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## FOREWORD

This volume presents information on the food of farm families at different income levels in the 66 counties surveyed by the Bureau of Home Economics as part of the consumer purchases study. Another report deals with the food of village and city families, and other publications present facts on family income, patterns of family consumption as a whole, and expenditures for other major budget categories, such as clothing, automobile, and medical care (see p. 377).

The study of consumer purchases was modertaken to provide comprehensive data on the income and consumption of American families. It was conducted by the Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, with the cooperation of the National Resources Planning Board, the Work Projects Administration, and the Central Statistical Board. Plans for the study were formulated by the National Resources Planning Board and the two operating bureaus, with the advice of the two other cooperating agencies. The project was financed by the Work Projects Administration.

The study was administered under the guidance of a steering committee composed of Stuart A. Rice, chairman, representing the Work Projects Administration (now with the Central Statistical Board); Louise Stanley, Bureau of Home Economics; Isador Lubin, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Gardiner C. Means, National Resourees Planming Board; and Morris A. Copeland, Central Statistical Board. Details of administration were formulated and procedures were coordinated by a technical subcommittee on which each of the five agencies had representation. Membership was as follows: Hildegarde Kneeland, National Resources Planning Board, chairman; Day Monroe, Bureal of Home Economics; Faith M. Williams, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Milton Forster, Work Projects Administration; and Samuel J. Dennis and W. M. Hoad, Central Statistical Board. Various other Government agencies, in particular the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, furnished helpful advice. The assistance of Clarence Purves and Nathan Koffsky deserves special mention in regard to plans for obtaining and tabulating information on farm income.

The following members of the staff of the Economics Division of the Bureau of Home Economics collaborated with the authors in the preparation of this report: Dorothy S. Brady, Thelma Porter, Sadye Adelson, Kathryn Cronister, Margaret Perry, Kiarl Benson, Don Heiser, Marie Waite, Gertrude York Christy, and Margery Gray.

Acknowledgment is made of the excellent work of the field supervisory staff during the period of field collection. Much credit for the reliability of the data is due to the editing staff and the conscientious field agents who obtained the schedules, as well as to the families that cooperated in providing the information requested. Acknowledgment is made also of the help given by State and district officials of the Work Projects Administration, by representatives of the State colleges and universities and of the extension service in agriculture and home economics, and by the local organizations and officials of the communities in which the survey was conducted.
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## INTRODUCTION

Food-consumption patterns of different population groups are of interest not only to families wishing to improve their levels of living and to persons engaged in the production and marketing of food materials, but to all that are concerned with the Nation's broad social and economic problems. Diet can play an important role in the conservation of human resources, and food is a major part of any study of national, regional, or community production and consumption.

Information regarding the diets of farm families living in different parts of the United States was obtained as part of the 1935-36 study of consumer purchases. This report, one in a series for that study as a whole, considers the relationships between income and family composition on the one hand, and the money value of food, both farmfurnished and purchased, programs of food production for household use, and the quantities consumed of different types of food, on the other. This report also discusses the nutritive value of farm family diets and their probable adequacy from the nutritional viewpoint.

The farm farnilies included in this study of consumption were limited to those in which there was a husband and wife, both nativeborn, and to white families in all regions except the Southeast, where a separate study of Negroes was made. Only those families were included that had not moved during the year covered by the study and that operated the farms they owned or rented (except in the Southeast, where special studies were also made of families of sharecroppers. None had received relief during the report year.

The eligibility requirements just mentioned and others, minor in character, served to eliminate from this investigation relatively more of the families with low incomes in each community than of those in the higher income classes. Common observation and special studies of the excluded groups indicate that native-white, unbroken, nonrelief families generally are in better circumstances than those groups omitted from this study, i. e., the foreign-born and the broken families, those receiving relief, the one-person and the very large families, Negro familics (separate analyses of Negro families were made in the Southeast), farm laborers (sharecroppers, however, were studied separately in the Southeast), and those that had moved during the report year. The differences between the group studied and the total population should be recognized in using the expenditure and consumption data of this volume. (See Methodology, Data from the Consumption Sample (Expenditure Schedules).)
The farm sample studied was obtained from five broad gcographic regions-New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, Pacific, and Southeast. ${ }^{1}$ Within these regions farm sections were chosen on the basis of the type of agriculture predom-

[^1]inating or widely prevalent. Fourteen types of farming, each important in the Nation's agriculture, were selected for representation, The farm sections were chosen on a national and regional basis rather than State; small groups of counties selected because of the importance of a specific type of farming would not necessarily be representative of the major type of agriculture, or of the income received from agriculture, in the State in which they were located.
This report on food is based on the following series of facts, obtained through personal interview with families:

1. Expenditures for food to be prepared and served at home, and for food and meals eaten away from rome; the money value of food furnished by the farm or received as gift or pay; the quantity of different types of food canned at home, and whether half or more of the various products thus canned were home-produced. These data, pertaining to some 12 -month period in 1935-36, were summarized in 13 analysis units for families of white operators; in 2 units for those of white sharecroppers in the Southeast; and in 4 units for Negro families in the Southeast-2 for farm operators' families and 2 for sharecroppers'; there were 19 analysis units in all. (See Methodology, Combinations of Farm Sections into Anglysis Units.)
2. The quantity and money value of different classes and articles of food consumed at home by the household during a 7 -day period some time in 1936 or 1937. These data were obtained from the families giving information on expenditures for food that were willing and able to keep the necessary records or to estimate the approximate quantities.

The figures on quantity and money value of food for a week afforded by the check lists were summarized for groups of food in five analysis units-one for families of white operators in the New England, Middle Atlantic, and North Central States (sometimes cailed North in this report); a second, for familics in the Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions (sometimes called West in this report); and a third, for families of white operators in the Southeast. The fourth and fifth units included, respectively, familics of white sharecroppers in the Southeast and Negro families (operators and sharecroppers combined) in this same region. In presenting the details of consumption, food item by food item, the two analysis units of the North and West were combined into a single unit.
Figures derived from the 7 -day records of household food consumption were summarized by level of money value of food for several regional-color-tenure groups. The quantities of food consumed by each group are given for major classes of food and the nutritive value of diets is presented in terms of food energy, protein, threc mineral elements, and four vitamins.
3. The number of families producing on their farms different kinds of food needed for household use during a 12 -month period in 1935-36. These data were obtained in connection with the study of income, and hence, from a larger group than was included in the consumption study. (See Methodology, Population Groups Included in the Farm Sample. and Collection Procedures.) Data were summarized for each group of counties studied and, in the Southeast, for farm operators and sharecroppers separately, and for white and Negro families separately. In all there are 33 analysis units.

