one interview to build up a fair picture of the farm income on many farms. On many others, however, scrutiny of the results revealed that the estimates obtained were not very reliable. It was therefore decided in the interests of accuracy to go over to book-keeping on all except the very small businesses.

At the end of the accounting periods the book results were compared with the available one-visit estimates with rather indifferent results. In some cases the estimates were quite close to the account figures but in others they diverged considerably, particularly on large mixed holdings. It is not possible, however, to draw any firm conclusions from the discrepancies found since the two sets of figures relate to two different years, i.e. the account book results relate to the survey year while the one-visit estimates relate to the previous year. As a result of our experiences, however, we would not be too happy with figures for farm incomes obtained at one visit on medium to large mixed farms. On these holdings two to four visits would be required depending on the size of the business. Only in rare instances should more than four visits be necessary. On small farms on the other hand and on medium to large dairy farms where creamery receipts are available, good income figures could be obtained at one visit. In a full-scale inquiry the farm surveyor would have to decide for himself whether he should keep an account book on a holding or do the job in one interview but whoever is in charge of the survey should keep in close

\*Personal communication from M. Brannick, Head of Field Services, Rural Economy Division, an Foras Talúntais.

†Copies of this book were kindly supplied by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for the purpose of this study.

touch in order to see exactly what is happening in the field in this regard, and advise accordingly.

In the final count we had 74 completed farm account books for the 105 households of which 10 were entered up at one visit. All of these had some sales of farm produce. In addition there were a further 18 completed farm income schedules showing that there was some farm income for 92 households. The entries on these 18 schedules related almost entirely to household consumption of own farm produce, only on four of them were some sales recorded. On the holdings for which farm accounts were kept, inventories were taken at the first visit but inventories taken after 1 February 1969 were in all cases dated back to that date so as to prevent the inquiry extending over too long a period. This back-dating by as much as three months in some cases presented no great problems.

Farm transactions were recorded from the date of the opening inventory and were kept up to date on subsequent visits by the surveyor. At the final visit transactions since the previous visit together with end inventories were entered. The accounts were then summarised and the required details extracted. On some of the very small holdings, there was little farm recording to be done at the different visits but since the households were being visited every quarter in connection with the irregular large expenses, the surveyor usually checked the farm accounts whenever he called.

In all cases the surveyor retained the account book himself and made the necessary entries at his visits from data supplied by the farmer. In most cases these data were supplied from memory by the farmer but in some cases a record of large transactions was kept in a diary. On two holdings accounts were being kept by the local agricultural advisor. These were made available to the farm surveyor with the farmers' permission. The definitions used in obtaining farm income are given in Appendix B.

#### *Problems Encountered in Estimating Household Consumption of Own Farm Produce*

The problem of weighing and measuring the home produced food presented the usual measurement difficulties. Where no measure for liquids or solids was available, it was necessary to measure the cooking and storage utensils which were in daily use; the housewife indicated the amounts normally consumed by the family and these were weighed or measured. Where the housewife had an existing means of measure either for solids or liquids, this was checked before recording began.

It was considered that the 14-day records of home-produced food would give accurate annual estimates of these data when grossed for all households. This was because it was hoped that the records would be staggered over most of the year and that seasonality would thereby be allowed for. However, with this sample, the 14-day records were carried out over the seven-month period December 1968 to July 1969 only and as a result seasonality was not fully taken

into account for all items. This was evident from the results of the farm records from which estimates of household consumption of own produce were also obtained.

For some items like milk and potatoes, the grossed 14-day figures were quite close to the farm records. For others, particularly pigs and poultry, the two estimates differed, the farm record figures being somewhat lower than the 14-day figures, except for turkeys.

Though the estimates from the farm accounts were considered more accurate than the 14-day figures, it was decided not to use the farm figures since purchased and home-produced goods are probably competitive consumption items. Thus, if consumption of home produced meats were reduced to the amounts indicated by the farm records, the consumption of purchased meats would have to be increased by some amount to counterbalance this reduction. As it was not possible to define the amount of this adjustment, it was decided to accept the data as recorded in the 14-day schedules, except in the case of turkeys. In this latter case, the figure on the 14-day schedules was understated as the householders were not asked to keep records over the Christmas period. The figures for this item from the farm records were used, but no adjustments were made in the consumption of other meats to counteract the inclusion of turkeys.

As stated above the discrepancies between the two estimates of household consumption of own produce were no doubt strongly associated with the period over which the recording extended. They may also be due to a certain extent to the size of the sample. Therefore, with a large sample and 14-day records spread over the year the results would probably be much better. However, for satisfactory results the records for each household should extend over two 14-day periods at six monthly intervals and the records for the total sample should be continuous for a period of at least one year.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY

Though the sample of households included in this study is very small and is unrepresentative nevertheless it is felt that the results should be published in some detail for the following reasons:

1. To show by comparison with data from other sources whether or not reasonably accurate figures can be obtained from such surveys. It had been suggested to us at the commencement of this study that householders would be unwilling to disclose details of non-farm income. The authors are reasonably satisfied that such figures can be obtained but it is left to discerning readers to judge if the overall results look realistic (though not necessarily representative) when compared with data from broadly based national surveys.

2. To show the type of information forthcoming from a survey of this nature so that official authorities can decide if public money should be spent on obtaining such information in a full-scale inquiry.
3. To give an indication of how data of this kind should be presented (i.e. the type of tables which might be constructed and the sort of commentary which might be of interest).
4. It is felt that despite their limitations the data are of interest in their own right and provide a strong case for the conduct of a broadly based inquiry of this nature.

The detailed results of the Survey are set out in Table A.1 to A.7 of Appendix A. To facilitate the presentation two main classifications were adopted namely:

- (1) Size of household (number of persons) and
- (2) Gross weekly income per household (£).

Results were also classified by size of holding but as there were small numbers in the different conventional size groups very few results are given for this classification. Because of the small size of the sample it was not considered realistic to analyse the data on the basis of household location (i.e. by county or region). The class intervals for the classifications used and the number of households in each class are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1: *Main Classifications adopted and number of households in each class*

<i>Size of holding (acres)</i>	<i>Number of households</i>	<i>Size of households (Number of persons)</i>	<i>Number of households</i>	<i>Gross weekly income per household (£)</i>	<i>Number of households</i>
0-1 acre	27	1-2	39	under 10	35
1-30 "	36	3-4	24	10-20	31
30-100 "	29	5-6	25	20 and over	39
100 acres and over	13	7 and over	17	—	—
Total	105	—	105	—	105

#### *Summary of the Main Results*

A summary of the main results of the survey is given in Table 2 where data on household composition, income, and expenditure are classified by household size and gross weekly income.

This table shows that in all households the average number of gainfully employed persons per household was 1.35 while the number of non-gainfully employed persons was 1.60. The average number of total persons per household was 4.06.

TABLE 2: *Summary of Household Composition, Income and Expenditure per Household, classified by Size of Household and Gross Weekly Income (a)*

Item	Size of Household (Persons)				Gross Weekly Income (£)			All Households
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	under 10	10-20	20+	
Number of Households	39	24	25	17	35	31	39	105
<i>Household Composition</i>	<i>(Persons per household)</i>							
Gainfully employed	0.82	1.38	1.88	1.76	0.83	1.26	1.90	1.35
Non gainfully employed	0.90	1.54	2.20	2.41	1.23	1.87	1.72	1.60
Total 14 years and over	1.72	2.92	4.08	4.18	2.06	3.13	3.62	2.95
Total under 14 years	0.00	0.50	1.32	4.18	0.20	0.97	2.02	1.11
Total persons	1.72	3.42	5.40	8.35	2.26	4.10	5.64	4.06
<i>Household Income</i>	<i>(£ per week)</i>							
Earned Income (b)	8.06	22.11	22.54	25.76	3.50	9.84	36.38	17.58
Unearned income	3.83	3.23	4.87	4.93	4.05	5.08	3.42	4.12
Total gross income	11.90	25.34	27.40	30.69	7.55	14.92	39.80	21.70
Obligatory deductions	0.23	0.60	0.99	0.64	0.03	0.19	1.33	0.56
Disposable income	11.67	24.74	26.41	30.05	7.52	14.71	38.47	21.14
Inventory changes	0.78	-0.31	2.20	3.33	0.45	0.13	2.95	1.28
Balance of income (b)	10.89	25.05	24.21	26.72	7.07	14.58	35.52	19.86
<i>Household Expenditure (b)</i>	<i>(£ per week)</i>							
Food	3.94	6.13	8.31	11.21	3.92	6.44	9.29	6.66
Clothing and Footwear	0.95	1.93	3.18	6.34	0.99	2.62	3.97	2.58
Fuel and light (b)	0.89	1.05	1.06	1.36	1.08	0.97	1.43	1.05
Housing	0.97	0.89	1.02	0.97	0.50	1.21	1.19	0.96
All other goods	3.80	4.29	6.63	6.65	2.11	4.46	7.79	5.00
All services	1.81	2.46	3.64	4.36	0.90	2.36	4.87	2.85
Total expenditure (b)	12.36	16.75	23.84	30.89	9.50	18.06	28.54	19.10

(a) The figures given in this and in other tables are of an illustrative nature and must not be taken as being representative of rural conditions generally.

(b) Includes household consumption of own produce.

For all households the average earned income per household per week was £17.58. Unearned income was £4.12 giving a total gross weekly income of £21.70. The obligatory deductions (income tax, social welfare contributions etc.) were £0.56 per week leaving disposable income at £21.14 per week. If we wish to compare income with expenditure, however, two\* further items should, be allowed for, namely, depreciation of farm machinery and the value of changes in farm inventories, since these are non-cash items which enter into the estimates of farm expenses and output.

For all households combined it was found that depreciation was almost

\*As expenditure in this table has been defined to include household consumption of own produce, which item is also included in income, no adjustment need be made for such consumption.

identical with expenditure on farm capital items less capital receipts, hence no adjustment need be made for depreciation. An adjustment has, however, to be made for inventory changes since these are substantial on some of the larger holdings.

For all households the value of inventory increases came to £1.28 per week and when this is deducted from disposable income, giving what we termed the "balance of income", the amount available for spending is £19.86 per week. This compares with the figure of £19.10 per week for total expenditure which is a very close correspondence for figures of this kind. As might be expected, the correspondence is not nearly so close for the various sub-groups, particularly for the 3-4 person households where the balance of income is £25.05 as against an expenditure of £16.75 per week, and for the £20 and over per week households where balance of income is £35.52 as against expenditure of £28.54. Among the lower income group on the other hand there tends to be dissaving. In the £10-£20 income group balance of income is £14.58 per week while expenditure is £18.06 while in the under £10 per week group the figures are £7.07 and £9.50 respectively.

