

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA NEWS LETTER

The news in this publication is released for the press on receipt.

Published Weekly by the University of North Carolina for the University Extension Division.

MAY 28, 1924

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

VOL. X, NO. 28

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hoops, Jr., L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, J. B. Ballitt, H. W. Odum.

Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1919

AUTOMOBILE INVESTMENTS IN N.C.

BETTER RURAL SCHOOLS

The consolidation of rural schools and the adoption of the county unit of administration are perhaps the greatest educational needs of the state, according to Mr. M. A. James who recently read a paper before the North Carolina Club in which he fully treated this subject. The intelligent farmer is wanting to know, with an interest never before manifested, why his children do not have the same educational advantages that are being enjoyed by town and city children. The answer lies in the little country school which gives most country children all the schooling they ever get.

In 1922 there were 7,333 rural school houses in North Carolina, 50 percent of which were one-room structures, 25 percent two-room structures, and the remaining 25 percent were buildings with more than two rooms. In other words, three-fourths of all the rural school buildings in North Carolina were of the one- and two-room type. Any person with school experience knows that adequate school work can not be conducted in such a limited space.

In practically all cases these small schools are taught by unskilled teachers. According to the latest published report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, there were in North Carolina 15,254 teachers, 11,929 of whom were rural teachers. Fifty-five percent of these rural teachers did not hold certificates as high as Elementary-A, as contrasted with only 12 percent for town and city teachers. In other words, the proportion of teachers that did not hold certificates as high as Elementary-A was four and one-half times as large in the rural schools as in the urban schools.

For the school year 1921-22, seventy-eight percent of the state's entire school enrollment of 753,698 were rural. Twenty-two percent lived in towns and cities. For that school year the total available school fund for each of the rural children was \$20.91, as against \$56.09 for each of the children who lived in the towns and cities. The annual salary of the teachers of the rural schools was about \$548, as against \$998 for the teachers of the urban schools.

We cannot expect the same school results from the rural pupils who have poor school equipment, poorly trained teachers, short terms, and few social advantages that we expect from the urban pupils who have fine equipment, well-trained teachers, long school terms, and excellent social advantages.

In order that the rural child may have as good school advantages as the urban child, we must have fewer and larger country schools. At the end of the school year 1921-22 there were in North Carolina 355 consolidated schools. Of these schools 127 had four teachers; 78 had six teachers; and 150 had more than six teachers. Experience has taught us that results equally as good can be obtained in the large consolidated school as in the city school. The small consolidated school, on the other hand, is of little advantage, and we should discourage the union of only two one-teacher schools. The average country dweller thinks that a two- or a three-teacher school is sufficiently large. Such schools are too small for effective work. Dr. E. C. Brooks says, "We are coming to realize more and more that we should strive for a six-teacher school as the smallest type of school that will guarantee really efficient instruction for our country boys and girls."

The time is coming when North Carolina will have a state-wide system of public education, but the time is not yet ripe to advocate the adoption of such a system. At present we should strive for the reorganization of our schools under the county-wide unit of administration. Under this plan it is possible for every child in the county to have practically equal educational opportunities, and in addition a chance to attend a good high school.

The county-wide plan of consolidation would do three things: first, it would equalize school advantages throughout the county, giving the same advantages to both town and country children. Second, it would

equalize the tax rate throughout the county. Third, it would lower the special school tax rate in most districts which at present are operating consolidated schools. Under such a plan the county superintendent and county board of education must be men of the highest type, and unless the most capable men are selected for the direction of the county-wide school system we cannot hope for maximum success.

In summing up the advantages we find the following features favorable to consolidation:

1. Consolidation means a larger taxable area.
2. It increases attendance.
3. It makes possible the securing of better trained teachers.
4. Salaries of teachers will be increased.
5. The health of the children will be conserved.
6. A better and more efficient course of study will be made possible.
7. School spirit will be increased.
8. Finally it means a chance to get a high-school education for thousands of rural boys and girls who under the present location and distribution of high schools are denied this opportunity.