The four schedules affording information relevant to the family's food supply were obtained in differing numbers. Different degrees of detail were requested on each-some schedules covered a 12 -month period; others, a 1-week; some afforded over-all estimates in terms only of money value; others, details regarding the quantity and price of individual articles of food. It was necessary, therefore, to combine data from more farm sections for the analysis of some of the more detailed aspects of the report than for others less detailed, in order to have enough cases for reliable averages. For the analysis of data from the expenditure schedules, counties in two States have usually been combined to form an analysis unit; for the more detailed material from the check lists, however, farm sections of several States have been combined. (See Methodology, table 66, for analysis units established for different types of schedules.)

## SECTION 1. SUMMARY

## Food of White Farm Operators' Families

The money value of the food of farm families tends to represent a larger share of the money value of family living than in the case of village and city dwellers at comparable income levels. This is due chiefly to the food-production programs of farm families. Home-grown products of white farm operators' families in the income class $\$ 1,000-$ $\$ 1,249$ represented from 44 to 65 percent of the value of food in 9 of 13 analysis units. To supplement these farm-furnished goods, farm families spent for food a large share of the cash available for day-byday living; in the income class mentioned, from 26 to 39 percent of total money outlays for family living were spent for food in the 13 farm sections studied.

The distribution of the money value of food between farm-furnished and purchased goods may be illustrated by figures from families in the general farming section in Pennsylvania and Ohio. For a group of families consisting of husband, wife, and two children under 16 years of age, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, the averages were as follows:



Obtained without direct expenditure





As meals at work, school, or on vacation--...........-. 0
As between-meal refreshment away from home...-- 1
The money value of food increased as incomes rose throughout the income scale. The increases differed somewhat from one analysis unit to another and were somewhat smaller for families including a relatively large proportion of persons under 16 years of age in their membership as compared to families including relatively few. The average value of food of families in the income class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499$ in one farm section-Pennsylvania-Ohio-tended to be over half again as great as in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$; and in the $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ class, about a fourth greater than in the lower income class mentioned.

Within a given income class, there were also increases in the money value of food with increases in family size. The differences in the money value of food between the family-type groups studied usually were much too small, however, to enable the larger families to fare so well as those including only a husband and wife.

The choices made of foods to be prepared at home by white operators' families probably differ as widely between the North and West (New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Moun-
tain, and Pacific regions) on the one hand, and the Southeast on the other, as between any two parts of the country. Although the total quantities consumed in these two regions were similar when the food supply was considered under three broad classes (A, selected food groups that include many of the so-called protective foods; B, other groups of foods of plant origin; C, other groups of foods chiefly of animal origin) there were characteristic differences within the totals. For example, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, the total quantities consumed per person in summer months differed by less than 10 percent, but families living in the North and West consumed over 60 percent more eggs, 17 percent more meat, and over twice as many potatoes, but only three-fourths as many other vegetables, only half as much of grain products, and less than half as much of fats (other than butter) as did families of the same size living in the Southeast.

In each region larger quantities of most of the major groups of food usumlly were provided for each household member as incomes increased. Among families that included, in addition to husband and wife, one person 16 years or older and none to three others ${ }^{1}$ the rate of increase in the quantities consumed with rising income was greatest for fresh fruit in farm sections in the North (New England, Middle Atlantie and North Central States). The rate of increase was next greatest for meat, eggs, and fresh vegetables; and least, for milk, fats, grain products, sugars, and potatoes. The trend toward an increase in the consumption of fresh vegetables and fruit with rising income is significant; these foods are important sources of vitamin C, a nutrient in which farm dicts often were not well fortified.

In the West (Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions) as incomes rose, the rate of increase in consumption among families of the type group described above was greatest for fresh vegetables. Upward trends were found also for eggs, milk, sugars, and fresh fruit, whereas the per capita consumption of meat, grain products, and potatocs changed but little. In the Southeast the most marked increases in per capita consumption were in eggs and meat.

The quantities of important food groups consumed by families differing in type increased with family size; but the increases were not proportional to the increase in numbers to be fed. The rates of increase differed for the various food groups. Thus, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, families of other type groups most nearly approximated on a per capita basis the food supplies of type 1 families, including husband and wife only, with respect to milk, grain products, and potatoes; they approximated them least closely with respect to eggs, meat, and (except in the Southeast) fresh fruit.

Eggs, dairy products, fruit, and vegetables other than potatoes play an important role in determining dietary adequacy. They tend to provide farm families with much of the calcium, the vitamin A value, the ascorbic acid, and the riboflavin of their diet, as well as a large share of the high-quality protcin. These are nutrients in which farm diets often are relatively deficient; the foods supplying them are sometimes called protective foods. The level of consumption on farms of most of these foods is closely related to programs of food production for household use. This is especially true of eggs and milk, and to a lesser degree, of succulent vegetables and fruit.

[^2]There was a close association between the content of diets as reflected in money value of food per food-expenditure unit, and nutritive value. In the Middle Atlantic and North Central region, for example, in progressing from diets valued in the class $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per week per food-expenditure unit to the class $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$, increases in averages for the several nutrients studied (protein, three minerals, and four vitamins) were usually as much as a fourth to a half. This association between money value of food and quality of diet from the nutritive viewpoint exists because diets of higher money value tend to include relatively more of the protective foods. Only insofar as this is true is there a relationship between money value of food and nutritive quality.

In each analysis unit, diets of low money value were likely to provide insufficient quantities of several nutrients. For example, in the Southeast, food valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per week per food-expenditure unit, provided less than 2,400 calories per nutrition unit per day in 17 percent of the houscholds. A deficiency of calcium among this group was widespread; 37 percent recorded diets furnishing less than 0.45 gram per nutrition unit per day. Food of such low money value frequently provided only small quantitics of vitamins as indicated by the following facts: 33 percent of these diets furnished less than 3,000 International Units of vitamin A per nutrition unit per day; 17 percent, less than 1 milligram of thiamin; 33 percent, less than 25 milligrams of ascorbic acid; and 55 percent, less than 1.2 milligrams of riboflavin.