As was pointed out in the evaluation of the results of the urban household budget inquiry<sup>4</sup> direct comparison between income and expenditure is misleading to a certain extent. In the first place the scope of the income compared with the expenditure definitions employed in all household budget inquiries differs in a number of respects. For example, in this study the definition of household income excludes certain receipts of an irregular and non-recurring nature such as legacies, receipts from the sale of possessions, loans, withdrawals from savings, maturity payments on insurance policies, etc. As these receipts can be used to finance consumer transactions they must account to some extent for the apparent deficit in the results in the lower income households. On the other hand additions to savings could account for the surplus in the higher income households. Also the time periods for the income and expenditure figures did not always coincide so that stated income and expenditure figures need not necessarily be the same. In addition, of course, the income of a particular household in a certain year may be temporarily higher or lower than its long run level.

In the 1965/66 urban household budget inquiry, expenditure exceeded income in all households by an average of £2.16 per week as the figures in Table 3 show. Despite this overall deficit, however, income was greater than expenditure in the £40 per week and over income groups, showing that as in the present study the upper income people tend to save and the lower income group to dissave.

#### *More detailed Results*

The data in Table 2 are in a rather abbreviated form and so give a general

<sup>4</sup>*Op. cit.*—p. xiii.

TABLE 3: *Summary of Income and expenditure from 1965/66 urban household budget classified by size of income*

Item	Gross weekly income (£)						All income groups
	Under 10	10-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50+	
(1) Disposable household income	5·65	14·39	22·85	31·78	40·21	58·93	19·06
(2) Total expenditure	7·84	17·24	25·89	34·61	39·43	51·10	21·22
(3) Difference (1) — (2)	-2·19	-2·85	-3·04	-2·83	0·78	7·83	-2·16

outline only of the sample results. Detailed tables are therefore presented in the following sections which give a more comprehensive picture of household composition, income and expenditure patterns in the different households.

### *Household Composition*

#### *Age and Marital Status*

The number of persons in the sample classified by age and conjugal condition is shown in Table 4. A number of ratios based on the data in this table are given in Table 5, where they are compared with similar ratios for aggregate rural areas\* in the 1966 Census of Population.<sup>5</sup>

As can be seen from Table 4, the total number of persons in all households in the sample was 426. This is an average of 4·06 persons per household compared with 4·03 in the urban household budget inquiry of 1965/66 and with 3·95 in "aggregate rural areas" in the 1966 Census of Population.<sup>6</sup>

TABLE 4: *Number of Persons in households classified by sex, age group and conjugal conditions*

Age Last Birthday	Male				Female				Total Persons
	Single	Married	Widowed	Total	Single	Married	Widowed	Total	
0-4	28	0	0	28	15	0	0	15	43
5-13	39	0	0	39	34	0	0	34	73
14-19	27	0	0	27	11	0	0	11	38
20-29	26	5	0	31	8	9	0	17	48
30-39	13	7	0	20	2	13	1	16	36
40-49	5	15	0	20	4	19	3	26	46
50-64	9	25	2	36	4	24	4	32	68
65+	11	27	6	44	5	15	10	30	74
Total	158	79	8	245	83	80	18	181	426

\*The area outside towns of 1,500 inhabitants or over is classed as belonging to the aggregate rural area.

<sup>5</sup>Census of Population of Ireland, 1966, Vol. II—Ages and Conjugal Conditions Classified by Areas.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 266.

Of the total persons in the sample 116 were under 14 years of age while 74 were 65 years of age and over. The ratio of the sum of these two groups to the remaining persons commonly known as the dependency ratio was 0.81 as shown in Table 5. This ratio is a good deal higher than the corresponding figure of 0.71 kindly calculated for us in the CSO for aggregate rural areas in the State in 1966. However, it should be pointed out that this difference is not statistically significant, as can be shown by testing the difference between the proportions of dependents in the sample which is 44.6 per cent and that in the rural population which is 41.5 per cent.

The number of females per 100 males in the sample was only 74 compared with 89 in the aggregate rural areas in 1966. The low female/male ratio is due among other things to the fact that in the sample there was an extraordinarily low number of females in the 0-13 year age groups. Since this cannot be explained by migration or emigration as could such a sex ratio among the over 14 year age groups it must have occurred by chance.

TABLE 5: *Average Household Composition, and Other Population Characteristics in Rural Household Budget Sample (1968/69) compared with those in aggregate rural areas (1966)*

Item	Aggregate rural areas 1966	Rural Household Budget sample 1969
Average number of persons per household	3.95	4.06
Dependency ratio (a)	0.71	0.81
Number of females per 100 males	89	74
<i>Single persons 20 years and over as per cent of all members of similar sex in this age group</i>		
Males	45	42
Females	25	19

(a) Persons under 14 years of age plus those 65 years of age and over as a proportion of the remaining population.

Of the females in the age group 20 years and over 19 per cent were single while of the males in the same age group 42 per cent were single. These proportions compared with figures of 25 per cent and 45 per cent respectively for the same categories in the aggregate rural areas in 1966.

#### *Occupations of Household Members*

The number of household members in each occupational group 14 years and over classified by age and conjugal condition is given in Table 6.

As can be seen from this table there were 142 gainfully employed persons in the sample. Of these 61 returned themselves as farmers, 28 had other agricultural occupations, mainly relatives assisting on farms while 53 were returned as having other gainful employment.



TABLE 6: *Household Members (male and female) in each Occupational Group Classified by Age and Conjugal Conditions*

Occupations	Age in Years				Conjugal Conditions						All Persons
	14-19	20-39	40-64	65+	Single		Married		Widowed		
					M	F	M	F	M	F	
Number of Persons											
Farmers	0	16	33	12	18	1	38	0	2	2	61
Other agricultural occupations	3	16	8	1	22	1	5	0	0	0	28
All other gainful employment	4	24	21	4	18	12	17	2	0	4	53
Total gainfully employed	7	56	62	17	58	14	60	2	2	6	142
Home duties	1	25	43	10	0	10	0	68	0	1	79
Retired	0	0	3	43	7	1	12	10	6	10	46
All other 14 years and over	30	3	6	4	26	9	7	0	0	1	43
Total not gainfully employed	31	28	52	57	33	20	19	78	6	12	168
Total persons 14 years and over	38	84	114	74	91	34	79	80	8	18	310

Of the 168 people in the sample not gainfully employed, 79 were engaged in home duties, 46 were retired and the remaining 43 were returned as others. The latter were mainly students. Of the 61 farmers in the sample 33 were between 40 and 64 years and 12 were 65 years of age and over. Thirty-eight of the farmers were married and 4 (2 males and 2 females) were widowed. The number of household members in each occupational group classified by size of holding, size of household and gross weekly income is given Table A.1 of Appendix A.

#### *Details of Income*

##### *Income Sources*

Figures for average weekly income per household from different sources classified by size of household and gross weekly income are given in Table A.2. Because of the nature of the sample, however, it must not be assumed that this income pattern is representative of rural households generally.

Figures for the proportional contribution of certain sources to total gross income in different classes of household are shown in Table 7 below. Proportions for different sized holdings are given here also so as to give an idea of the sources of income in farm households. This table shows that for all households agricultural occupations contributed almost half of the total gross income (47%) with other gainful employment contributing about one-third. Unemployment assistance and other state benefits such as old age pensions, children's allowances, etc. accounted for about 13 per cent of total gross income, interest

and dividends were about 4 per cent, while emigrants' remittances were less than 2 per cent. In summary, therefore, for all households in the sample earned income accounted for about four-fifths of total gross income while unearned income accounted for almost one-fifth. Of course, this proportion varied very much as between different classes of household.

The first section of Table 7, where households are classified by size of holding, shows that on the 1-30 acre holdings gross income was divided fairly equally between agriculture, other gainful employment and unearned income. On these small holdings 28 per cent of the gross income came from state benefits, the main constituent of this item being old age and widow's pensions and children's allowances. The state benefits included here do not include any of the items of "state expenditure in relation to agriculture" which are published annually in the Budget tables and which amounted to about £90 million in 1969-70.<sup>7</sup> The appropriate items of the latter expenditure are included in the figures for income from agricultural occupations. On the very large holdings agriculture contributed over 80 per cent to total income while unearned income accounted for less than 4 per cent. About 16 per cent of the income on these farms came from gainful employment other than agriculture. On the 30-100 acre holdings, on the other hand, agriculture provided only two-thirds of the gross income.

The second section of Table 7, where incomes are classified by size of household shows that in the very small households unearned income was about one-third of total income, the major portion of this income being state benefits.

TABLE 7: *Percentage contribution of certain income sources to total gross income in different classes of household*

<i>Income Sources</i>	<i>Size of holding (acres) (a)</i>		
	1-30	30-100	100 and over
<i>Earned income from:</i>			
Agricultural occupations	31.1	63.7	80.3
Other gainful employment	32.3	23.0	16.1
Total earned income	63.5	86.8	96.4
<i>Unearned income from:</i>			
Interest, dividends, pensions from employment	6.2	0.8	1.2
Social welfare and other State benefits (b)	28.1	10.8	1.6
Emigrants' remittances and other unearned	2.1	1.5	0.8
Total unearned income	36.4	13.1	3.6
Total gross income	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>7</sup>Budget 1970, p. 59—Stationery Office, Dublin.

	<i>Size of household (Persons)</i>			
	1-3	3-4	5-6	7 and over
<i>Earned income from:</i>				
Agricultural occupations	50·0	55·0	40·6	43·8
Other gainful employment	17·8	32·2	41·7	40·1
<i>Total earned income</i>	67·8	87·2	82·3	83·9
<i>Unearned income from:</i>				
Interests, dividends, pensions from employment	9·0	1·0	6·2	1·4
Social welfare and other State benefits ( <i>b</i> )	20·3	11·0	10·6	12·7
Emigrants' remittances and other unearned	2·9	0·8	0·9	1·9
<i>Total unearned income</i>	32·2	12·8	17·7	16·0
<i>Total gross income</i>	100·—	100·—	100·—	100·—
	<i>Gross weekly income (£)</i>			
	0-10	10-20	20 and over	All Households
<i>Earned income from:</i>				
Agricultural occupations	34·2	39·0	52·0	47·1
Other gainful employment	12·2	26·9	38·3	33·9
<i>Total earned income</i>	46·4	66·0	90·3	81·0
<i>Unearned income from:</i>				
Interest, dividends, pensions from employment	7·4	6·4	3·3	4·3
Social welfare, and other State benefits ( <i>b</i> )	41·7	24·3	6·0	13·2
Emigrants' remittances and other unearned	4·4	3·2	0·4	1·5
<i>Total unearned income</i>	53·5	33·9	9·7	19·0
<i>Total gross income</i>	100·—	100·—	100·—	100·—

(a) Holdings of 0-1 acre excluded from the classification by size of holding but are included in the other classifications.