TOO FEW IN HIGH SCHOOL

One of the weak points of our educational system in North Carolina is that such a small percent of school children graduate from high school or even reach the high-school grades. Most rapid improvement is being made, but even with our present attainment we rank very low in the number of high-school students and in high-school graduates in comparison with other states. The lack of enough high schools is one answer, while another lies in the lack of a desire on the part of many children for a high-school education.

For the United States about ten percent of the children enrolled in school are in the high-school grades. In North Carolina the children enrolled in high school are only five percent of all children enrolled in school. In other words we ought to have 90 thousand children in high school instead of about 45 thousand.

As indicative of the tendency to drop out of school too early we are giving a few of the facts found in studying Guilford and Forsyth counties, both of which have excellent high schools, and rank far above the state average in high-school attendance and graduates.

In 1923 Guilford had a total white school enrollment of 17,799 children. Her high-school enrollment rate was about three times the state average, yet only 348 white students were enrolled in the eleventh grade against 3,442 in the first grade. Of the total white enrollment only 1.9 percent were in the final grade.

In Forsyth county 12,809 white children were enrolled in school, yet only 194 were in the eleventh grade, or 1.5 percent of all white children enrolled in school. The first grade had a white enrollment of 2,801, the second grade 1,868, third 1,675, fourth 1,520, fifth 1,332, sixth 1,086, seventh 1,005, eighth 623, ninth 435, tenth 259, while only 194 were enrolled in the eleventh grade.

The mortality rates in the higher grades are large even in such prize high-school counties as Forsyth and Guilford. The mortality rates in the less favored counties are even larger. The high-school graduating class of 1923 was only one percent of the white school enrollment in North Carolina. In other words out of every one hundred white children enrolled in school in 1923 only one became a high-school graduate. Instead of 6,317 white high-school graduates as in 1923, we should have had at least thirteen thousand.

Only six states have more children enrolled in school than North Carolina. Would that only six states ranked ahead of us in high-school graduates!

This new bulletin, containing ten chapters and about 120 pages, is the work of Mr. Chas. N. Siewers of Forsyth county, a senior in the University. For more than a year Mr. Siewers has been busy in the seminar library of the department of rural social economics collecting important information about his home county and interpreting these facts in a simple way for the enlightenment and inspiration of the citizens of the home county, and of others who might be interested in Forsyth county.

Mr. Siewers has assembled his facts with diligent care, and in the interpretation of them he has shown rare competence. He has traced the historic, economic, and social development of Forsyth from its settlement to the present time, and in concluding the study he attempts to picture what the county may be in the years to come.

The chapters are as follows: History of Forsyth County, Resources and Opportunities, Industries of Forsyth, Wealth and Taxation, Facts About the Folks, Farm Conditions and Practices, The Schools of Forsyth, The Local Market Problem, Things to Be Proud Of, and Where We Lag and the Way Out.

The bulletin will be distributed free of charge as long as the issue of 3,000 copies lasts. A copy may be secured from the Department of Rural Social Economics, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

One of the aims of the department of rural social economics is to publish a somewhat similar bulletin for every county in the state. More than a dozen have already been published. In addition to the Forsyth bulletin, there will go to the press this month bulletins for Randolph and Guilford counties, copies of which may be had upon request.

All these bulletins represent the work of students from the home counties. This department has collected and assembled a vast storehouse of historic, economic, and social data for the state and for the counties of the state. It remains for interested students to assemble the data properly and prepare it for publication. The cost of printing is always borne by individuals and businesses in the home county, either through contributions or by subscribing to advertising space. If you are interested in a bulletin for your county, get behind your capable students at the University.

During these four months fifty-three bond issues totaling \$10,081,286 were sold in North Carolina by the state, the towns, cities, counties, and districts. The two states ranking ahead of us were Texas and Alabama, the latter by only a small margin.

The following table shows the rank

of southern states and the total value of bonds sold, for the first four months of 1924, for highways, school buildings, light and sewer systems, street pavings, and so forth.

1. Texas	\$18,918,486
2. Alabama	10,086,500
3. North Carolina	10,081,286
4. Florida	8,055,500
5. Louisiana	7,400,000
6. Mississippi	5,801,750
7. South Carolina	5,711,500
8. West Virginia	5,391,000
9. Tennessee	5,114,347
10. Georgia	4,612,500
11. Virginia	3,766,000
12. Arkansas	3,749,500
13. Oklahoma	2,289,000
14. Maryland	1,455,000
15. Kentucky	465,000

valued at more than twice the amount of the bonded debt incurred for school purposes.