At one of the most usual levels of money value of food- $\$ 2.08$ $\$ 2.76$ per week per food-expenditure unit-the average nutritive values were high enough to suggest fairly generous diets. In each farm section, however, there were some families in this money-value-of-food class with diets furnishing one or more nutrients in quantities below desirable levels. In the North and West, diets were most often in need of improvement with respect to calcium, vitamin A, and ascorbic acid. In a number of households milk consumption was extremely low; this food in itself usually supplies from two-thirds to three-fourths of the calcium in customary diets, and an important share (about a sixth) of the vitamin A. Low ascorbic acid values were associated with low consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables, particularly citrus fruits and tomatoes. At this level of money value of food, it is estimated that approximately half of the families used no citrus fruit during the 7 days of the special consumption study; however, some other fresh fruit and tomatoes often were available.

In the Southeast, among families of white operators with food valued at this level ( $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per food-expenditure unit), diets were good on the whole; only in two nutrients, ascorbic acid and vitamin A, was improvement likely to be needed. (Diets were not analyzed for nicotinic acid, a pellagra-preventive factor.) More than threc-fourths of the familics in this money-value-of-food class used no citrus fruit, an important source of ascorbic acid; and more than a fourth, no other fruit during the week covered by the food record. Contributing to the low vitamin A values in some of the diets was the low consumption of sweetpotatoes, of green-colored leafy vegetables, of butter, and of milk. In diets of this group of
families as a whole, sweetpotatoes and potatoes furnished over a third and green-colored leafy vegetables over a fourth of the total vitamin A value.

About one-tenth of the families of the North and West that kept food records and about one-fourth of those in the Southeast reported diets so low in one or more nutrients that they were classed as poor. (See p. 82 for specifications used in this classification.) Ori the other hand, more than a third of the families in the North and West and about a fourth of those in the Southeast obtained diets that could be classed as excellent. In both analysis units the percentrge of diets graded excellent increased markedly as money value of food per food-expenditure unit increased, while the percentage graded poor decreased.

For a given family-type group the proportion of diets graded excellent or good generally increased with income, but within a given income class there was a decrease in the proportion graded excellent or good as family size increased from one family type to another. The association of nutritive quality of diet with income is less clear-cut than with money value of food. Through well-planned programs of home production many low-income farm families succeed in attaining relatively high dietary levels. At all levels of money value of food, however, some families were more successful than others in obtaining satisfactory diets. Thus, in the North and West about one-fifth of the families with food valued in the class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit per week succeeded in obtaining excellent diets, whereas onetenth had diets that were graded poor. Greater knowledge and skill in the selection of purchased food, together with home-production programs better adapted to family needs, undoubtedly were factors in this situation.

## Food of White Sharecroppers' Families in the Southeast

More than four-fifths ( 84 percent) of the nonrelief families of white sharecroppers in the Georgia-Mississippi section had incomes (money and nonmoney) below $\$ 750$ in 1935-36. In the counties of the Carolinas the proportion was smaller, 39 percent. However, even in the latter section, the median income was under $\$ 900$. These figures indicate that many families must devote a high proportion of their income to food, or subsist on a low dietary level, or both.

The average money value of the food of families of sharecroppers was higher in the Georgia-Mississippi section than in the Carolinas. For example, the average for families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ amounted to $\$ 419$ in the former section and $\$ 387$ in the latter. These sums were 63 and 56 percent, respectively, of the money value of family living. Although products furnished by the farm were valued at approximately 70 and 60 percent of the total for the food of these groups in the two sections, average expenditures for food were slightly more than 40 percent of money expenditures for living in each of the two analysis units. This is a relatively high proportion to devote to the purchase of so small a share of the food supply; it reflects the fact that the amount of money available for family living was relatively low.

Practically all of the money spent for food by families of sharecroppers was for meals to be prepared and served at home. Most of the money for food purchased and eaten away from home was
spent for between-meal food and drink, such as soft drinks, sandwiches, candy, and ice cream; only small amounts went for school lunches and for meals at work. In the income class $\$ 500-\$ 749$, for example, average expenditures for meals amounted to about 82 or less for any family-type group; the highest average for between-meal food was about $\$ 5$.

The important difference between diets of families of white sharecroppers and white operators in comparable family-type groups and income clases was in the relatively expensive eggs, dairy products, and in fruit and succulent vegetables taken together. The quantities of these foods had by each tenure group during the week of the special diet study are shown below for families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$, all farm sections in the Southeast combined:

|  | Pounds per household in a ureek |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groups of food: | Starecroppers | operitors |
| Eggs | - 2.0 | 2.4 |
| Milk, fluid or its equivalent in other forms | 51.6 | 58.3 |
| Butter | - 2.4 | 2. 6 |
| Succulent vegetables, fresh and canned | - 14.6 | 13.9 |
|  | -10.8 | 14.2 |

Includes also the fienh fruit equivaient of dried fruit.
Among sharecroppers an average of 4.76 persons were fed from the food supplies listed above; the corresponding figure for operators was 4.57 . The average value of the food per expenditure unit-meal was 8.1 cents and 8.6 cents for families of the two tenure groups, respectively. (These figures are based on information obtained in the period March-November 1936.)

As incomes (money and nonmoney) rose to the $\$ 1,000$ mark, average consumption of most major goups of foods increased among sharecroppers' families. Also, at each income level there were increases in the consumption of most food groups with increasing family size from one type group to another, but the increases were not in proportion to the number of persons to be fed.

At comparable levels of money value of food per food-expenditure unit, the nutritive quality of the diets of white sharecroppers' families in the Southeast tends to be less satisfactory than that of operators' families. Thus, in the money-value class $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07,21$ percent of the sharecroppers and 26 percent of the operators studied had diets that could be graded good or excellent. At the next higher class ( $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ ), the percentages were 45 and 58 , respectively, for the two tenure groups. At each money-value level, the diets of sharecroppers' families tend to include less of the protective foods; they are the more likely, therefore, to be classified in the fair- or poor-diet grades.

