



3 0307 00026 9285

5840

1976

This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library
as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp>

Minnesota

Research Bulletin # 02

Quality of Life:
Measurement of
the State of the States

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA



Department of Economic Development

HC
106.7
.M56
1976x

QUALITY OF LIFE:

Measurement of the State of the States

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Prepared by:
Research Division
Department of Economic Development
480 Cedar St.
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-3871
January, 1976

QUALITY OF LIFE

A Systematic Look at the State of the States

H. L. Mencken, in 1931, in collaboration with Charles Angoff, authored a three-part series in the American Mercury entitled "The Worst American State". From the title, it is quite apparent that it was the intention of Mencken, as was his nature, to berate the less progressive states and areas of the country, if not the country as a whole.

Regardless of Mr. Mencken's intent, what developed was a studied evaluation of the relative Quality of Life among the states, based on a set of sound criteria, from which one could ascertain not only the worst, but also the best American State.

Since Mr. Mencken's articles first appeared, three other studies have been conducted to measure this positive side of the picture, i.e., the states that offer the highest Quality of Life.

John Berendt, with some minor changes, did an update of the Mencken study, based mainly on 1970 data, which he reported on in the November 1972 issue of Lifestyle Magazine.

Prior to this, Dr. John O. Wilson conducted a study on "The Quality of Life in America", based on a whole new set of criteria and data. This was reported on in the 1967 Midwest Research Institute Winter Report.

The Wilson study, with what we believe to be some significant definitional and measurement changes, was updated for Midwest Research Institute by Dr. Ben-Chieh Liu, with the cooperation of Mr. Robert Gustafson and Mr. Bruce Macey. This study, made public in a Midwest Research Report in 1973, was, like the Berendt 1972 Lifestyle study, based mainly on 1970 data.

It is the intent of this paper to present a summary of the conclusions of these four studies in table form (pages 5 - 8) and thus provide a capsulized picture which accentuates the consistency of the conclusions, even though these four studies cover a long period of time and involve different criteria, definitions and data.

Regarding the significant shift of Minnesota's ranking between the Midwest Research Institute study reported in 1967 and the one reported in 1973, we have included the commentary of Dr. John O. Wilson (page 9) who designed the original MRI study, explaining some of the changes in concepts which were being measured by the two MRI studies.

A further confirmation of Minnesota's consistent ranking as a high quality of life state is seen in numerous other articles, books and studies which have been published from time to time.

Political scientist Neal Pierce in his book, The Great Plains States of America (the fourth of a nine-volume examination of contemporary America), praised Minnesota as the best model of the successful society in the U. S.

Mr. Pierce begins the Minnesota chapter with the following two paragraphs:

"Minnesota is a state spectacularly varied, proud and handsome, with a progressive political tradition', John Gunther reported in Inside U.S.A. The intervening quarter century has done little to tarnish the bright image of the North Star State. Its leaders, in fact, have played an increasingly prominent role in national life, far out of proportion to the state's modest 2 percent of the national population. Its political structure remains open, issue-oriented, responsible. Its state government has been a leader in services for people, even though citizens and corporations alike have had to pay a high tax bill for those services. Few states exceed Minnesota in the quality and extent of the education offered its citizens; none appears to provide health care of comparable quality. Economic growth has been strong and steady, encompassing the brainpower industries of the electronic era along with traditional farming, milling, and mining. And Minnesota maintains a clear focus of economic and cultural leadership in her Twin Cities, towns whose great industries have resisted the siren call of the national conglomerates.

"Minnesota is a state in which its people can take justifiable pride and, despite a number of shortcomings which we will not ignore, as good a model as one can find in these United States of the successful society."

Time Magazine, in its August 13, 1973 issue, featured Minnesota with an extensive article entitled "Minnesota: A State That Works." The article goes on to praise the state's people, its political and industrial leadership and its progressive approach to solving problems.