On June 30, 1923, the bonded debt of the counties for school purposes totaled \$9,184,288, while the debt of town and cities for school purposes totaled \$10,343,650. The net debt of all counties, towns, and cities in North Carolina in 1923 was \$134,443,016. Of this total \$19,527,938 was classed as school debt, and it amounts to only 14.6 percent of the total county and municipal debt. It is rather surprising that the net bonded debt of our counties, towns, and cities for the erection of school houses is such a small percent of the total bonded debt.

One of the most important matters to be considered in discussing the value of school property is what proportion the bonded debt is of the total value. Public school property in the state is

In the table exhibiting State Health Expenditures, appearing in News Letter Vol. X No. 26, North Carolina appears twice. The 48th state should be North Dakota.

PUBLIC SERVANTS

The only forces that can preserve our republic are men with convictions and the courage of their convictions. My plea is that a modicum of the same sort of courage that actuated our fathers shall be manifested not only by public officials but by the great mass of privates in the ranks of our citizenship. What we must have is an active exercise of the duties of citizenship by men who stand outside of party or class, whose sole motive and objective is the public weal, and who have the courage to tear a question open and let the light through it. We must have men who stand for the right, for justice, for liberty under the law, for government under the constitution, and who will carry our republic forward toward the fulfillment of its high mission as a leader and exemplar for the emulation and inspiration of all the nations of the earth.—Robert E. L. Saner, President American Bar Association.

valued at more than twice the amount of the bonded debt incurred for school purposes.

On June 30, 1923, the bonded debt of the counties for school purposes totaled \$9,184,288, while the debt of town and cities for school purposes totaled \$10,343,650. The net debt of all counties, towns, and cities in North Carolina in 1923 was \$134,443,016. Of this total \$19,527,938 was classed as school debt, and it amounts to only 14.6 percent of the total county and municipal debt. It is rather surprising that the net bonded debt of our counties, towns, and cities for the erection of school houses is such a small percent of the total bonded debt.

SCHOOL BONDED DEBT

One of the most important matters to be considered in discussing the value of school property is what proportion the bonded debt is of the total value. Public school property in the state is

A CORRECTION

In the table exhibiting State Health Expenditures, appearing in News Letter Vol. X No. 26, North Carolina appears twice. The 48th state should be North Dakota.

INVESTMENT IN AUTOMOBILES

Per Inhabitant in June 1918 and January 1924

In the following table, based on U. S. Census of Population data and the number of automobiles as reported by the Secretary of State, the counties are ranked according to the per inhabitant investment in motor cars on January 1, 1924. The accompanying column shows the per inhabitant investment on June 30, 1918. The average motor car is officially reported to represent an investment of \$800. State total number of motor cars January 1, 1924, was 248,414, representing an investment of \$198,731,200. On June 30, 1918, there were 77,000 motor cars in the state.

The state average investment in motor cars on January 1, 1924, was \$74.00 per inhabitant.

The total bonded debt of the state and all its subdivisions, for every purpose whatsoever, was 203 million dollars on June 30, 1923, or only slightly more than our investment in motor cars.

All public school property in North Carolina is valued at around 47 million dollars, or less than one-fourth the amount invested in motor cars, at the beginning of the year.

Since January first of this year 35,000 motor cars have been purchased in North Carolina representing an expenditure of approximately \$30,000,000 which is nearly two-thirds the value of all public school property in the state.

Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

The state average investment in motor cars on January 1, 1924, was \$74.00 per inhabitant.

The total bonded debt of the state and all its subdivisions, for every purpose whatsoever, was 203 million dollars on June 30, 1923, or only slightly more than our investment in motor cars.

All public school property in North Carolina is valued at around 47 million dollars, or less than one-fourth the amount invested in motor cars, at the beginning of the year.

Since January first of this year 35,000 motor cars have been purchased in North Carolina representing an expenditure of approximately \$30,000,000 which is nearly two-thirds the value of all public school property in the state.