## Food of Negro Farm Families in the Southeast

Most of the nonrelief Negro families living on farms in the counties studied in the Southeast had incomes (money and nonmoney) under $\$ 750$ in $1935-36$. Included in this group were 57 percent of the families of farm operators in the Carolinas, 70 of those in Georgia and Mississippi; 70 percent of the families of sharecroppers in the former section, and 92 of those in the latter. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the average moncy value of the food of Negro farm families
relatively low. Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class \$250-\$499, for example, the average money value of a year's food supply in the North Carolina-South Carolina farm section was $\$ 267$ for Negro operators and $\$ 237$ for Negro sharecroppers. These figures are similar to those for corresponding family-type, income, and tenure groups in the Georgia-Mississippi section. Home-produced food accounted for almost two-thirds of the total value of food of these farm operators ( 61 and 65 percent in the two analysis units) but for only about half that of the sharecroppers ( 43 and 54 percent). Despite the fact that farms furnished so large a share of food, average expenditures for food took almost half of the total money expenditures for living of fomilies of operators and more than half of those of sharecroppers' families.

As incomes rose, there was an accompanying increase in average money value of food; within an income class, however, the average value of food per expenditure unit decreased with increasing family size from one type group to another.

Since the consumption of vegetables, fruit, eggs, dairy products, and meat on farms tends to be related to home-production programs, it is of interest that practically every family of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500$ - $\$ 999$ included in the study had a garden, and most of them ( 90 percent or more except among sharecroppers in South Carolina and Mississippi) had some farm-furnished eggs. The proportion having home-produced milk was lowest in North Carolina-48 percent of the operators and 27 percent of the sharecroppersand highest in Georgia where practically all families, both operators and sharecroppers, had milk furnished by the farm at some time during the year. Some farm-furnished pork was consumed by 80 percent or more of the families in each section.

As incomes rose there were marked increases in the consumption of eggs, milk in its various forms, meat, poultry and fish, and potatoes; and relatively smaller increases in the consumption of vegetables other than potatoes. The diets of families even in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$ (almost half of the Negro families included in the consumption sample had incomes under $\$ 500$ ) were rather restricted, however.

The diets of about half of the Negro families furnishing food records failed in one or more respects to meet the specifications of a fair diet. The proportion classed as fair or poor decreased with increasing money value of food, and with increasing incomes within family-type groups. Within a given income class, however, the proportion classed as fair or poor inereased with size of family. Almost half of the diets classed as poor failed to meet the specifications for a fair diet with respect to calcium and ascorbic acid; about a third with respect to vitamin A and riboflavin, and nearly a fifth, protein and thiamin. When only one nutrient was the limiting factor, it was most likely to be calcium or vitamin C. Shortages of other nutrients were found as part of multiple rather than as single deficiencies. The deficiencies mentioned could be corrected through increased consumption of dairy products, of leafy and green-colored vegetables, and of fruit and vegetables rich in vitamin C .

## SECTION 2. FOOD OF WHITE FARM OPERATORS' FAMILIES

## Money Value of Food in a 12-Month Period

## Money Value of Food in the Pennsylvania-Ohio Farm Section

Food is an important component of the total money value of living of farm families. Its average money value amounted to $\$ 507$ in a year for the 2,257 nonrelief families of white farm operators included in the consumption sample of counties surveyed in Pennsylvania and Ohio. ${ }^{1}$ The economic status of these families, with an average size of 4.19 persons and having, for family living, goods and services averaging $\$ 1,292$ in value, was higher than that of the total farm population in these counties. (See Methodology, The Consumption Sample in Relation to the Total Population.)

The major part of the food supply of these families was produced at home. They valued their farm-furnished products at an average of $\$ 321,{ }^{2} 63$ percent of the money value of all food consumed in the $12-$ month period covered by the study. An average of about $\$ 4$ worth of food was received as gift or pay. Average expenditures for food, amounting to 26 percent of all money expenditures for living, were \$182. Of this sum, $\$ 175$ was spent for food to be prepared and served at home. Expenditures for board at school averaged less than $\$ 2$; for meals bought by family members including those eaten at work, at school, while traveling or on vacation, $\$ 3$; and expenditures for between-meal refreshment, purchased and eaten away from home, almost $\$ 2$ (tables 42 and 43).

## Money Value of Food in Relation to Income and Family Type

As incomes rose, the money value of the food supply of families in the Pennsylvania-Ohio farm section increased fairly steadily. In the income class $\$ 250-\$ 499$, the average value of all food of type 3 families (husband, wife, and two children under 16 years) was $\$ 315$; in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249, \$ 453$; and in the class $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,909, \$ 555$. Corresponding figures for purchased food were $\$ 129, \$ 155$, and $\$ 278$; and for the home-produced share, $\$ 186, \$ 296$, and $\$ 277$, respectively. For any given income class, the value of all food increased with size of family, but not sufficiently, as a rule, to maintain the larger families on as high a dietary plane as that enjoyed by the two-person families.

To study problems of consumption as related to income and family composition, families were classed in type groups based on the number

[^3]and age of family members other than husband and wife. The classification of a large number of families in a few groups implies that each group will present considerable variation in the age and to some extent in the number of family members. By definition, however, some groups varied less than others. In some (types 1, 2, and 3), the number of persons was rigidly specified and those other than the husband and wife had to be in a given age class, i. e., under 16 years. Definitions of other types had greater flexibility both as to size and age composition. The seven types for which consumption data are presented are described in figure 1; dotted lines are used where varia-


Figure 1.-Definitions of family types: Illustration of the definitions of the seven types used.in the classification of families in the consumption sample. Possible variations in the number and age class of persons other than husband and wife are indicated by dotted lines.
tion in age class, or in number, or in both was permitted by definition. (See Glossary, Family Type, for details of classification.)
Families of type 1 included husband and wife only, save for the occasional cases where there were infants or others who had been members of the economic family for fewer than 27 weeks. Families of type 2 included, in addition to husband and wife, one person under 16 years of age. Type 3 families had two children under 16. Families of type 4 had, in addition to husband and wife, a third member 16 or older and possibly a fourth of any age. Type 5 families included three or four persons in addition to husband and wife, one of whom was 16 or older, one under 16, and the others of any age. Families of type 6 had three or four persons under 16 years of age; families of type 7 , five or six persons (of whom one, by definition, had to be under 16) in addition to husband and wife.

The distribution of the families studied in the Pennsylvania-Ohio farm section among these type groups is shown in table 1. Had more family-type groups been set up, each could have been more narrowly defined. As will be seen later, however, it was necessary to combine these seven groups into four for the analyses of expenditures and consumption in most farm sections. (See Methodology, p. 357.)