(b) Other State benefits do not include State expenditure in relation to agriculture as published in the Budget tables. Appropriate items of this latter expenditure are included in arriving at income from agricultural occupations.

The last section of Table 7 shows that in the very low income groups unearned income made up over half of the total income with agricultural occupations accounting for about one-third. In the very high group on the other hand unearned income accounted for only about 10 per cent while income from agricultural occupations accounted for over half of total income.

*Home consumed food and fuel valued at retail prices*

It might be argued that for measuring rural incomes, unsold food and fuel consumed in the homes should be valued at retail prices and that if this were done the average incomes would be much higher. The results after such a valuation are given in Table 8.

As can be seen from this table the valuation of food and fuel at retail prices did not affect the income situation substantially particularly in the smaller sized and lower income households. In the 1-2 person households and in the households having less than £10 per week gross income, the valuation of food and fuel at retail prices increased average income by only about £0.51 per week. In other households it increased incomes somewhat more but in no case was the average increase more than £1.40 per week. For all households the average increase was about £0.80 per week.

*Details of agricultural output, expenses and resources on sample farms*

Though the figures for farm output and income are not representative of farms generally, nevertheless it is felt that such figures should be given in a paper of this kind, so as to complete the picture of the sample used. Figures for output, expenses and income classified by size of holding are given in Table A.3 while details of resources used per holding and certain economic indicators for the different sized holdings are given in this table also. The more important results from this table are summarised in Table 9 opposite.

TABLE 8: *Income effects of valuing home produced food and fuel (a) at agricultural and (b) at retail prices*

Classification	Value of home produced food and fuel at						All other Incomes (c)	Total Gross Income	
	Agricultural Prices			Retail Prices				(a+c)	(b+c)
	Food	Fuel	Total (a)	Food	Fuel	Total (b)			
	£ per week								
<i>Size of household (persons)</i>									
1-2	0.41	0.29	0.70	0.68	0.42	1.10	11.20	11.90	12.30
3-4	0.70	0.42	1.12	1.26	0.60	1.86	24.22	25.34	26.08
5-6	1.15	0.62	1.77	1.99	0.90	2.89	25.63	27.40	28.52
7+	1.38	0.42	1.80	2.56	0.61	3.17	28.89	30.69	32.06
<i>Gross weekly income (d) (£)</i>									
0-10	0.43	0.40	0.83	0.76	0.58	1.34	6.72	7.55	8.06
10-20	0.84	0.42	1.26	1.48	0.61	2.09	13.66	14.92	15.75
20+	1.13	0.43	1.56	1.99	0.63	2.62	38.24	39.80	40.86
All households	0.81	0.42	1.23	1.42	0.61	2.03	20.47	21.70	22.50

(a) and (b) Agricultural and retail prices for the different foods were obtained from CSO.

(c) Income not including the value of home produced fuel and food.

(d) In deriving the income intervals for this classification, home produced food and fuel were valued at agricultural prices.

Table 9 shows that in the 1-30 acre group, output per holding was about £246. Total current expenses were £69 leaving a family farm income of £177. On the 30-100 acre holdings total output per holding was £1,087, total current expenses were £397 leaving a family farm income of £690. On the large holdings, on the other hand, total output per holding was £3,925, of which £354 was for increased inventories. Some of the inventory rises were due to increased prices but they were mainly due to extra stock numbers particularly cattle. Total current expenses on the over 100 acre holdings were £2,101 leaving a family farm income of £1,824.

The average area of land farmed per holding on the 1-30 acre holdings was 10.4 acres, on the 30-100 acre holdings 55.1 acres and on the 100 and over holdings 130.2 acres. An average of less than one labour unit was employed on the 1-30 acre holdings; somewhat more than one unit was employed on the 30-100 acre holdings while on the 100 and over acre holdings

TABLE 9: *Agricultural output, expenses, income and resources used classified by size of holding (a)*

Item	Size of holding (acres)			
	1-30	30-100	100+	
<i>Per Holding</i>				
<i>Output</i>				
Sales less purchases of livestock	£	162	935	3,478
Changes in inventories	£	14	62	354
Household consumption of own produce	£	70	90	93
<b>Total output</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>1,087</b>	<b>3,925</b>
<b>Total current farm expenses</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>2,101</b>
<b>Family farm income</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1,824</b>
<i>Resources used</i>				
Land farmed	acres	10.4	55.1	130.2
Total labour units	units	0.88	1.13	1.78
Total inventories (b)	£	307	1,407	5,825
<i>Economic indicators</i>				
Total output	£ per ac. farmed	23.6	19.7	30.2
Family farm income	£ " " "	17.2	12.8	16.1
Total inventories	£ " " "	29.5	25.5	44.8
Family farm income	£ per unit family labour	202	627	1,381

(a) Because of the nature of the sample the results for the different size groups must not be taken as being nationally representative.

(b) Average of beginning and end of year inventories.

a little less than two units were employed of which about half a unit was hired. The average value of investment in livestock, machinery and crops was £307, on the 1-30 acre holdings, £1,407 on the 30-100 acre holdings and £5,825 on those 100 acres and over. On the latter holdings the total investment in livestock, machinery and crops per acre was £45 of which £34 was for livestock and £10 for machinery.

The total output per acre farmed was about £24 on the 1-30 acre holdings, £20 on the 30-100 acre holdings and £30 on the 100 and over acre holdings. The output figure of £30 per acre on the 100 acre holdings compared with £20 on the 30-100 acre farms is unusual as it is normal for output per acre to decrease with increased farm size. The results of the 1955-59 Farm Survey<sup>8</sup> showed that for all regions and all systems of farming the small farms tended to have higher outputs per acre than the larger ones. However, the more recent Farm Management Surveys by An Foras Talúntais,<sup>9, 10</sup> do not follow this pattern entirely as the figures in Table 10 show.

TABLE 10: *Output per acre on different sized holdings in all regions and for all systems of farming, 1955-59, 1966-67 and 1967-68*

Size Group acres	Farm Survey 1955-58	Farm Management Surveys	
		1966-67	1967-68
<i>Output per adjusted acre (£)</i>			
5- 30	20.7	19.6	23.9
30- 50	20.5	21.8	25.2
50-100	20.0	22.7	26.9
100-200	18.4	20.5	25.0
200 + acres	15.6	18.9	21.0

As can be seen from this table the per acre outputs in 1966-67 and 1967-68 are higher on the 30-50 and 50-100 holdings than on the 5-30 acre groups, indicating a change in the output pattern by farm size over the years. This trend however does not progress into the over 100 acre groups where the per acre outputs are lower than those on the smaller holdings. The high output per acre figures obtained on the large holdings in the present study do not therefore appear to be very typical. As it turned out, most of the large farms included in the survey had high stock and cropping rates and appeared to be farmed rather efficiently. There is no doubt but that they are much better than average.

<sup>8</sup>National Farm Survey 1955/56-1957/58 Final Report compiled by CSO. Pr. 6180 Stationery Office, Dublin, August 1961.

<sup>9</sup>Farm Management Survey, 1966/67, An Foras Talúntais, Sept. 1969.

<sup>10</sup>Farm Management Survey, 1967/68, An Foras Talúntais, August 1970.

*Expenditure Patterns**Total Expenditure*

The average values of goods and services consumed in different households in the sample on a per household and per person basis classified in different ways are shown in Table A.5. The goods entered include both purchased and home produced items the latter valued at agricultural prices. A summary of these results for all households combined is given in Table 11 below.

TABLE 11: *Average weekly value of goods and services used in all households*

Item	Per Household (£)			Per Cent			Per Person
	Purchased	Home Produced	Total	Purchased	Home Produced	Total	Total (£)
Food	5.85	0.81	6.66	32.73	65.89	34.87	1.64
Clothing and footwear	2.58	—	2.58	14.42	—	13.49	0.63
Fuel and light	1.05	0.42	1.47	5.85	34.11	7.67	0.36
Housing	0.96	—	0.96	5.39	—	5.04	0.24
All other goods	4.63	—	4.63	25.91	—	24.24	1.14
All services	2.81	—	2.80	15.70	—	14.69	0.69
Total expenditure	17.87	1.23	19.10	100.—	100.—	100.—	4.70

This table shows that of the total value of £19.1 per week for goods and services £17.9 was spent on purchased items, the value of home produced food and fuel being about £1.2 per week. The total value of goods and services used per person was £4.7 per week of which about £1.6 went for food. Of the money spent on purchased items about one-third went for food, one-seventh for clothing and footwear, about one-tenth for fuel, light and housing, one-quarter for all other goods and about one-sixth for all services.

In order to see if the pattern of expenditure of this inquiry appears realistic, some of the percentage figures from Table A.4 are given in Table 12 along with similar figures from the 1965-66 Household Budget Inquiry and from the 1964-65 Foras Talúntais Study. This table shows that the figures from the study under review appear fairly realistic particularly when the purchased items are compared with the CSO results.

Figures for housing were not collected in the Foras Talúntais Survey but as might be expected the proportion spent on housing is somewhat higher in the overall CSO sample than in the ESRI study. However the CSO figure for small towns and that from the ESRI study are remarkably close. On the other hand the proportion spent on clothing and footwear in the CSO study is less than in either of the others. The figure for fuel and light is much higher and that for all other goods is much lower in the Foras Talúntais Survey than in the other two.

TABLE 12: *Proportional contribution of different items to total expenditure from different surveys*

Item	ESRI (a)		CSO (b)		FT (c)
	1968-69		1965-66		1964-65
	Purchased	Total	Total	Small Towns*	Purchased
<i>Per Cent</i>					
Food	32.73	34.87	31.55	33.90	35.52
Clothing and footwear	14.42	13.49	9.10	10.25	13.93
Fuel and light	5.85	7.67	5.29	6.11	11.33
Housing	5.39	5.04	8.09	5.09	—
All other goods	25.91	24.24	27.98	28.96	19.67
All services	15.70	14.69	17.99	15.68	19.55
Total	100.—	100.—	100.—	100.—	100.—

(a) Present study.

(b) CSO Household Budget Inquiry, 1965-66.

(c) An Foras Talúntais farm-family expenditure study, 1964-65.

\*Towns with less than 1,500 inhabitants.