"It is a state where a residual American secret still seems to operate. Some of the nation's more agreeable qualities are evident there: courtesy and fairness, honesty, a capacity for innovation, hard work, intellectual adventure and responsibility.

"Politics is almost unnaturally clean -- no patronage, virtually no corruption.

"Part of Minnesota's secret lies in people's extra-ordinary civic interest. The business community's social conscience, for example, is a reflection of the fact that so many companies have their headquarters in the state.

"Minnesotans tend to be participants in their communities, perhaps because for so long they were comparatively isolated and developed traditions of mutual reliance. Citizens' lobbies are a real force."

National Geographic, in its February, 1976, issue, featured Minnesota in a 29-page article, "Minnesota, Where Water Is The Magic Word." About Minnesota it said:

"It's way of life seems permanently positioned in the middle of the American dream.

"I'm talking now about the vision that brought immigrants to our shores, that bent men to the plow, that promised in return for honest labor a life of some plenty, some peace, and some dignity. A life in which people respect their community, and each man repays something of what he thinks he owes to it. A life formed by a closeness to nature."

Minnesota's major population center, the Twin Cities metropolitan area, has likewise received high quality of life rankings in recent studies.

The Urban Institute of Washington, D. C., in 1972, published a paper entitled "A Study in Comparative Urban Indicators: Conditions in 18 Large Metropolitan Areas." Making a composite index of the 12 quality of life indicators evaluated in this study, you find the Twin Cities ranked number one.

A study conducted by the Midwest Research Institute for the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency was made public August, 1975, and ranked the Twin Cities fifth out of 244 metropolitan areas studied. Like the state quality of life studies conducted by Midwest Research, this was a very comprehensive study using 123 different criteria which were boiled down to five broad categories.

Arthur M. Louis, in the January, 1975 issue of Harper's Magazine, took the H. L. Mencken approach in an article entitled "The Worst American City". Of course, you then can readily derive the Best American City. Mr. Louis limited his study to the nation's 50 largest cities. He evaluated them in terms of 24 statistical comparisons. In the composite of these 24 separate evaluations, Minneapolis was ranked 8th and St. Paul 13th in quality of life out of the nation's 50 largest cities.

In another study conducted by the Council on Municipal Performance (a non-profit New York-based research group), Minneapolis was ranked in the top five cities in terms of the soundness of local economies.

Fortune Magazine, in its January, 1976 issue, featured Minneapolis in a comprehensive article, "How Minneapolis Fends Off the Urban Crisis." It notes Minneapolis as a "shining exception" to the American big city currently viewed as "a symbol of society's ailments -- rampant crime in the streets, fiscal mismanagement, a deteriorating quality of life." It goes on to state "In a magic sort of way, that city (Minneapolis) has taken on a cloak of glamor as a place where a lot of things are going right."

We agree that comparisons between different states, cities or metropolitan areas on such a nebulous concept as quality of life must be viewed with a reasonable amount of skepticism. It was our attempt in this paper to simply point out Minnesota's consistently high ranking in study after study using different criteria, definitions and data.

QUALITY OF LIFE AND THE PUBLIC INVESTMENT

In looking at those states which rank high on the composite score for the four Quality of Life measurements, the informed observer is intuitively struck by the impression that, in general, high quality of life states are also high tax states.

To investigate this intuitive relationship further, an attempt is made here to establish whether a statistical correlation does exist and, if so, the extent of that correlation.

To accomplish this, a simple rank order correlation technique was used. The states' composite ranking of the four "Quality of Life" studies was compared to the rank of the states on state and local tax revenues "per capita" and "per \$1,000 of personal income" for the fiscal year 1973 as reported in 1975 Fiscal Facts for Minnesotans, published by the Minnesota Taxpayers' Association.

With this analysis, it is clear that a positive rank correlation does exist: for "per capita income" the coefficient was .85, and for "per \$1,000 of personal income" it was .57. The ranked tables are given on page 10 of this report. From this data evaluation it would appear that public investment has more than a mild relationship to the "Quality of Life" elements which have been presented in the studies reviewed in this paper.