The relationship between family type and money value of food is fairly definite. With families of the different types ranked by the total money value of their food supply, the type 1 families of husband and
wife only stood at the bottom of the list, having food of the lowest average money value in each of 11 income classes; in 10 out of the 11 income classes, the large type 7 families (with an average of 7.35 persons) stood at the top (table 2). Nine times out of eleven, families of type 5 (five or six members) stood second, and those of type 2 (three members), sixth. The intermediate third, fourth, and fifth positions were not occupied by any one family type in the majority of income classes. There was a tendency, however, for families of type 6 to occupy the third place, and those of types 3 and 4, somewhat smaller, to be fourth and fifth on the list.
The ranking is almost reversed, however, when the average value of food is considered on a food-expenditure-unit basis rather than on a family basis. (Sce Glossary, Food-expenditure Unit.) Average values per unit-meal were highest among the smallest families, those of type 1, and next highest among families of type 2. The largest families, those of type 7, generally stood at the foot of the list. Families of types 3 and 4 competed for the third and fourth places; fumilies of types 5 and 6 , for fifth and sixth places. Thus, the larger the family, the lower the money value of food per unit-meal tended to be within each income class.

Table 1.-Family type: Number of persons included by definition in each family type, and number, percentage distribution, and average size of families, by family type, Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, ${ }^{\text {: 1935-56 }}$
[White nonrellef families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Famiy } \\ & \text { tyre No. } \end{aligned}$ | Fotential mernbers ' |  | Familles |  | A vernee persons fami:y ${ }^{3}$ | Average persons other than husband and wife |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total number | Number other than husband and wife |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{16}{\text { Under }}$ | 1sor |
| All types- |  | None <br> 1 child under 16 <br> 2 children under 16 <br> 1 person 16 or older with or without 1 other person, regardless of sge. <br> 1 child under 16 , I person 16 or older, and <br> 1 or 2 others, regardless of age. <br> 3 or 4 children under 16 . | Num- $\begin{aligned} & \text { ber } \\ & 2,257 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per. } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \\ 4.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num. } \\ \text { ber } \\ 1.49 \end{gathered}$ | Number 0.70 |
|  |  |  | 428 | 19 | 2.02 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 264 | 12 | 3.01 | 1.00 |  |
|  |  |  | 24.3 | 11 | 4.01 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 474 | 21 | 3.52 | . 28 | 1. 28 |
|  |  |  | 300 | 13 | 5.45 | 1. 29 | 1. 69 |
|  |  |  | 259 | 11 | 5. 38 | 3.39 |  |
|  |  | 1 child under 16 and 4 or 5 others, regardless of age. | 289 | 13 | 7.35 | 3. 75 | 1. 62 |

1 Includes families in the consumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this tahle.
: Fumber of year-eguivalent persons included by definition in cach family type.
${ }^{2}$ Year-cquivalent persons. Slizht discrepancies may oceur between the average for all members aded the amount obtained by adding 2.00 (husband and wife) to the sum of the averages for persons under 16 and 16 or older. These discrepancies result from differences in the methods of romputing averages for all members and for persons other than husband or wife. Sce Glossary, Family Type.

A clear-cut, quantitative expression of the variations in average value of food within family-type groups at higher and lower income levels, and between family types at the same income level requires a very large sample. Although the consumption sample of the Pennsyl-yania-Ohio farm section included 2,257 families, this number proved insufficient to show smooth trends for the 7 family-type groups within an income class as well as for the 13 income classes within cach type. Relatives showing the money value of food of familics dif.
fering in type calculated for the separate income classes do not show any distinct tendency to differ along the income scale, but appea: to fluctuate widely around some central value, if allowance is made for the variation in average size within type groups. Figures for selected income classes illustrate these points:

|  | Relative money value of food (family type $1=100$ ) in the income class-. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family type: | 8750-8999 | \$1,550-81,499 | \$1,760-81,990 |
| 1---.- | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2 | 116 | 107 | 121 |
| 3 | 127 | 124 | 121 |
| 4 | - 121 | 124 | 137 |
| 5 | - 150 | 161 | 154 |
| ¢ | - 132 | 144 | 132 |
| 7 | 159 | 163 | 170 |

For families in the Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, therefore, the relation between income and consumption (family types combined) is discussed first, then the relation between family type and consumption (income classes combined).

Table 2.-rank comparison of famley types by money value of food: Families in each income class ranked by average money value of food per family in a year, and by average money value of food per food-expenditure unit-meal, by family type, Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-86
[White nonrelief familles that include a husband and wife, both native-born]


1 This tabie includes white operator [amilies in the consumption sample and is based on tahles 42 and 44. See Glossary for definitions of lerms used in this table.
${ }_{2}$ The highest average was ranked 1. with each sucocssively lower average assigned tho next larger rank. Thus. low numbers indicate high valucs. Tted ranks indicate approximately equal money valuc for families of different tyyes.

3 Includes income classes $\$ 0-\$ 249$ and $\$ 5,000-\$ 0,999$.
The relation of income alone to money value of food cannot be measured by comparing the average values for food obtained by pooling for each successive income class the data obtained from families of all types. The increases observed may be due not only to higher incomes, but in part to an increasing proportion of families of larger size. The proportion of families of types $3,5,6$, and 7 included in the consumption sample tended to increase with income, while the relative number of other types decreased; 48 percent of the type 1 families included had incomes under $\$ 1,000$, but only 15 percent of the families of type 7 .

In table 3, the relative increase in money value of food due only to rising incomes has been studied by making use of figures obtained
from a standardized distribution of families by type. (Family-type groups were assumed to have cqual frequencies in all income classesi. e., within each income class, a simple average was obtained of the average money value of food for families of each type.)

With the distribution of families by type standardized, the average money value of the food of families in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ was found to be 25 percent greater than that of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$; and of families in the class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499$, almost half again as great ( 47 percent) as that of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$. On a food-expenditure-unit basis, the relation of income to money value of food was less marked; the average value of the food of families in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ was 21 percent greater than that of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$; and in the class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499$, only 36 percent greater than that of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ (table 3).

From one family-type group to another, with increases in family size there were also increases in the money value of the family food supply. With a standardized distribution of families by income (income classes were assumed to have equal frequencies in all familytype groups, and a simple average was obtained of the average money value of food for each income class within a family-type group), the average money value of the food of families of type 3 , for example, was almost a fourth, 24 percent, greater than that of families of type 1 ; and the food of families of type 7, almost two-thirds, 64 percent, greater than that of the type 1 group. Among family-type groups including approximately the same number of persons (types 5 and 6) there was a tendency for the type group having the higher percentage of family members 16 years of age or older (type 5) to have food of the higher money value.