### *Expenditure on Food*

Details of the average weekly value of all food (purchased and home produced) consumed per household and classified by size of household and by income are given in Table A.5. As can be seen from this table the average consumption in all households out of a total food budget of £6.66 per week was £1.8 per week for meat or 28 per cent; £1.3 for bread, flour and cereals or 19 per cent; £1.4 for dairy produce and eggs or 22 per cent; £0.5 for potatoes and vegetables or 7 per cent and £0.2 for fruit or about 3 per cent. The average weekly expenditure on meals away from home was about £0.2 or about 3 per cent of total food expenditure. Details of the average weekly quantities of the principal foods consumed per person classified by gross weekly income and by size of household are given in Table A.6. The consumption of the principal items for all households from this table are converted to annual data in Table 13 below where they are compared with similar data from the 1965-66 Household Budget Inquiry and with the national data published annually by the Central Statistics Office. In preparing this table some of the data from the present study (ESRI figures) and from the Household Budget Inquiry had to be adjusted so as to make them comparable with the national figures. For example, cream was converted to milk equivalent and entered with fresh milk while the figures for rashers, bacon and ham were converted to pork equivalent and added on to the figures for pork. Despite this adjustment the figures for pig meat are still not entirely comparable as between the



national estimates and the others since the pork equivalent of sausages and cooked meats is included in the national figures while it is not in the others.

One further general point regarding comparability should be noted also. As the national estimates of consumption per person are obtained by dividing total national consumption by the indigenous population (tourists being omitted) the resulting figures are not strictly comparable with those from household budget inquiries. The degree of non-comparability will tend to vary for different items depending on tourists' preferences but in general because of the method of calculation the national figures for all items should tend to be higher than those for comparable items from a full scale, representative national household budget inquiry.

Table 13 shows that for practically all items the figures for consumption per person from the 1965-66 HBI are lower than the national estimates for comparable items. They are also lower than the ESRI figures for all items except beef, veal and other meats. Because the consumption figures from the

TABLE 13: Comparison of figures for certain items of food consumption from different sources

Item	Unit of Quantity	ESRI	Central Statistics Office	
		1968-69	Household Budget 1965-66	National estimates for 1968 <sup>11</sup>
<i>Per person per year</i>				
Fresh milk (a)	gallon	40.7	33.3	45.7
Butter	lb.	32.2	30.2	29.1
Cheese	lb	4.7	4.0	4.7
Eggs	No.	313	196	230
Beef and veal	lb.	18.2	24.1	39.3
Mutton and lamb	"	27.0	17.8	23.8
Pig meat (b)	"	56.7	38.7	56.3
Poultry	"	10.4	—	20.2
Other meats (c)	"	13.0	22.2	—
Total meat	"	125.3	102.8	139.6
Potatoes	"	339	250	312
Tea	"	9.4	8.8	—
Sugar	"	69.2	58.7	59.1

(a) Includes the milk equivalent of cream.

(b) The figures given for pig meat are for pork equivalent and are obtained by multiplying those for rashers, bacon and ham by 1.33.

(c) Includes sausages, black and white puddings, cooked meats, liver and other edible offals, together with poultry meat in the case of the 1965-66 HBI figure. Where actual quantity figures were not available the amounts were estimated from the values of the items concerned.

<sup>11</sup>*Irish Statistical Bulletin*, p. 293, Vol. XLIV, No. 4. Dec. 1969.

HBI (which relate to town households) are lower than the national averages for comparable items we would expect that the ESRI estimates for rural households should be higher than the national figures. This is not always the case, however, but when account is taken of the tourist effect mentioned above the ESRI figures look reasonably realistic.

*Expenditure on non-food items*

Figures for the average weekly expenditure per household on non-food items classified by size of household and gross weekly income are given in Table A.7. As can be seen from this table the total expenditure on non-food items varied from £8.1 per household in the small sized households to £19.3 in the largest size group, the average for all households being £12.0 per week. In the households with less than £10 per week gross income the average expenditure on non-food items was £5.2 per week while in the £20 and over households it was £18.8 per week.

Further reference to Table A.7 shows that for practically all the classifications listed expenditure per household increased with household size and average household income. Actually there was no expenditure at all on children's clothing or on education in the 1-2 person households reflecting the absence of children in these households.

A summary of the actual and percentage expenditure per household on non-food items for all households is given in Table 14. This table shows that

TABLE 14: *Actual and percentage weekly expenditure per household and per person on purchased non-food items*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Actual</i>		<i>Per Cent</i>
	<i>Per Household</i>	<i>Per Person</i>	
	£		
Clothing and footwear	2.58	0.63	21.43
Fuel and light	1.05	0.26	8.69
Housing	0.96	0.24	8.02
Tobacco and cigarettes	1.21	0.30	10.05
Alcoholic drinks	0.55	0.13	4.58
Household durables and semi-durables	0.62	0.15	5.19
Transport and vehicles	1.57	0.39	13.06
Miscellaneous goods	0.68	0.17	5.64
Holiday expenses and entertainment	0.55	0.13	4.54
Medical expenses	0.65	0.16	5.37
Insurance and pension contributions	0.41	0.10	3.41
Education, training and personal services	0.34	0.08	2.85
All other expenditure	0.86	0.21	7.17
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>12.02</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>100.00</b>

the highest proportion of the expenditure on non-food items went for clothing and footwear (21 per cent). The next highest was transport and vehicles (13 per cent) followed closely by tobacco and cigarettes (10 per cent) purchased fuel and light (9 per cent) and housing (8 per cent). Medical expenses accounted for about 5 per cent of non-food expenditure with somewhat similar amounts being spent on household durable and semi-durable goods and on holiday expenses and entertainment.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR A FULL SCALE RURAL HOUSEHOLD BUDGET INQUIRY

On the basis of the results obtained in this study the authors are satisfied that a full scale rural household budget inquiry is a feasible proposition. It is pertinent therefore to examine the problems likely to be encountered in making such a study and the best means of overcoming these.

The problems are discussed under the following headings:

- (1) Choice of a sampling frame.
- (2) Collection of data on expenditure and household consumption of own produce.
- (3) The estimation of incomes and
- (4) The organisation of fieldwork including cost.

### *Choice of a sampling frame*

The choice of a sampling frame depends on the population it is intended to survey. If the inquiry is to cover only the farm population the best available sampling frame is the agricultural enumeration books in the Central Statistics Office. However, a rural survey which would complement the urban household budget would need to cover all rural households including households in small towns with a population of less than 200 people. For such an inquiry, the agricultural enumeration books are an inadequate frame as they cover only households having at least  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre of land attached. Households with gardens of less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre in area (and there are many of these in rural areas and small towns) would therefore have no chance of being selected. In the survey under review we sampled for convenience from the agricultural enumeration books and even though over a quarter of the households selected had no significant farm income it is suspected that the latter were not fully representative of rural non-farms. Hence for a comprehensive rural survey it is felt that some other sampling frame would be required.

The most up-to-date and comprehensive list of rural adults is of course the voters' registers. Unfortunately, these lists are not a satisfactory frame from which to draw a sample of households in small towns and rural areas since

in these places the names are registered in alphabetical rather than in household order. It might appear that by over-sampling, it would be possible to obtain a reasonable sample from such lists but this is only partially true. Random samples drawn from alphabetical lists will give over-representation to the larger households and though an adjustment can be made for this later, such adjusting is rather awkward and is not favoured by statisticians.

The only other available sampling frame is the list of households from the census of population. The criticism of this register is that since it is compiled every five years only, it may be very much out of date by the time a survey is carried out. This is a serious disadvantage in large towns where a good deal of new building is taking place, but it is not of such great importance in rural areas where changes come about very slowly and where few new households tend to appear. Accordingly it is felt that the census of population register is a suitable sampling frame for a rural household budget inquiry.

With regard to sample size the number of households included in the 1965-66 urban inquiry forms a good yardstick. Since the number of urban and rural households is about the same (i.e. 325,000 and 362,000 respectively in 1966), sample size in a full scale rural survey should theoretically be about the same as that in the urban inquiry, namely, 2,400 households visited twice at 6 monthly intervals which is equivalent to 4,800 visited once. Practical considerations however may cause a considerable reduction in this number. As shown later the cost of carrying out a rural inquiry is so very high and the staffing problems are so great that the responsible authorities may have to settle for a much lower figure.

#### *Collection of data on Expenditure and Household Consumption of own Produce*

There appears to be little difference between urban and rural households as regards the difficulty of keeping expenditure records. If anything the recording of these items is somewhat easier in the country because people do not shop so often there. The problems of estimating household consumption of own produce are slightly more difficult in rural than in urban areas because of the larger amount of such produce consumed in the country areas. However, no great difficulty was experienced with this recording in the study under review.

The visiting of households is undoubtedly more difficult in rural than in urban areas because of the wider dispersion and greater inaccessibility of the former. Despite this problem of access the time taken per household in the present survey compared favourably with that taken in the 1965-66 HBI. In the latter survey it is estimated that each interviewer completed one cycle in 18 households in three weeks, whereas in the present study it took about 3 weeks to complete the equivalent of one cycle in 16 households.

#### *Estimation of Incomes*

In urban household budget inquiries it is usual to record data from all

sources at a single interview. In a rural inquiry data on non-farm income could also be obtained at one visit but as pointed out earlier the authors would not be too happy with figures for farm incomes obtained at one visit on medium to large mixed farms. On these holdings two to four visits would be required depending on the size of the business. One of these visits should be arranged close to the beginning and another to the end of the accounting year so as to obtain accurate inventory data.

Since the collection of farm income data is a rather specialised undertaking, it would be necessary to employ some experienced farm surveyors in a large scale household budget inquiry. These would deal with the medium to large farms. With a little training however the female interviewers could easily record the farm income on small holdings at a single interview thus saving travelling time by the farm surveyors. For this purpose they should be supplied with a farm income schedule similar to that shown in Appendix B, which should be completed at the same time as the information on other income is being obtained. In practice however, the estimates of farm income on the very small holdings should be recorded by the interviewer, male or female, who makes the initial contact. If it happens that the farm surveyor is the first to visit a small holding he might as well canvass co-operation and record the farm income at that visit.

#### *Organisation of Fieldwork*

It is estimated that in a full scale rural household budget inquiry the farm income (if any) could be recorded by the female interviewers in about one-third of the households, leaving two-thirds of the sample to be covered by the farm surveyors. On the basis of the time taken for visits in the present survey it is estimated that with suitable clustering a farm surveyor should be able to make about 20 visits per week or 800 per annum (allowing for office work etc.). Assuming an average of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  visits per household, a surveyor could therefore cover about 230 holdings in a year. To maintain this timetable he would need to stick closely to financial transactions and except for checking animal numbers and household consumption of own produce he should do the minimum of other physical recordings. A specially designed farm record book would be required similar to that used in connection with the Small Farm Incentive Bonus Scheme but having summary tables from which the data could be punched directly on to cards.