The Minnesota experience is reflective of this apparent condition with ranks of 9th for "per capita" tax revenues; 4th for "per \$1,000 personal income" tax revenues and 4th for the composite "Quality of Life" measurement.

RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT MEASUREMENTS:

Between Per Capita and Quality of Life composite:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6(3210)}{124950} = .85$$

And Per \$1,000 Personal Income and Quality of Life composite:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6(8972)}{124950} = .57$$

derived from the formula: $\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$

MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE (MRI)
 THE COMPARATIVE RANKING OF INDIVIDUAL STATES - 1967 REPORT

State	Final Ranking	Status of the Individual	Equality	Democratic Process	Education	Economic Growth	Technology Change	Agriculture	Living Conditions	Health and Welfare
California	1	3	17	6	4	1	1	1	3	14
Minnesota	2	10	1	4	9	3	11.5	19	10	1
Connecticut	3	2	6	2	6	13	14	16	1	9
Massachusetts	4	1	3	1	10	19	4	25.5	9	12
Washington	5	6	5	19	2	7	13	10	12	20
Colorado	6	14	14	10	3	15	19	7.5	24	6
New York	7	4	20	15	15	16	2	32	2	2
Oregon	8	7	8	12	1	8.5	32	29	11	11
Wisconsin	9	8	26	7	18	6	11.5	25.5	22	7
Iowa	10	13	2	26.5	7	11	26	6	29	13
Illinois	11	9	27	14	19	8.5	10	17	14	21
Delaware	12	20	30	31	16	4	29	7.5	8	3
New Jersey	13	11	9	8	35.5	33	9	24	4	24
Hawaii	14	21	18	3	22	10	40	15	7	27
Rhode Island	15	5	4	13	24	34	37	39	6	4
Michigan	16	12	13	20	27	2	8	46	13	41
Utah	17.5	25	36	5	5	27	22	22	20	40
Ohio	17.5	16	19	23	32	20	6	42	17	30
North Dakota	19	22	11	34	25	21	41	12	33	8
Nevada	20	23	37	9	30	24	44	4	5	35
Pennsylvania	21	18	23	17	37.5	37.5	5	48	16	16
Maryland	22	31	39	33	40	5	15	36	21	5
Arizona	23	29.5	40	21	8	29	28	2	31	38
Wyoming	24	17	15	35	11	43	46	5	28	32
Indiana	25.5	27	25	28	17	12	17	30.5	34	47
Kansas	25.5	19	24	32	12	27	31	20	38.5	34
Vermont	27	32.5	28	16	23	30	45	30.5	25	10
Idaho	28	28	27	22	26	31.5	43	9	18	44.5
New Hampshire	29	15	7	30	34	35.5	42	49	19	22
Florida	30	39	44	26.5	37.5	18	7	3	37	42
Montana	31	24	31	24	28	47	47	13	23	19
Nebraska	32	29.5	22	38	29	31.5	39	14	40	29
Oklahoma	33	32.5	38	39	13	45	23	23	43	17
Alaska	34	26	29	18	21	41.5	49	40	26	25
Virginia	35	43	42	11	41	14	16	41	42	26
Texas	36	41	45	37	20	22	3	11	50	49
South Dakota	37	34	10	42	35.5	48	48	18	35	18
New Mexico	38	37	35	29	14	46	36	21	32	43
Maine	39	36	12	25	47	49	50	43	15	23
North Carolina	40	45	41	40	33	28	18	33	44	33
Missouri	41	38	32	41	39	37.5	20	44	36	28
Tennessee	42	44	34	36	42	23	22	47	38.5	37
West Virginia	43	35	16	48	50	50	34	50	30	15
Georgia	44	48	48	44	44	17	24	28	45	39
Louisiana	45	40	46	43	31	41.5	25	35	49	31
Kentucky	46	42	33	50	48	26	30	45	27	46
Arkansas	47	46	43	47	43	44	35	27	41	36
Alabama	48	47	50	46	46	39.5	21	38	47	44.5
South Carolina	49	49	47	45	49	39.5	33	34	48	50
Mississippi	50	50	49	49	45	35.5	38	37	46	48