The increases in the money value of food from one family-type group to another were insufficient, however, to maintain the larger families at as high a diet level (measured by money value of food per food-expenditure unit) as that had by families consisting only of husband and wife. In any given income class, the larger the family, the cheaper was the type of diet to which it resorted. On a food-expenditure-unit basis (standardized income distribution), the average money value of the food of families of types 3 and 4 was more than a fifth smaller than that of type 1 families; and that of families of types 5,6 , or 7 , more than a third smaller than that of type 1 families.

Relative to the food supplies of type 1 families, families of types 3 and 6 maintained their home-production programs somewhat more adequately than their food purchases. Among families of other types about the same relationships between purchased and home-produced food prevailed as among families of type 1.

Differences in money value of food between families differing in type but in the same income class are better measured by the relatives just discussed (based on standardized distribution) than by relatives based on actual averages for separate income classes if there are but comparatively few cases in some of the cells. The latter (p. 10) fluctuate near the relatives determined from the standardized distribution as shown in table 3.

The preceding paragraphs and table 3 indicate the magnitude of the effect upon money value of food (1) of variations in income only, and (2) of variations only in family type. This analysis was made

[^4]possible through use of a standardized distribution, a device which may be employed when the averages given in appendix tables for groups classified by income and family type are based on so small a number that trends are not smooth because of sampling fluctuations.

The degree of error that would be involved in using the all-incomes or all-family-types lines of appendix tables, i. e., actual distributions instead of a standardized distribution, in studying relationships can be seen from table 3. This table presents the relative money value of food (1) between families in higher and lower income classes, regardless of their size (family types combined), and (2) between families differing in size (income classes combined) both as found in the consumption sample, and for a standardized distribution.

Table 3.-Relative money value of food, standardized and actual distribetions: Relative money value per family and per food-expenditure unit of all food, purchased food, and home-produced food, by income and by family type, standardized and actual distributions, Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, ${ }^{1} 1985-96$
[White nonrellef families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]


[^5]Inspection of this table will indicate that as incomes rose, the increases in average money value of food per family appear to be relatively greater when averages for all families, regardless of their distribution by type, were considered at each income level than when a standardized distribution by type was considered. On a food-expenditure-unit basis, the reverse is true. Differences between family types in average money value of food also appear to be greater when averages for each type, regardless of their distribution by income,
were considered than when a standardized distribution was considered. On a food-expenditure-unit basis, the reverse is true.

The exaggeration of trends that appear when the actual rather than standardized distributions are considered is due, of course, to the fact that the higher income classes of the consumption sample included proportional y more of the family-type groups with relatively numerous family members. ${ }^{3}$

Table 4.- relative expenditures for food, by family type and income: Relative food expenditures per family within family-type groups by income, and within income classes by family type, 3 Middle Allantic and North Central analysis units combined, ${ }^{1} 1985-96$
[White nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

| Family-income class (dollars) | Family type 1 | Fanaily types 2 and 3 | Family types 4 and 5 | Family types fisand 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INCOME OLASS $\$ 500-\$ 990=100$ |  |  |  |
| 500-999.- | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1,000-1,499 | 122 | 109 | 118 | 11.5 |
| 1, 500-1,909 | 128 | 113 | 131 | 123 |
| 2, 000-2, 999. | 144 | 127 | 141 | 128 |
|  | FAMILY TYPE $1=100$ |  |  |  |
| 800-998. | 100 | 131 | 137 | 155 |
| 1,000-1, 409 | 100 | 117 | 132 | 146 |
| 1,500-1,999. | 100 | 115 | 141 | 14.9 |
| 2,000-2, 999 | 100 | 115 | 134 | $13 \%$ |
| All combined ${ }^{2}$ - | 100 | 119 | 138 | 146 |

[^6]As shown previously, at any given income level, the larger the family, the higher the money value of food tends to be on a family basis, but the lower, on a food-expenditure-unit basis (see table 2).
To show clearly the variations in money expenditures for food as related to two factors-income and family type-a larger number of cases is needed than was furnished by the Pennsylvania-Oh o farm section alone. Data from three analysis units-Pennsylvania-Ohio, Michigan-Wisconsin, Illinois-Iowa-were combined for this analysis, and relative expenditures for food were computed for broader income bands ( $\$ 500$ intervals) and for more inclusive family-type groups (four rather than seven groups) than shown in preceding pages (table 4).

The relative increases in food expenditures with income were similar in magnitude for families of type 1 and of types 4 and 5 com-bined-families with a large proportion of members 16 years of age