With regard to the female interviewers it has been shown above that it took one interviewer 3 weeks to complete 16 sets of household schedules. On this basis and allowing for holidays, training time and for time lost in moving from one area to another it is felt that a female interviewer could cover about 220 households in one year in a single cycle survey. Allowing for time saved in locating households it has been estimated that this rate of work would be equivalent to the completion of about 240 sets of household schedules in a two cycle survey, where each household is visited twice. This compared with 264

sets of completed household schedules per interviewer in the 1965-66 HBI.

For a two cycle rural survey therefore covering 2,400 individual households, 20 female interviewers and 6 male farm surveyors would be required. They would need to work in teams of 4 or 5 depending on the region of the country involved. Two teams operating in the west and north of the country might have 4 female and one male interviewer per team, while 4 teams operating in the remainder of the country where farm recording would be more onerous could have 3 females and one male, per team. In addition, at least two field supervisors would be required (one male and one female) to co-ordinate the work and see that the schedules were being completed properly.

At the beginning of the survey all interviewers male and female should set out to visit separate households, but as each household in rural areas is visited, the location should be entered on a map so that another interviewer searching for this household can find it easily. In marking the location an indication should be made in coloured ink as to whether or not the household is one for a farm account. Maps marked in such a way by female interviewers and passed on to the appropriate farm surveyor indicate to the latter at a glance the exact location of the households he should visit.

In the organisation of fieldwork for a full scale rural inquiry a major difficulty is likely to arise in connection with the travelling of interviewers. In an urban inquiry the field workers can get around by public transport or by taxis for short fares. In a rural household inquiry on the other hand it is essential that each interviewer be motorised and this raises a most serious question in present circumstances.

For a survey of this nature employment is normally offered for one year only. The type of candidate applying will therefore be a young person interested in obtaining experience of survey work, and few of these people will be able to provide themselves with a car for such a short-term appointment. The employer could of course make possession of a car essential for appointment but such a condition would be dangerous as it would in all probability eliminate many desirable people and bring about the inclusion of people who would not be capable of doing the job properly.

The non-possession of cars by the interviewers is however not as great a drawback as might be thought. At the present time fleets of small cars can be rented from car hire firms and some organisations have found that the hiring of such cars is more economical for them than the payment of a mileage allowance on employees' own cars if the annual travelling on official business is more than 17,000 miles per person. In a rural household budget, interviewers would on average have to travel this number of miles during the year and so the hiring of cars if necessary would be a feasible proposition.

Unfortunately even with hired cars it may be impossible to get the work done using temporary wholetime interviewers. As a result of the high costs of learning to drive a car nowadays it may be difficult to recruit a sufficient

number of suitable interviewers who are also qualified to drive cars. In these circumstances there may be no option except to employ at least some part-time staff on the collection of expenditure data in household budget inquiries. This is unsatisfactory in many ways and it may prove quite costly to overcome some of the problems to which this arrangement gives rise.

Increased costs may have to be incurred for the following reasons:—

1. A large number of part-time interviewers would have to be employed and so the cost of training would be very high. The cost of training 60 part-time people would be three times that of training 20 whole-time workers.
2. Very tight field supervision would be necessary and so extra field supervisors would have to be employed. However one supervisor per 20 female interviewers should be sufficient.
3. Part-time interviewers would have to operate outside their own immediate neighbourhoods and so travelling expenses would probably be higher than if whole-time staff were employed.

If however care were taken with the training and supervision it is felt that part-time workers could be used to supplement a small core of whole-time staff, particularly as there is a considerable number of suitably qualified people (mainly married women) throughout the country who would be willing to do work of this kind. It would not be possible to recruit farm surveyors in this way and suitable people able to drive cars would have to be employed on a whole time basis for this work. Such people will not be found easily but the small number required might be obtained on secondment from some other organisation.

#### *Cost*

It is estimated that the cost of doing the fieldwork in a two-cycle household budget survey covering 2,400 individual households (4,800 sets of household returns) would at current (1971) costs work out at about £60,000 if whole time interviewers were employed and possibly up to £10,000 extra if a large number of part-time interviewers had to be employed. In arriving at this cost it is assumed that the households are clustered in such a way that the average travel per visit is around 15 miles, a figure which is somewhat lower than the average mileage per visit in rural ESRI surveys of this kind but greater than that in the Foras Taluntais Farm Management Survey.

This cost includes salaries or fees paid to interviewers and supervisors, travelling and maintenance expenses for fieldwork and training sessions and gratuities at £1 per income recipient. As the above cost is very high there may be little option except to reduce the sample size.

## SUMMARY

This feasibility study of rural household budgets was undertaken to investigate the methods of obtaining both income and expenditure information in a single survey from individual rural households. This paper reports on 105 households in different parts of the country. It should be emphasised that a sample of this size while sufficient for testing methodology is not intended to give representative results. Accordingly the results given must be taken as being of an illustrative nature rather than as accurate estimates of rural income and expenditure levels.

The counties in which the survey was done were arbitrarily selected to represent different types of farming and different social conditions so that the full spectrum of farming conditions could be experienced and any special problems located. The sample was drawn in the Central Statistics Office from the 1965 Agricultural Enumeration Books. A total of 138 households were approached to obtain a final sample of 105 co-operating households.

In this study, the households co-operated in (a) an expenditure survey involving the recording of detailed household accounts for a period of two weeks as well as giving information on expenditure by interview, (b) a survey to determine farm income, farm expenditure and household consumption of own farm produce for one year and (c) an investigation to determine non-farm income from all sources such as off-farm employment, dividends and pensions from at home or abroad, social welfare and other benefits, emigrants' remittances etc.

Fieldwork commenced in December 1968 and continued until February 1970. Two female interviewers collected the data on household expenditure and non-farm income. One male interviewer (farm surveyor) dealt with the farm income. Each householder was canvassed by letter and this was followed within a week by a visit from one of the interviewers. The purpose of the inquiry was explained at this visit, complete confidentiality was assured and co-operation was sought from each income recipient present. If all income recipients were not present, an appointment was made for a time when the absent members would be available. The female interviewers spent about 2½ weeks in a region covering about 16 households. They made at least four visits to each household during this time and in some cases they had to make extra visits.

Ninety-two households had farm incomes of one kind or another. From these 74 completed farm account books were obtained. Ten of these accounts had very few transactions and were entered up at a single visit. In the remaining 18 households the farm incomes related almost entirely to household consumption of own produce and were recorded at one visit on a single page Farm Income Schedule.

Though the sample of households included in this study is very small and may be unrepresentative of rural households, nevertheless it is felt that the results should be published in some detail, for the following reasons:



1. to show by comparison with data from other sources whether or not reasonably accurate figures can be obtained from such surveys,
2. to show the type of information forthcoming from a survey of this nature so that official authorities can decide if public money should be spent on obtaining such information in a full scale inquiry,
3. to give an indication of how data of this kind should be presented and finally,
4. it is felt that despite their limitations the data are of interest in their own right and provide a strong case for the conduct of a broadly based inquiry of this nature.

Results were classified by size of household, gross weekly income and size of holding. There were 142 gainfully employed persons and of these 61 returned themselves as farmers, 28 had other agricultural occupations (mainly relatives assisting on farms) while 53 were returned as having other gainful employment. Of the 168 people not gainfully employed, 79 were engaged in home duties, 46 were retired and the remaining 43 were classified as other (being mainly students). The average number of persons (14 years of age and over) per household who were gainfully employed was 1.35 while the average number of non-gainfully employed was 1.60. There were 1.11 children under 14 years giving an average of total persons per household of 4.06.

Agricultural occupations contributed almost half of the total gross weekly income (47 per cent) per household with other gainful employment contributing about one-third. Unemployment assistance and other state benefits such as old age pensions, children's allowances etc. accounted for about 13 per cent of total gross income; interest and dividends were about 4 per cent while emigrants' remittances were less than 2 per cent. To summarise the income situation, then, earned income accounted for approximately four-fifths of total gross income and unearned income for the remaining fifth. This proportion varied very much between households at different income levels.

The average earned income per household per week was £17.58, unearned income being £4.12 giving a total gross weekly income of £21.70. The obligatory deductions (income tax and social welfare contributions) were £0.56 per week leaving a disposable income of £21.14 weekly. However, two further items should be taken into account when comparing income with expenditure (1) depreciation of farm machinery (2) the value of changes in farm inventories, since these are non-cash items which enter into the estimates of farm expenses and output. When gross weekly income was adjusted by these items, the result was £19.86 weekly, being the "balance of income". Total expenditure (purchases and value of home produced goods) amounted to £19.10 weekly. Both in this survey and in the Urban Household Budget (1965-66) the higher income households tended to save and the lower income households to dissave.

In the 1-30 acre holdings, output per holding was £246, total current expenses were £69 leaving a family farm income of £177. On the 30-100 acre holdings total output per holding was £1,087, total current expenses were £397 leaving a family farm income of £690. On the holdings over 100 acres total output per holding was £3,925 of which £354 was due to increases in inventories. Total current expenses on these holdings were £2,101 leaving a family farm income of £1,824. The total value of goods and services consumed per household was £19.10, of which £17.9 was spent on purchased items the remaining £1.2 being the value (at agricultural prices) of home produced food and fuel consumed in households. One-third of the money spent on purchased items was for food, one-seventh for clothing and footwear, one-tenth for fuel, light and housing, one-quarter for all other goods and one-sixth for all services.

The average food budget was £6.66 per household per week of which £1.8 was allocated to meat and meat products (28 per cent); £1.3 to bread, flour, cereals etc. (19 per cent); £1.4 to dairy products and eggs (22.2 per cent); £0.5 to potatoes and vegetables (7 per cent); £0.2 to fruit (3 per cent) and meals away from home £0.2 (3 per cent).

The average expenditure on non-food goods per household was £12.02 of which the highest proportion was allotted to clothing and footwear (21 per cent); next came transport and vehicles (13 per cent), followed closely by tobacco and cigarettes (10 per cent), purchased fuel and light (9 per cent) and housing (8 per cent). Approximately 5 per cent was spent on each of the following categories: alcoholic drink; household durable and semi-durable goods; miscellaneous goods; holiday expenses and entertainment; and medical expenses. Insurance and pension contributions and education, training and personal services accounted for 3 per cent each while the remaining groups accounted for 7 per cent in total.