LIFESTYLE MAGAZINE
 THE COMPARATIVE RANKING OF INDIVIDUAL STATES - 1972 REPORT

	<u>Final Ranking</u>	<u>Wealth</u>	<u>Culture</u>	<u>Health & Society</u>	<u>Civic Affairs</u>
Connecticut	1	2	2	1	6
Minnesota	2	21	9	2	2
New York	3	4	4	20	9
Illinois	4	3	15	22	5
Massachusetts	5	7	1	4	35
Hawaii	6	12	19	5	15
New Hampshire	7	13	13	10	16
Rhode Island	8	15	11	3	23
California	9	11	7	21	14
Utah	10	25	18	6	4
Iowa	11	27	12	19	1
Washington	12	28	3	13	13
Michigan	13	5	22	24	8
New Jersey	14	1	14	11	34
Maryland	15	8	21	18	19
Delaware	16	6	16	27	18
Oregon	17	23	8	14	22
Wisconsin	18	20	20	8	20
Nebraska	19	22	23	9	17
Pennsylvania	20	14	27	7	24
Ohio	21	9	26	16	27
Colorado	22	19	6	26	33
Kansas	23	18	30	25	12
Vermont	24	32	5	12	41
Wyoming	25	34	10	38	21
Maine	26	35	25	17	28
Idaho	27	39	33	29	3
Indiana	28	16	29	31	29
South Dakota	29	42	34	23	7
Alaska	30	30	28	47	10
Nevada	31	10	24	48	38
North Dakota	32	45	37	15	26
Montana	33	47	17	30	31
Florida	34	17	38	40	32
Virginia	35	24	36	33	37
Missouri	36	26	31	37	40
New Mexico	37	40	35	50	11
Tennessee	38	37	43	32	25
Oklahoma	39	38	39	28	36
Arizona	40	31	32	35	45
Texas	41	29	40	34	46
West Virginia	42	44	45	41	30
Louisiana	43	36	41	44	44
Georgia	44	33	44	49	42
Kentucky	45	43	46	42	39
North Carolina	46	41	42	45	43
Alabama	47	46	47	39	48
Arkansas	48	49	49	36	50
South Carolina	49	48	48	43	47
Mississippi	50	50	50	46	49

MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE (MRI)
THE COMPARATIVE RANKING OF INDIVIDUAL STATES - 1973 REPORT

STATE	FINAL RANK	STATUS OF THE INDIVIDUAL		DEMOCRATIC PROCESS	EDUCATION	ECONOMIC GROWTH	TECHNOLOGY CHANGE	AGRICULTURE	LIVING CONDITIONS	HEALTH AND WELFARE
		EQUALITY								
California	1	11	19	1	10	1	4	3	15	12
Colorado	2	1	85	4	14	5	2	17.5	5	6
Connecticut	3	5.5	24	24.5	12.5	4	12	11	2	3
Washington	4	3	3	3	9	6	12	14	23.5	21
Oregon	5	2	10.5	8	5	24	12	15.5	16	16
Wyoming	6	8.5	38.5	20	2	16.5	12	6	19	27
Massachusetts	7	32.5	30	9	19.5	24	3	15.5	1	10.5
Utah	8	24	16.5	2	3	12.5	8	25	8.5	27
Montana	9	10	12	5	4	24	30	9	25	10.5
Rhode Island	10	16.5	1.5	38	33	19	23	8	3	4
Arizona	11	16.5	24	18.5	51	14.5	10	1	43	39
New York	12	45.5	18	10	26	8	6	19	10.5	5
Minnesota	13	22	1.5	6	14	12.5	12	43	12.5	8
District of Columbia	14	18.5	22	28	33	9	1	31	16	1
Hawaii	15	14.5	4	14.5	39	30	12	4	26.5	27
Nebraska	16	7	34	11.5	8	3	38	17.5	6	19.5
Pennsylvania	17	20.5	5	14.5	21	18	12	37	4	19.5
Delaware	18	36	49.5	29	17.5	2	12	11	21.5	13
Nevada	19	4	14.5	16	30.5	19	30	2	31	39
New Jersey	20	45.5	30	32.5	37.5	10.5	4	7	10.5	44.5
Wisconsin	21	29.5	34	18.5	19.5	19	23	41.5	7	2
Iowa	22	12.5	41	11.5	1	28.5	30	31	12.5	17.5
Kansas	23	5.5	30	30	14	14.5	28.5	31	16	23
New Mexico	24	20.5	8.5	26.5	24.5	37.5	9	11	42	39
Alaska	25	29.5	7	7	28	10.5	12	25	48.5	35
Michigan	26	34	19	13	21	16.5	23	41.5	28	17.5
Idaho	27	24	24	17	11	33	30	10	29.5	35
Vermont	28	37	13	32.5	12.5	33	23	25	35	13
North Dakota	29	8.5	24	20	7	28.5	46	22	20	7
Maryland	30	34	49.5	36	33	23	7	19	14	13
Illinois	31	31	51	20	29	7	12	25	29.5	22
South Dakota	32	12.5	19	31	6	33	38	19	23.5	27
Oklahoma	33	14.5	6	25	27	37.5	30	37	26.5	9
New Hampshire	34	28	14.5	48	24.5	40.5	12	25	8.5	47
Ohio	35	24	38.5	26.5	21	24	23	43	32	43
Indiana	36	42.5	34	23.5	37.5	30	12	37	33.5	51
Texas	37	32.5	41	38	32	19	28.5	22	37	44.5
Florida	38	18.5	45.5	41	33	30	41	5	41	32
Maine	39	40.5	16.5	38	17.5	43	46	22	21.5	32
Missouri	40	34	29	37	30.5	36	30	43	33.5	27
Georgia	41	23	41	45	49	42	41	35.5	44.5	35
Tennessee	42	42.5	34	46	46	45	30	48.5	40	35
Virginia	43	37	47.5	42	43.5	39	38	46.5	38.5	46
Arkansas	44	48	24	43.5	46	50.5	46	25	36	25.5
West Virginia	45	47	23	35	40.5	46	41	50.5	38.5	25.5
Louisiana	46	51	47.5	34	40.5	40.5	41	34	51	24
North Carolina	47	24	45.5	50	43.5	47	30	50.5	44.5	50
Kentucky	48	40.5	10.5	47	50	44	46	48.5	47	39
Mississippi	49	50	40	43.5	45	48	46	35.5	50	32
Alabama	50	44	30	49	46	50.5	41	46.5	48.5	47
South Carolina	51	49	44	51	42	47	46	40	46	49

QUALITY OF LIFE STUDIES

(Overall Ranking of States)