Department of Rural Social Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	County	Invest. per Inhab. June 1918	Invest. per Inhab. Jan. 1 1924	Rank	County	Invest. per Inhab. June 1918	Invest. per Inhab. Jan. 1 1924
1	Guilford	\$25.0	\$128.2	51	Currituck	\$13.1	\$64.9
2	Davidson	24.6	111.1	52	Union	12.5	64.5
3	Mecklenburg	26.3	108.6	53	Person	12.8	64.3
4	Rowan	26.0	108.5	53	Greene	38.1	64.3
5	Alamance	20.2	101.1	55	Hertford	22.1	64.1
6	Forsyth	28.6	98.2	56	Caldwell		63.3
7	Lincoln	22.3	97.7	57	Alexander	10.2	62.9
8	Wilson	33.3	96.8	58	Northampton	12.2	62.3
9	Moore		95.5	58	Robeson		62.3
10	Wake	25.2	95.1	60	Sampson	16.2	62.0
11	Gaston	17.9	94.0	60	Camden	16.8	62.0
12	Scotland	31.1	93.3	62	Granville	16.0	59.9
12	Iredell	18.6	93.3	63	Perquimans	16.9	59.7
14	Randolph	17.4	90.8	64	Martin	32.0	58.1
15	Cleveland	16.2	89.8	65	Craven	19.2	57.7
16	Montgomery	14.9	88.8	66	Duplin	14.1	56.2
16	Buncombe	23.5	88.8	67	Franklin	17.5	55.1
18	Catawba	20.8	87.3	68	Warren	17.9	54.5
18	Cabarrus	23.5	87.3	69	Gates	15.5	53.4
20	Richmond	20.2	85.2	70	Washington	15.4	52.4
20	Durham	16.3	83.8	71	Burke	6.8	52.3
22	Lee		82.5	72	Haywood	7.4	48.1
23	Edgecombe	27.1	82.0	73	Tyrrell	15.8	45.0
23	Rockingham	21.4	82.0	74	Onslow	10.1	44.1
25	Cumberland		81.5	75	Columbus	8.9	43.6
26	Orange	15.5	81.4	76	Bladen	11.1	43.4
27	Johnston	22.6	80.5	77	Pender	9.1	43.3
27	Nash	27.3	80.5	78	Polk	9.0	42.9
29	Davie	13.7	79.7	79	Pamlico	9.0	42.5
30	Pasquotank	21.2	79.0	80	Transylvania	9.8	42.0
31	Hoke		78.1	81	Jones	16.3	40.9
32	Anson	16.0	76.5	82	McDowell	5.4	38.6
33	Harnett	17.1	76.4	83	Allegany	8.2	38.0
34	Stokes	17.0	76.1	84	Wilkes	6.1	34.5
35	Henderson	15.0	74.4	85	Watauga		29.8
36	Pitt	33.9	73.1	86	Brunswick	6.0	29.0
37	Surry	14.6	72.5	87	Jackson	3.2	28.4
38	Chowan	19.5	72.3	88	Carteret	8.1	28.1
39	New Hanover	23.1	70.7	89	Hyde	9.1	27.6
40	Lenoir	28.3	70.0	90	Cherokee	3.4	23.8
40	Wayne	25.0	70.0	91	Clay	1.2	23.7
42	Stanly	22.0	69.0	92	Madison	4.0	22.4
42	Yadkin	14.3	69.0	93	Macon	3.1	21.5
44	Rutherford	11.3	68.6	94	Ashe	1.8	21.3
45	Bertie	21.9	66.9	95	Avery		20.5
46	Caswell	16.1	66.4	96	Dare	1.7	16.3
47	Vance	19.6	66.2	97	Swain	2.8	15.3
48	Chatham		66.1	98	Graham		13.3
49	Beaufort	16.3	65.0	99	Yancey	.4	11.8
49	Halifax	18.1	65.0	100	Mitchell		11.0

The investment per inhabitant in 1918 is omitted for ten counties for which population figures are lacking, due to the formation of new counties and changes in territory of old counties.

FORSYTH COUNTY BULLETIN

Forsyth County: Economic and Social, is the title of a new county bulletin that has recently gone to press.