On the basis of the results obtained in this study, the authors are satisfied that a full scale rural household budget inquiry is a feasible proposition. The sample size should be about the same as that in the urban inquiry (2,400 households visited twice at 6 monthly intervals, which is equivalent to 4,800 visited once). There appears to be little difference between urban and rural households as regards the difficulty of keeping expenditure records. No great difficulty was experienced in this survey in the recording of household consumption of home produce. Data on non-farm income could be obtained at one visit but the recording of farm incomes would require two to four visits on medium to large mixed farms, while one visit would be sufficient for small holdings. It is estimated that in a full scale rural household budget inquiry the farm income (if any) could be recorded by the female interviewers in about one-third of the households. The remaining two-thirds would have to be dealt with by trained farm surveyors. A female interviewer could deal with about 220 holdings in one year in a single cycle survey or with 240 sets of household schedules in a two cycle survey. Assuming an average of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  visits

per household a farm surveyor should be able to cover 230 holdings in a year. For a two cycle rural survey therefore covering 2,400 individual households, 20 female interviewers and 6 male farm surveyors would be required.

While the ideal arrangement would be to employ full-time staff, a lack of suitable interviewers who are qualified to drive cars may make it necessary to employ some part-time interviewers. If this is done, training and supervision would need to be very rigorous, resulting in increased training and other costs.

It is estimated that the cost of completing the fieldwork in a two cycle household budget inquiry would be approximately £60,000 at current (1971) prices if whole-time interviewers are employed and possibly up to £10,000 extra if a large number of part-time interviewers have to be taken on. In arriving at this cost it is assumed that the households are clustered in such a way that the average travel per visit for whole-time interviewers is not greater than 15 miles. This cost includes salaries or fees paid to interviewers and supervisors, travelling and maintenance expenses for fieldwork and training sessions and gratuities of £1 for each income recipient who fully co-operates. As this cost is very high there may be no option except to reduce the sample size.

TABLE A.1: Household members male and female in each occupational group classified by size of holding, size of household and gross weekly income

Occupation	Size of Holding (acres)				Size of Household (persons)				Gross weekly income (£)			All Households
	0-1	1-30	30-100	100+	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	under 10	10-20	20+	
Number of Households	27	36	29	13	39	24	25	17	35	31	39	105
Farmer	0	20	28	13	16	20	16	9	15	17	29	61
Other agricultural occupations	3	12	6	7	5	8	11	4	8	8	12	28
All other gainful employment	25	17	9	2	11	5	20	17	6	14	33	53
Total gainfully employed	28	49	43	22	32	33	47	30	29	39	74	142
Home duties	17	28	21	13	14	21	25	19	19	26	34	79
Retired	11	29	5	1	19	7	15	5	17	20	9	46
All other 14 years and over	10	12	14	7	2	9	15	17	7	12	24	43
Total not gainfully employed	38	69	40	21	35	37	55	41	43	58	67	168
Total 14 years and over	66	118	83	43	67	70	102	71	72	97	141	310
Total under 14 years	27	31	39	19	0	12	33	71	7	30	79	116
Total persons	93	149	122	62	67	82	135	142	79	127	220	426

TABLE A.2: Average weekly income per household from different sources classified by size of household and gross weekly income per household (£) (a)

Income Sources	Size of household (persons)				Gross weekly income (£)			All Households
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	under 10	10-20	20+	
Number of Households	39	24	25	17	35	31	39	105
<i>Earned Income</i>								
Family farm income	5.02	12.27	10.19	13.28	2.23	5.13	18.81	9.24
Other agricultural income including wages of hired farm workers	0.93	1.67	0.94	0.17	0.35	0.69	1.77	0.98
Income from all other gainful employment	2.12	8.16	11.42	12.30	0.92	4.01	15.80	7.36
(1) Total Earned Income	8.06	22.11	22.54	25.76	3.50	9.84	36.38	17.58
<i>Unearned Income</i>								
Interest, dividends, rents, pensions from past employment	1.07	0.25	1.71	0.44	0.56	0.96	1.24	0.93
Unemployment benefits or assistance	0.78	0.21	0.77	0.91	0.97	0.59	0.46	0.67
All other state benefits	1.63	2.57	2.15	2.99	2.18	3.04	1.51	2.19
Emigrants' remittances	0.27	0.20	0.11	0.30	0.33	0.26	0.08	0.22
All other unearned incomes	0.08	—	0.13	0.29	—	0.21	0.13	0.11
(2) Total Unearned Income	3.83	3.23	4.87	4.93	4.05	5.08	3.42	4.12
(3) Gross Weekly Income (1)+(2)	11.90	25.34	27.40	30.69	7.55	14.92	39.80	21.70
<i>Obligatory deductions</i>								
Income Tax	0.18	0.52	0.80	0.40	—	0.04	1.16	0.44
Social Welfare contributions	0.05	0.08	0.19	0.24	0.03	0.15	0.17	0.12
(4) Total Deductions	0.23	0.60	0.99	0.64	0.03	0.19	1.33	0.56
(5) Disposable Income (3)—(4)	11.67	24.74	26.41	30.05	7.52	14.71	38.47	21.14

(a) Because of the nature of the sample it must not be concluded that this income distribution pattern is representative of rural households generally.

TABLE A.3: *Details of Agricultural Output, Expenses, Income and Resources, together with certain Economic Indicators; classified by size of holding(a)*

Item	Size of Holding (acres)			Item	Unit of Quantity	Size of Holding (acres)				
	1-30	30-100	100+			1-30	30-100	100+		
Number of Holdings	36	29	13	<i>RESOURCES</i>						
<i>OUTPUT</i>				<i>Per Holding</i>						
<i>Per Holding</i>				<i>Land</i>						
1. Sales (including current subsidies and lettings)	188	1,108	4,171	Land owned	acres	10.4	52.2	115.9		
2. Purchases of livestock	26	173	693	Less land let	"	0.6	0.0	2.9		
3. Sales less purchases of livestock 1-2	162	935	3,478	Plus land taken	"	0.5	3.0	17.2		
4. Changes in inventories	14	62	354	=Land farmed	"	10.4	55.1	130.2		
5. Household Consumption	70	90	93	<i>Labour</i>						
6. Total Output 3 +4 +5	246	1,087	3,925	Family labour, male	unit (b)	0.83	1.02	1.25		
<i>EXPENSES</i>				Family labour, female	"	0.06	0.07	0.07		
7. Rates, Annuities and rent of conacre	8	61	529	Total family labour	"	0.88	1.10	1.32		
8. Depreciation of machinery	3	31	249	Total hired labour	"	0.00	0.02	0.46		
9. Fertilisers and Lime	8	54	241	Total all labour	"	0.88	1.13	1.78		
10. Feeds and Seeds	27	153	402	<i>Inventories (c)</i>						
11. Current Hired Labour	1	15	276	Livestock	£	278	1,175	4,437		
12. Other current farm expenses	22	83	404	Machinery	£	17	178	1,299		
13. Total current expenses 7 +... 12	69	397	2,101	Crops	£	13	55	89		
14. Family Farm Income 6 - 13	177	690	1,824	Total inventories	£	307	1,407	5,825		
15. Labour and Family Income 11 +14	178	705	2,100	<i>ECONOMIC INDICATORS per acre farmed £</i>						
16. Capital farm cash receipts	4	34	47	Total output		23.6	19.7	30.2		
17. Capital farm cash expenses	4	80	278	Labour and family income		17.2	12.8	16.1		
				Family farm income		17.1	12.5	14.0		
				<i>Inventories</i>						
				Livestock		26.7	21.3	34.1		
				Machinery		1.6	3.2	10.0		
				Crops		1.2	1.0	0.7		
				Total inventories		29.5	25.5	44.8		
				<i>Labour Productivity</i>						
				Total output (per unit total labour)		279	961	2,205		
				Family farm income (per unit family labour)		202	627	1,381		

(a) These results must not be taken as being nationally representative.

(b) For definition of labour units see Appendix B.

(c) Average of beginning and end inventories.



TABLE A.5: Average Weekly Value of Total Food (home produced and purchased) Consumed per Household Classified by Size of Household and by Gross Weekly Income

	Size of Household (persons)				Gross Weekly Income (£)			All households
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	Under 10	10-20	20+	
	£							
Bread, flour, biscuits, breakfast cereals	0.89	1.03	1.47	2.13	0.92	1.33	1.51	1.26
Milk and cream	0.22	0.41	0.58	0.80	0.25	0.38	0.66	0.44
Cheese	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.06
Eggs	0.23	0.26	0.48	0.57	0.23	0.34	0.47	0.35
Butter	0.40	0.55	0.63	1.14	0.42	0.59	0.79	0.61
Margarine and other fats	0.02	0.05	0.09	0.19	0.03	0.07	0.10	0.07
<i>Meat</i>								
Beef and veal	0.18	0.41	0.39	0.43	0.13	0.33	0.49	0.32
Mutton and lamb	0.21	0.36	0.75	0.67	0.17	—	0.79	0.44
Pork, bacon and ham	0.56	0.74	0.96	1.03	0.57	0.78	0.95	0.77
Poultry	0.09	0.10	0.14	0.19	0.09	0.13	0.14	0.12
Sausages, liver and all meat extracts	0.08	0.17	0.21	0.40	0.09	0.19	0.26	0.18
Total Meat	1.12	1.76	2.45	2.71	1.04	1.75	2.63	1.84
Fish	0.04	0.11	0.17	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.16	0.09
<i>Vegetables</i>								
Potatoes and potato chips	0.17	0.28	0.28	0.45	0.21	0.24	0.35	0.27
All other fresh vegetables	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.25	0.05	0.16	0.21	0.14
Processed vegetables	0.03	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.02	0.11	0.13	0.09
Total Vegetables	0.26	0.53	0.59	0.83	0.28	0.50	0.69	0.49
Fresh fruit	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.32	0.01	0.15	0.25	0.14
Processed fruit	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.03	0.06	0.10	0.05
Total Fruit	0.08	0.15	0.30	0.42	0.04	0.20	0.35	0.20
Tea	0.18	0.31	0.36	0.34	0.24	0.29	0.31	0.28
Sugar	0.13	0.20	0.30	0.48	0.15	0.25	0.31	0.24
Other miscellaneous foods	0.21	0.54	0.70	0.90	0.18	0.52	0.82	0.52
Meals away from home	0.10	0.18	0.14	0.51	0.07	0.08	0.41	0.20
Total Value of All Food Consumed	3.94	6.13	8.31	11.21	3.92	6.44	9.29	6.66



TABLE A.6: *Average Weekly Total Consumption per Person of Principal Food Items (Quantities) Classified by Household Size and Gross Weekly Income*

Item	Unit of Quantity	Size of Household (persons)				Gross Weekly Income (£)			All households
		1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	Under 10	10-20	20+	
Fresh milk	pt.	6.57	6.56	5.87	5.87	6.05	5.68	6.39	6.11
Skim milk	pt.	0.01	0.12	0.08	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.07	0.06
Cream	pt.	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01
Cheese	lb.	0.14	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.09
Eggs	No.	9.28	4.96	6.05	5.04	6.83	5.69	6.27	6.01
Butter	lb.	0.97	0.67	0.49	0.55	0.75	0.60	0.59	0.62
Beef and veal	lb.	0.49	0.50	0.33	0.22	0.27	0.36	0.37	0.35
Mutton and lamb	lb.	0.63	0.50	0.64	0.37	0.41	0.39	0.63	0.52
Pig meat (a)	lb.	1.97	1.28	0.96	0.69	1.57	1.12	0.91	1.09
Poultry meat	lb.	0.35	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.24	0.18	0.18	0.20
Potatoes	lb.	9.58	8.67	5.25	4.56	9.01	5.72	6.08	6.52
Turnips	lb.	0.06	0.90	0.19	0.11	0.13	0.57	0.17	0.28
Tea	lb.	0.28	0.23	0.16	0.11	0.28	0.18	0.14	0.18
Sugar	lb.	1.64	1.38	1.22	1.27	1.49	1.38	1.25	1.33

(a) Pork equivalent (i.e. bacon and ham converted to pork by multiplying by 1.3.)