1931; 1967; 1972; 1973

	Average Rank (all studies)	Mencken 1931	MRI 1967	Lifestyle 1972*	MRI 1973*
Connecticut	1	2	3	1	3
California	2	5	1	9	1
Massachusetts	3	1	4	5	7
Minnesota	4	6	2	2	13
New York	5	3	7	3	12
Washington	6	13	5	12	4
Oregon	7	9	8	17	5
Rhode Island	8	10	15	8	10
Hawaii	9	N.A.	14	6	14
Iowa	10	7	10	11	21
New Jersey	11	4	13	14	19
Colorado	12	22	6	22	2
Illinois	13	8	11	4	30
Utah	14	18	17.5	10	8
Wisconsin	15	14	9	18	20
Michigan	16	11	16	13	25
Delaware	17	25	12	16	17
Pennsylvania	18	20	21	20	16
Nebraska	19	17	32	19	15
New Hampshire	20.5	15	29	7	33
Wyoming	20.5	29	24	25	6
Ohio	22	16	17.5	21	34
Kansas	23	19	26	23	22
Maryland	24.5	27	22	15	29
Nevada	24.5	24	20	31	18
Vermont	26	21	27	24	27
Montana	27	30	31	33	9
North Dakota	28	28	19	32	28
Arizona	29	34	23	40	11
Indiana	30	23	25	28	35
Idaho	31	31	28	27	26
Maine	32	12	39	26	38
Alaska	33	N.A.	34	30	24
South Dakota	34	32	37	29	31
New Mexico	35.5	39	38	37	23
Florida	35.5	36	30	34	37
Oklahoma	37	35	33	39	32
Missouri	38	26	41	36	39
Virginia	39	37	35	35	42
Texas	40	38	36	41	36
West Virginia	41	33	43	42	44
Tennessee	42	43	42	38	41
Georgia	43	45	44	44	40
Louisiana	44.5	41	45	43	45
North Carolina	44.5	42	40	46	46
Arkansas	46.5	44	47	48	43
Kentucky	46.5	40	46	45	47
Alabama	48	47	48	47	49
South Carolina	49	46	49	49	50
Mississippi	50	48	50	50	48

* Both studies were based mainly on 1970 data.

Why isn't Minnesota still No. 2?

By Dr. John O. Wilson
President, North Star Research and Development Institute, Minneapolis

Five years ago, at the request of the Missouri State Legislature, I completed a study on "quality of life" in the United States. The results of this study suggested that Minnesota was the second-best state in the nation in which to live.

Minnesotans took a great deal of pride in the fact that they ranked so high as compared to other states. Maybe the cold winters and high taxes were more than offset by our good living conditions, beautiful lakes and clean cities. Yet just this past week an updated version of my earlier study was released to the public by Midwest Research Institute in Kansas City. In the newer version, Minnesota dropped to 13th in the nation. From second to 13th in only five years. What happened?

Nine indicators, based primarily on criteria developed in 1960 by former President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, provide the framework for both assessments of quality of life. The changes in the relative ranking of Minnesota in each of these areas are:

Individual status — 9th to 22nd.

Individual equality — 4th to 1st.

Living conditions — 10th to 12th.

Agriculture — 21st to 42nd.

Technology — 11th to 12th.

Economic status — 6th to 12th.

Education — 17th to 14th.

Health and welfare — 1st to 8th.

State and local government — 7th to 6th.

Now that I am also a resident of Minnesota, I have more than just an academic interest in these new results. While I recognize that studies which attempt to compare one state to another on such a general concept as quality

of life should be treated with a certain amount of healthy skepticism, such dramatic changes cannot be easily ignored. Nor is it likely that other states will let us ignore the new results, particularly after the publicity given to the earlier version.

Let us examine the changes that occurred in four areas in particular — individual status, agriculture, economic status and health and welfare. Did our relative decline in these areas suggest that Minnesota was lax, maybe living on past glories, while other states forged ahead? Or do the two studies really measure different things, even though the nine goals are identical?

It is apparent, after carefully examining the specific data, that the two studies measure a different concept of individual status. In my earlier version, individual status was defined in terms of those

factors which enhance human dignity, such as living conditions, quality of medical services, racial equality and public assistance. While in the more recent study, individual status is much more economically orientated as it considers people's ability and willingness to work and their financial independence.