[^7]{\mathrm{ direct }}<br>{\mathrm{ expenditure}}

```} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{All
(12)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pur. chased} \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Home produced \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Gift or pay \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & & & \begin{tabular}{l}
All purchased food \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Food } \\
\text { at } \\
\text { home }{ }^{\mathrm{a}} \\
\text { (8) }
\end{gathered}
\] & Fnod away from home \({ }^{7}\)
(9) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Home produced \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
CHift or pay \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
3!IDDLE ATLANTIC \\
AND NORTH \\
CENTRAL-COD.
\end{tabular} & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Pennsylvania-Ohio Continued & Num- & Num- & Num- & Num- & Dol- & Dol- & Dol- & 700l- & Dol. & Dol- & Dol. & Dol- \\
\hline Type 3-Con. & bet & bet & ber & ber & lars & lars & lars & lars & lars & lars & lars & lats \\
\hline 1,250-1,499. & 54 & 54 & 4 & 4.00 & 503 & 151 & 149 & 2 & 350 & 2 & 1,263 & 638 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 31 & 31 & 4 & 4.03 & 543 & 181 & 175 & 6 & 361 & 1 & 1,403 & 739 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 14 & 14 & 3 & 4.00 & 488 & 147 & 144 & 3 & 338 & 3 & 1,445 & 800 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 25 & 25 & 4 & 4. 00 & 504 & 179 & 173 & 6 & 321 & 4 & 1,473 & 766 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 15 & 15 & 1 & 4.00 & 655 & 278 & 271 & 7 & 277 & (9) & 1,747 & 1,076 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 12 & 12 & 1 & 3.98 & 476 & 159 & 155 & 4 & 317 & (9) & 1,637 & 1.897 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999. & 5 & 5 & 1 & 3.95 & 588 & 228 & \(22 \overline{7}\) & 1 & 351 & 0 & 2,173 & 1,289 \\
\hline 5,000-8,899...... & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Type 4 & 474 & 474 & 66 & 3. 52 & 496 & 184 & 173 & 11 & 308 & 4 & 1.316 & 760 \\
\hline 0-249 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 3.75 & 458 & 205 & 205 & (9) & 253 & 0 & 1,466 & 1,030 \\
\hline 250-198 & 18 & 18 & 5 & 3.42 & 325 & 154 & 148 & 8 & 166 & 5 & \({ }^{1} \cdot 753\) & 1,428 \\
\hline \(500 \cdot 749\) & 50 & 50 & 3 & 3.30 & 367 & 131 & 128 & 3 & 235 & 1 & 890 & 497 \\
\hline 750-099 & 64 & 14 & 8 & 3.52 & 416 & 155 & 147 & 8 & 257 & 4 & 933 & 503 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 59 & 59 & 16 & 3.45 & 453 & 154 & 151 & 3 & 294 & 5 & 1,108 & 586 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 76 & 76 & 9 & 3.44 & 501 & 187 & 182 & 5 & 312 & 2 & 1,282 & 747 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 44 & 14 & 8 & 3.68 & 542 & 194 & 188 & 6 & 338 & 10 & 1,424 & 825 \\
\hline 1,750-1,998. & 42 & 42 & 4 & 3. 53 & 550 & 209 & 189 & 20 & 338 & 2 & 1,579 & 935 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 50 & 50 & 8 & 3. 60 & 630 & 227 & 202 & 25 & 400 & 3 & 1, 743 & 1,054 \\
\hline \(2,500-2,999\)
\(3,000-3,949\) & 28 & 28 & 3 & 3.64 & 612 & 220 & 192 & 28 & 385 & 7 & 1,745 & 972 \\
\hline 3,000-3,949 & 25 & 25 & 2 & 3.68 & 558 & 231 & 212 & 19 & 326 & 1 & 1,828 & 1, 101 \\
\hline \(4,000-4,999\)
\(5,000-8,999\) & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3.95 & 604 & 215 & 184 & 31 & 389 & 0 & 1,962 & 1,316 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999. & 5 & 5 & 0 & 3.80 & 455 & 250 & 249 & 1 & 205 & 0 & 1,903 & 1,372 \\
\hline Type 5 & 300 & 300 & 39 & 5.45 & 632 & 227 & 215 & 12 & 399 & 6 & 1.574 & 900 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-249 \\
& 250-498
\end{aligned}
\] & 1 & 1 & 1 & \({ }^{8} 5.00\) & \({ }^{8} 582\) & 1146
95 & 1146 & \({ }^{3} 0\) & \(\bigcirc\) & \({ }^{8} 141\) & 8 2,434 & \({ }^{8} 1,778\) \\
\hline 250-499 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 5. 18 & 351 & 95 & 85 & (9) & 225 & 31 & 736 & 1,778
367 \\
\hline 500-749 & 18 & 18 & 3 & 5.30 & 405 & 168 & 167 & 1 & 234 & 3 & 844 & 449 \\
\hline 750-999 & 30 & 30 & 4 & 5.32 & 516 & 193 & 188 & 5 & 321 & 2 & 1,033 & 513 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 \(\cdots \cdots\) & 32 & 32 & 5 & 5. 64 & 570 & 188 & 187 & 1 & 370 & 12 & 1,238 & 682 \\
\hline 1,250-1,488 \(\ldots\) & 33 & 33 & 9 & 5.41 & 654 & 222 & 219 & 3 & 418 & 14 & 1,369 & 734 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 42 & 42 & 2 & 5. 32 & 641 & 225 & 215 & 10 & 414 & 2 & 1,513 & 885 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 24 & 24 & I & 5.42 & 621 & 212 & 204 & 8 & 408 & 1 & 1, 609 & 934 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 42 & 42 & 3 & 5.61 & 601 & 259 & 245 & 14 & 428 & 4 & 1,822 & 1,039 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 31 & 31 & 5 & 5. 54 & 726 & 202 & 230 & 32 & 456 & 8 & 2,046 & 1,222 \\
\hline \(3,000-3,899\)
\(4,000-4,899\) & 30 & 30 & 3 & 5. 54 & 710 & 255 & 240 & 15 & 452 & 3 & 2,026 & 1,206 \\
\hline \(4,000-4,989\)
\(5,000-9,099\) & 7 & 7 & 0 & 5. 28 & 850 & 386 & 306 & 80 & 464 & 0 & 2,638 & 1, B84 \\
\hline 5,000-9,099 . . . . & 6 & 6 & 0 & 5. 21 & 746 & 251 & 238 & 13 & 495 & 0 & 2,458 & 1,477 \\
\hline Type 6...-.-.......- & 259 & 259 & 35 & 5.38 & 534 & 178 & 175 & 3 & 353 & 3 & 1,294 & 671 \\
\hline 0-249 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \({ }^{3} 5.00\) & \({ }^{8} 395\) & \({ }^{8} 180\) & \({ }^{180}\) & 80 & \({ }^{8} 215\) & \({ }^{8} 0\) & \({ }^{8} 832\) & 8448 \\
\hline 250-499 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 5.33 & 477 & 179 & 178 & 1 & 296 & 2 & 1, 108 & 803 \\
\hline 500-749 & 17 & 17 & 2 & 5. 24 & 395 & 141 & 141 & (7) & 245 & 9 & . 831 & 394 \\
\hline 750-999 ... & 36 & 30 & 7 & 5. 32 & 454 & 148 & 147 & 1 & 304 & 2 & 1, 019 & 502 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 37 & 37 & 4 & 5. 32 & 541 & 181 & 178 & 3 & 359 & 1 & 1,177 & 591 \\
\hline \(1,250-1,499\)
\(1,500-1,749\) & 32 & 32 & 2 & 5.31 & 582 & 176 & 173 & 3 & 404 & 2 & 1,289 & 639 \\
\hline \(1,500-1,749 \ldots\)
\(1,750-1,999\). & 37
33 & 37
33 & 12 & 5. 43 & 535 & 172 & 169 & 3 & 3.55 & 8 & 1,311 & 681 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 \(2, \ldots-\cdot\) & 33 & 33 & 1 & 5. 40 & 532 & 193 & 189 & 4 & 339 & () & 1,347 & 741 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 \(\ldots \ldots\)
\(2,500-2,999\) & 29 & 29 & 2 & 5. 42 & 569 & 187 & 185 & 2 & 381 & 1 & 1,481 & 730 \\
\hline \(2,500-2,999 \ldots\)