TABLE A.7: *Average Weekly Expenditure per Household on Non-Food Items Classified by Size of Household and Gross Weekly Income*

	Size of Household (persons)				Gross Weekly Income (£)			All households
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	Under 10	10-20	20+	
	£							
<i>Clothing and Footwear</i>								
Men's	0.66	0.63	1.08	1.21	0.51	1.06	0.98	0.85
Women's	0.28	0.83	1.05	1.76	0.43	0.53	1.43	0.83
Children's	0.00	0.47	1.04	3.37	0.05	1.03	1.56	0.90
Total Clothing and Footwear	0.95	1.93	3.18	6.34	0.99	2.62	3.97	2.58
<i>Fuel and light*</i>	0.89	1.05	1.06	1.36	0.68	0.97	1.43	1.05
Housing	0.97	0.89	1.02	0.97	0.50	1.21	1.19	0.96
Tobacco and cigarettes	0.93	0.88	1.52	1.86	0.79	1.16	1.62	1.21
Alcoholic drink	0.52	0.28	0.80	0.63	0.33	0.43	0.84	0.55
Household durable and semi-durable goods	0.37	0.61	0.83	0.93	0.26	0.49	1.06	0.62
Miscellaneous goods	0.42	0.57	0.97	0.99	0.20	0.52	1.23	0.68
Transport and vehicles	1.28	1.53	1.89	1.82	0.52	1.43	2.62	1.57
<i>Services</i>								
Holiday expenses	0.16	0.18	0.22	0.35	0.05	0.13	0.42	0.21
Entertainment	0.17	0.17	0.47	0.75	0.07	0.37	0.55	0.34
Education and training	0.00	0.06	0.32	0.05	0.00	0.08	0.20	0.10
Medical expenses	0.33	0.69	0.99	0.81	0.30	0.46	1.10	0.65
Insurance and pension contributions	0.19	0.28	0.54	0.89	0.09	0.18	0.88	0.41
Personal services	0.17	0.36	0.20	0.33	0.13	0.12	0.45	0.25
All other expenditure	0.79	0.72	0.89	1.19	0.26	1.02	1.28	0.86
Total Non-Food Expenditure	8.13	10.20	14.91	19.26	5.17	11.20	18.82	12.02

\*Excluding home produced fuel.

## APPENDIX B.

### BASIC CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

The basic concepts and definitions used in the survey and given below are, generally, those used in: (a) the Household Budget Inquiry 1965-66 carried out by the Central Statistics Office, and (b) the Family Expenditure Survey (1967) carried out annually by the British Department of Employment and Productivity.

#### 1. *Household*

A household was defined as a single person or group of people who live at the same address and who normally have their meals together. The household members thus defined were not necessarily related by blood or marriage.

#### 2. *Head of Household*

The head of the household had to be a member of that particular household. He or she was the person or the husband or wife of the person who:—

- (i) owned the household accommodation;
- (ii) was legally responsible for the rent of the accommodation;
- (iii) had the household accommodation as an emolument, for example, farm managers, caretakers etc.
- (iv) had the household accommodation by virtue of some relationship to the owner, who was not a member of the household;
- (v) was the elder of two members of the same sex with equal claim;
- (vi) was the male when two members of different sex had equal claim.

#### 3. *Member of Household*

The following rules were applied to certain categories of person when deciding whether or not they were members of a particular household:

- (i) In general, members of the family who lived and worked away from home and who only came home for holidays were not included in the household;
- (ii) Children (under 14) away at primary, secondary, or technical schools and also older persons receiving higher education away from home at universities, seminaries, etc. were included;
- (iii) Relatives who were regularly away from the household for part of the week were included if they spent at least four nights in the household per week;

- (iv) Married persons working away from home were included in their "home" household if they returned home at least one night a week.
- (v) Boarders, i.e. members of the household not related by blood or marriage to any other member of the household who in return for payment received accommodation for at least four nights per week and at least one meal per day when they were in residence, were included in the household unless they were married and returned home at the weekend;
- (vi) People away from home on holiday, on business, or in hospital at the time of interview and who normally lived in the household were included as members, unless they had been away continuously for more than six months;
- (vii) Visitors and temporary members of the household were included as household members only if they had lived continuously in the household for more than six months prior to the interview.

#### 4. *Children*

Persons under 14 years were defined as children.

#### 5. *"Retired" Person*

The definition comprises those who described themselves as "retired" and also those above the age of 70 years, other than a few old persons who were solely responsible for the operation of agricultural holdings. The latter had to be defined as farmers.

#### 6. *Income Recipient*

Any member of the household aged 14 years and over who received income from outside the household.

Paid domestic servants, farm workers (including relatives assisting), or shop assistants, etc. living in, were included, as were also household members in receipt of old age pensions, widow's pensions or social security benefits. The term "income recipient" corresponds to "earner" in the Urban Household Budget Inquiry. We avoided using the term "earner" in this study because it might be misconstrued to mean a recipient of earned income only.

#### 7. *Spender*

- (i) All persons over 14 years;
- (ii) Any member of the household under 14 years who was working part-time.

Exceptions to the definition of spender were made in the case of household members who were senile or mentally defective.

### 8. *School Attendance*

An individual was considered to be attending school if, at the initial visit, he was enrolled in a public or private school of any level or type, though he might be temporarily absent due to illness, etc., or he might be attending school only part of the day.

### 9. *Occupation*

- (i) Part-time occupation or work was defined as work occupying over ten hours per week, and up to and including thirty hours a week.
- (ii) Full-time work was defined as work occupying over thirty hours per week.
- (iii) Any occupation or work occupying ten hours or less per week was regarded as odd-job or irregular employment.
- (iv) Main occupation was accepted as described by the respondent but in cases of uncertainty it was taken to be the occupation at which the greatest number of weeks per year were spent.
- (v) A subsidiary occupation was also accepted as described by the respondent but in cases of uncertainty it was taken to be the occupation at which the second largest number of weeks per year were spent.

### 10. *Income*

Income has been divided into two categories:

- (a) *Earned income*; the main components of which were:
  - (i) family farm income which is defined in the agricultural section below;
  - (ii) other agricultural income such as (a) for labour or from hire of machinery, etc., received by members of the household from other farmers; (b) wages received by a farm labourer living-in; since he too is a member of the household. Such wages were charged as an expense in the farm account book but were regarded as part of the income of the household.
  - (iii) income from other gainful employment such as from a trade or profession, from fishing, from public work, odd-jobs, or from fees of any kind.
- (b) *Unearned income*; the main components of which were:
  - (i) income from investments such as interest, dividends, etc. Although it is usual in household budget inquiries to include an

imputed value for the services of owner-occupied dwellings this was not done here since such imputations usually bear very little relationship to the real value.

- (ii) unemployment assistance or benefits or other State benefits such as pensions, family allowances, maternity benefits, scholarships, etc.
- (iii) emigrants' remittances from abroad.
- (iv) migrants' remittances from elsewhere in the State.

#### 11. *Gross Income per Household*

This was defined as the sum of all earned and unearned income accruing to the individual members of the household.

#### 12. *Disposable Income per Household*

This was defined as gross income minus the direct obligatory deductions of income tax and social welfare contributions.

The following items were not regarded as income:—

- (i) money received by one member from another member of the household (housekeeping money, children's pocket money, etc.)
- (ii) withdrawals from savings, maturity payments on insurance policies, receipts from sale of possessions (e.g. house, furniture, etc.); withdrawals from loans obtained, loan repayments received, windfalls gains, inheritance (lump sum), tax refunds, lump sum compensation for injury, legal damages received, etc.

These may have financed household transactions but were nevertheless excluded.

#### 13. *Expenditure*

Expenditure was defined as *payments made* during the 14-day of record-keeping, irrespective of whether the goods or services paid for had been delivered or consumed. The amounts paid over longer periods for goods and services bought regularly, though infrequently, were dealt with by stating the last payment or total payments made during specified periods. The figure was later converted to a weekly value. The main expenditure groups were:

- (i) Food.
- (ii) Clothing and Footwear: men's, women's and children's outerwear, underwear, footwear, material for making up and cost of making up clothes.

- (iii) Fuel and Light: coal, coke, candles, firelighters, turf, wood, blocks, briquettes, oil, gas, electricity, and all other fuel and light.
- (iv) Housing: rent, rates, ground rent, water charges, insurance, instalments on house purchase, repairs and decorations, maintenance on gas and electric appliances.
- (v) Tobacco: Pipe tobacco, cigarettes, cigars, snuff, etc.
- (vi) Alcohol: all wines, beer, ale, porter, spirits.
- (vii) Household Durable and Semi-Durable Goods: furniture, floor coverings, curtains, large and small gas and electric appliances, radios and television sets, household utensils and textiles, e.g. cutlery, china, linen, and towels, brushes etc.
- (viii) Miscellaneous Goods: household non-durable goods, e.g. matches, cleaning materials, personal care goods, shampoo, hair oil, cosmetics, etc., personal durables, e.g. leather goods, jewellery, sports goods, newspapers and books (including textbooks), records, etc.
- (ix) Transport and Vehicles: net purchase of cars, vans, cycles, tax and insurance of these vehicles, their maintenance and running costs, bus and train fares etc., driving lessons.
- (x) Holiday Expenses: all expenditure on food, accommodation, transport, entertainment, alcohol etc.
- (xi) Entertainment: cinema, theatre, dancing, sports, and games.
- (xii) Education and Training: school or college fees, private tuition fees, e.g. dancing, music, examination fees.
- (xiii) Medical Expenses: doctors', dentists', opticians' fees, hospital fees and charges, medicines and drugs, tests, X-rays etc., voluntary health insurance.
- (xiv) Insurance and Pension Contributions: this category excluded social welfare contributions. It included life assurance, pension and educational policies, accident insurance, pension funds, trades union and other professional association subscriptions.
- (xv) Personal Services: hairdressing, shoe repairs, laundry, dyeing, cleaning of clothes, domestic services, all other services.
- (xvi) All Other Expenditure: postage and telephone, church and charity contributions, subscriptions to clubs, T.V. and radio rental, licences for car, driving, radio, T.V., dog, gun, etc. pocket money to children, betting payments less winnings, and all other expenditure.