The changes in agriculture, where Minnesota plunged from 21st to 42nd, are also due to a difference in concept. Indeed, how Minnesota ranks in agriculture depends upon the value one attaches to small family farming versus large corporate farming. Do we want to preserve the family farm? Or should farming be done by large, impersonal corporations? The answer is not obvious. Yet the agriculture ranking of the new study greatly favors those states where farming has become a highly capitalized and incorporated business. Consequently, Minnesota with its smaller family farms loses out to those states where the family farm has declined more rapidly. An equally relevant measure might be to compare states on the value of the farm products which they produce, irrespective of the size of the individual farms. Minnesota would then rank seventh in the nation in

agriculture.

For the goals of economic status and health and welfare, the two studies are nearly identical in both the concept and the individual data used to measure these goals. We cannot conveniently explain away our decline by simply asserting that the studies measure different things. We can only conclude, without the benefit of much more extensive analysis, that these changes did in fact occur.

We should not ignore the results of this new study. For it is important that we be concerned with our quality of life in Minnesota. These studies have served as a catalyst for states to examine themselves to gain a sense of where they are strong and where challenges need to be met. We in Minnesota need to examine, much more thoroughly than I have done in this brief article, what has happened within our state during the past five years. Maybe that is a useful task for the State Planning Agency or a Commission on State Goals.

MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

May 15, 1973

TAXES AND QUALITY OF LIFE: WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP?

State	Minnesota Taxpayers' Association State & Local Tax Revenues (Fiscal 1973)		4 Study Avg. QOL Rank
	Per Capita Rank	Per \$1,000 of Personal Income Rank	
New York	1	1	5
California	2	5	2
Connecticut	3	11	1
Massachusetts	4	6	3
Nevada	5	9	24.5
Hawaii	6	8	9
District of Columbia	7	46	N.A.
Wisconsin	8	3	15
Minnesota	9	4	4
Michigan	10	15	16
New Jersey	11	29	11
Maryland	12	17	24.5
Vermont	13	2	26
Illinois	14	30	13
Delaware	15	35	17
Pennsylvania	16	14	18
Washington	17	19	6
Arizona	18	10	29
Colorado	19	25	12
Rhode Island	20	27	8
Wyoming	21	23	20.5
Oregon	22	22	7
Iowa	23	24	10
Montana	24	13	27
Kansas	25	32	23
Maine	26	7	32
Nebraska	27	33	19
South Dakota	28	12	34
Alaska	29	51	33
Florida	30	31	35.5
Virginia	31	39	39
Ohio	32	49	22
Missouri	33	41	38
Indiana	34	44	30
Utah	35	16	14
North Dakota	36	21	28
New Hampshire	37	42	20.5
Louisiana	38	18	44.5
Idaho	39	28	31
Georgia	40	40	43
New Mexico	41	20	35.5
North Carolina	42	38	44.5
Texas	43	45	40
West Virginia	44	34	41
Kentucky	45	37	46.5
Oklahoma	46	47	37
Tennessee	47	43	42
South Carolina	48	36	49
Mississippi	49	26	50
Alabama	50	50	48
Arkansas	51	48	46.5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berendt, John, "The Worst American State", Lifestyle, November, 1972.
- Boyer, David S. and Brill, David, "Minnesota, Where Water Is The Magic Word", National Geographic, February, 1976.
- Breckenfeld, Gurney, "How Minneapolis Fends Off the Urban Crisis", Fortune, January, 1976.
- Flax, Michael J., "A Study in Comparative Urban Indicators: Conditions in 18 Large Metropolitan Areas", An Urban Institute Paper, April, 1972.
- Liu, Ben Chieh, Ph. D., "The Quality of Life in the United States", May, 1973.
- Louis, Arthur M., "The Worst American City", Harper's, January, 1975.
- Minnesota Taxpayers Association, "Fiscal Facts for Minnesotans - 1975", January, 1975.
- Morrow, Lance, "Minnesota: A State That Works", Time Magazine, August 13, 1973.
- Peirce, Neil R., The Great Plains States of America, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, 1972.
- Wilson, Dr. John O., "The Quality of Life in America", MRI Report, 1967.