#### 14. *Household (Family) Expenses*

Household expenses were defined to include housing, fuel and telephone expenses incurred solely or in part for household purposes, as well as travel expenses for shopping, school, recreation, to and/or from work for wages or salaries off the farm.

### *Agricultural Definitions*

#### 15. *Land Farmed*

This consists of land owned, less land let, plus land rented (i.e. taken). It includes the areas under farmyards, farm roads and fences, but it does not include commonage nor land like turf bogs, lakes, swamps or woodlands on which crops were not grown nor livestock grazed. The land included however has not been adjusted in any way for rough grazing or other sub-standard areas.

#### 16. *Total Output*

Sales less purchases of livestock, plus household consumption of own farm produce, plus or minus changes in the value of opening and closing livestock and crop inventories. Farm produce used on the farm for further agricultural production was not regarded as output.

#### 17. *Cash Output*

The term cash output has been used to denote sales of all agricultural commodities less purchases of livestock.

#### 18. *Inventory Valuations*

In valuing inventories of livestock and crops, the same prices were used in the opening and closing inventories for dairy cows, sows, ewes, poultry, crops and produce. Farmers' own valuations were used in the case of all other items with the exception of stallions, stock bulls and stock boars. For these latter items, depreciation at fixed rates was adopted.

#### 19. *Household Consumption of Home Produced Goods*

Includes own produce consumed by family, given as allowances to workers, given as gifts or left-over food fed to domestic pets. This produce may have been raised or grown on the farm, or obtained by hunting, fishing, gathering wild berries, etc., but home-canned, home-frozen or home-baked foods prepared from purchased ingredients were excluded. The produce was valued at national average agricultural prices obtained from the Central Statistics Office.

## 20. *Expenses*

The items of expenses listed below do not include purchases of livestock. The latter items were deducted from sales in obtaining output of livestock. All non-farming expenses were excluded. The following expense items were included:

- (i) Rates and Land Annuities: the total rates and annuities payable in respect of the financial year corresponding to the survey year were included. A deduction was made however for estimated rates and annuities of land let to others. In all cases the rates of the dwelling house had been obtained or estimated separately and included as a household rather than as a farm expense.
- (ii) Depreciation of Machinery: machinery items were valued at the farmers' estimate of their selling value at the date of beginning of inquiry. Power machinery was depreciated at 20 per cent of its opening value while all other machinery and implements were depreciated at a rate of 10 per cent. Where the family car was used to any appreciable extent for farm purposes the appropriate proportion of the depreciation (and the running costs) was charged to the farm.
- (iii) Fertiliser and Lime: the total cost of all fertilisers and lime applied during the survey year was charged to the year of application and no attempt was made to calculate residual values.
- (iv) Labour Expenses: includes cash payments to hired workers on current farm work, social and workmen's compensation, insurance contributions and payment in kind to employees such as meals, cottage rent, land for grazing, potatoes, beet, etc., and other perquisites. These perquisites, charged at the Agricultural Wages Board rates, were entered as output under the appropriate heading in the output section of the Farm Account Book and as labour expenses in the expenses section of the account book.
- (v) Other Expenses: these included purchased animal feeding stuffs, maintenance and running costs of machines and implements, including farm share of family car, small tools, medicines, veterinary expenses, insecticides, service fees, insurance on farm and crops, farm share of electricity and telephone, hire purchase and bank interest appropriate to the farm, etc.

## 21. *Family Farm Income*

Family farm income was the difference between total output and total expenses. This was the portion of output remaining to remunerate the farm



family for its labour, management and interest on own capital invested in the farm.

### 22. Labour

Time devoted to farm work by both family and hired workers has been expressed in terms of labour units. A labour unit is defined as an adult male working for 52 weeks. Male workers, 18 years and over, are classed as adults and juvenile and female workers were equated to male adults as follows:

<i>Male workers:</i>	
18 years and over	1.0 labour unit
16-18 years	0.75 „ „
14-16 years	0.50 „ „
<i>Female workers:</i>	
16 years and over	0.67 „ „
14-16 years	0.50 „ „

### FARM INCOME SCHEDULE.

(To be used for recording at a single visit on small holdings, farm income and expenses for the previous year).

---

Date of interview..... Reference No.

---

#### *A. Farm or Garden Output (round all entries to nearest £)*

	<i>Total Sales</i>	<i>Purchases of livestock</i>	<i>Sales less purchases</i>	<i>Change in inventories</i>	<i>Consumed in house(a)</i>	<i>Total Output</i>
Cattle including cows						
Dairy produce						
Sheep and wool						
Pigs						
Poultry and eggs						
Crops						
Other receipts (b)						
Total						

(a) From B below. (b) Include rent for land let.



## THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

### Broadsheet Series:

1. *Dental Services in Ireland* P. R. Kaim-Caudle
2. *We Can Stop Rising Prices* M. P. Fogarty
3. *Pharmaceutical Services in Ireland* P. R. Kaim-Caudle,  
assisted by Annette O'Toole and Kathleen O'Donoghue
4. *Ophthalmic Services in Ireland* P. R. Kaim-Caudle  
assisted by Kathleen O'Donoghue and Annette O'Toole

### Publication Series:

1. *The Ownership of Personal Property in Ireland* Edward Nevin
2. *Short Term Economic Forecasting and its Application in Ireland* Alfred Kuehn
3. *The Irish Tariff and The E.E.C.: A Factual Survey* Edward Nevin
4. *Demand Relationships for Ireland* C. E. V. Leser
5. *Local Government Finance in Ireland: A Preliminary Survey* David Walker
6. *Prospects of the Irish Economy in 1962* Alfred Kuehn
7. *The Irish Woollen and Worsted Industry, 1946-59: A Study in Statistical Method* R. C. Geary
8. *The Allocation of Public Funds for Social Development* David Walker
9. *The Irish Price Level: A Comparative Study* Edward Nevin
10. *Inland Transport in Ireland: A Factual Survey* D. J. Reynolds
11. *Public Debt and Economic Development* Edward Nevin
12. *Wages in Ireland, 1946-62* Edward Nevin
13. *Road Transport: The Problems and Prospects in Ireland* D. J. Reynolds
14. *Imports and Economic Growth in Ireland, 1947-61* C. E. V. Leser
15. *The Irish Economy in 1962 and 1963* C. E. V. Leser
16. *Irish County Incomes in 1960* E. A. Attwood and R. C. Geary
17. *The Capital Stock of Irish Industry* Edward Nevin
18. *Local Government Finance and County Incomes* David Walker
19. *Industrial Relations in Ireland: The Background* David O'Mahony
20. *Social Security in Ireland and Western Europe* P. R. Kaim-Caudle
21. *The Irish Economy in 1963 and 1964* C. E. V. Leser
22. *The Cost of Irish Industry, 1950-60* Edward Nevin
23. *A Further Analysis of Irish Household Budget Data, 1951-1952* C. E. V. Leser
24. *Economic Aspects of Industrial Relations* David O'Mahony
25. *Psychological Barriers to Economic Achievement* P. Pentony
26. *Seasonality in Irish Economic Statistics* C. E. V. Leser
27. *The Irish Economy in 1964 and 1965* C. E. V. Leser
28. *Housing in Ireland; Some Economic Aspects* P. R. Kaim-Caudle
29. *A Statistical Study of Wages, Prices and Employment in the Irish Manufacturing Sector* C. St. J. O'Herlihy
30. *Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part I. Energy Consumption in 1970* J. L. Booth
31. *Determinants of Wage Inflation in Ireland* Keith Cowling
32. *Regional Employment Patterns in the Republic of Ireland* T. J. Baker
33. *The Irish Economy in 1966*
34. *Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part II. Electricity and Turf* The Staff of The Economic and Social Research Institute  
J. L. Booth
35. *Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part III, International and Temporal Aspects of Energy Consumption* J. L. Booth
36. *Institutional Aspects of Commercial and Central Banking in Ireland* John Hein
37. *Fuel and Power in Ireland; Part IV, Sources and Uses of Energy* J. L. Booth
38. *A Study of Imports* C. E. V. Leser
39. *The Irish Economy in 1967*
40. *Some Aspects of Price Inflation in Ireland* The Staff of The Economic and Social Research Institute  
R. C. Geary and J. L. Pratschke
41. *A Medium Term Planning Model for Ireland* David Simpson

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Publication Series:—continued.

42. *Some Irish Population Problems Reconsidered* Brendan M. Walsh  
 43. *The Irish Brain Drain* Richard Lynn  
 44. *A Method of Estimating the Stock of Capital in Northern Ireland Industry; Limitations and Applications* C. W. Jefferson  
 45. *An Input-Output Analysis of the Agricultural Sector of the Irish Economy in 1964* R. O'Connor with M. Breslin  
 46. *The Implications for Cattle Producers of Seasonal Price Fluctuations* R. O'Connor  
 47. *Transport in the Developing Economy of Ireland* John Blackwell  
 48. *Social Status and Inter-Generational Social Mobility in Dublin* Bertram Hutchinson  
 49. *Personal Incomes by County, 1965* Miceal Ross  
 50. *Income Expenditure Relations in Ireland, 1965-1966* John L. Pratschke  
 51. *Costs and Prices in Transportable Goods Industries* W. Black, J. V. Simpson, D. G. Slattery  
 52. *Certain Aspects of Non-Agricultural Unemployment in Ireland* R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes  
 53. *A Study of Demand Elasticities for Irish Imports* Dermot McAleese  
 54. *Internal Migration in Ireland with Appendix* R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes  
 55. *Religion and Demographic Behaviour in Ireland* C. J. Gillman  
 56. *Views on Pay Increases, Fringe Benefits and Low Pay,* B. M. Walsh  
 57. *Views on Income Differentials and the Economic Situation* H. Behrend, A. Knowles and J. Davies  
 58. *Computers in Ireland* H. Behrend, A. Knowles and J. Davies  
 59. *National Differences in Anxiety* F. G. Foster  
 60. *Capital Statistics for Irish Manufacturing Industry* Richard Lynn  
 61. *Rural Household Budget—Feasibility Study* C. W. Jefferson  
 Sile Sheehy and R. O'Connor