\(3,000-3,999\) & \(21)\) & 20 & 3 & 5. 54 & 627 & 197 & 193 & 4 & 428 & 2 & 1,765 & 761 \\
\hline \(3,000-3,999\)
\(4,000-4,999\) & 6 & 6 & 1 & 5.57 & 620 & 251 & 249 & 2 & 368 & 1 & 1,701 & 972 \\
\hline \(4,000-4,999 \ldots\)
\(5,000-9,999 \ldots\) & 3 & 3 & 0 & 5.33 & 489 & 223 & 223 & (0) & 266 & 0 & 1.864 & 1,254 \\
\hline 5,090-9,999 . . . - & 3 & 3 & 0 & 6.00 & 709 & 220 & 170 & 50 & 489 & 0 & 2,172 & 1,216 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-36-Continued
[Nonrelicf farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footmotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 193585-\) Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ?]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct experiditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1085-36-Continued

〔Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text { }}\) ]


See footnates at end of table.

Table 12.--all Food: Number of fami lite having ford oblained without direct expenditure, avesage number of persons per family, antuge money watue per fawily in a ycar of all food, murchased food. and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family liming, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 30 Statcs, \({ }^{1}\) 199\%-Sf-Continued

Wontilif farm families that include a husband and wife, hoth rative-born \(\left.{ }^{2}\right]\)


See footnotes at end ai table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-36-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{4}{*}{Families} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Familijes obtaining food without direct expenditure}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{Aver. age \({ }^{3}\) numnber of persolls per family \({ }^{4}\)} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Aperage \({ }^{3}\) value of food oper family per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value of family living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{3}{*}{All} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(\qquad\)} & \multirow{3}{*}{All} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & & & & & All & & Food & Home & Gift & & \\
\hline & & pro- & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { or } \\
\text { pay }
\end{gathered}
\] & & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { pur- } \\
\text { chased } \\
\text { food }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gt } \\
& \text { gome } \\
& \text { hom }
\end{aligned}
\] & sway home \({ }^{7}\) & pro- & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { or } \\
\text { pay }
\end{gathered}
\] & & \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{plains and mountain-con.} \\
\hline North Dakota-Kansas-Continued & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
371
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\(\mathrm{Num}-\)
ber
371} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num } \\
\text { ber } \\
85
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
3.50
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
457
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Dollars 196} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lar* } \\
188
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { larg } \\
8
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
255
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { laar } \\
6
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
\text { l, } 124
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lars }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline Kansas-Continued & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & & & & & & & & & & & & 710 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Net losses..-----.-----} & 30 & 30 & 8 & 3.38 & 420 & 171 & 158 & 13 & 234 & 15 & 1,101 & 724 \\
\hline & 341 & 341 & 77 & 3.51 &  & 199 & 191 & 8 & 250 & , & 1,126 & 708 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\underset{250-499}{0 .-249} \ldots
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{87
68} & 27 & 7 & 3.50 & 382 & 181 & 173 & 8 & 197 & 4 & 917 & 605 \\
\hline & & 68 & 19 & 3.30 & 404 & 172 & 165 & 7 & 226 & 6 & 939 & 570 \\
\hline 600-749 & 64 & 64 & 12 & 3.53 & 440 & 190 & 181 & 9 & 244 & 6 & 953 & 580 \\
\hline 750-999. & 67 & 67 & 17 & 3.63 & 485 & 198 & 190 & 8 & 282 & 5 & 1,155 & 706 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 38 & 38 & 6 & 3.56 & 488 & 194 & 187 & 7 & 271 & 3 & 1,066 & 654 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 31 & 31 & 4 & 3. 60 & 477 & 225 & 221 & 4 & 251 & 1 & d. 305 & 883 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 18 & 18 & 3 & 3.50 & 536 & 231 & 228 & 3 & 304 & 1 & 1,370 & 882 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 10 & 10 & 5 & 3.54 & 558 & 226 & 219 & 7 & 320 & 10 & 1,720 & 1,193 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{10
4
4} & 10 & 2 & 3.42 & 609 & 280 & 269 & 11 & 318 & 11 & 1,986 & 1, 264 \\
\hline 2,500-2,909 & & 4 & 0 & 3.75 & 558 & 275 & 261 & 14 & 283 & , & 1,850 & 1,199 \\
\hline 3,000-3,899 & 4 & 4 & , & 3.61 & 557 & 293 & 267 & 26 & 258 & 8 & 1,718 & 1,146 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5....... & 481 & 480 & 11.5 & 4.35 & 577 & 241 & 221 & 20 & 326 & 10 & 1,377 & 868 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Net losses} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{45
438} & 45 & 12 & 4.36 & 612 & 264 & 242 & 22 & 334 & 14 & 1,370 & 874 \\
\hline & & 435 & 103 & 4.35 & 574 & 238 & 219 & 19 & 326 & 10 & 1, 377 & 867 \\
\hline 0-249 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
40 \\
53 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & 39 & 8 & 4.23 & 488 & 214 & 188 & 18 & 277 & 7 & 1,148 & 721 \\
\hline 250-499 & & 53 & 9 & 4. 26 & 480 & 198 & 184 & 14 & 272 & 10 & 1,049 & 642 \\
\hline 5(4) 749 & 74 & 74 & 20 & 4.22 & 511 & 207 & 194 & 13 & 295 & 9 & 1,252 & 781 \\
\hline 750-999 & 75 & 75 & 23 & 4.58 & 560 & 241 & 226 & 1.5 & 304 & 15 & 1,313 & 818 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 49 & 49 & 18 & 4.32 & 615 & 254 & 235 & 19 & 347 & 14 & 1,474 & 931 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 47 & 47 & 8 & 4.48 & 626 & 239 & 221 & 18 & 382 & 4 & 1, 408 & 840 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 35 & 35 & 6 & 4.31 & 632 & 268 & 239 & 29 & 359 & 5 & 1,513 & 977 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 21 & 21 & 3 & 4.15 & fi38 & 250 & 223 & 27 & 372 & 14 & 1,754 & 1,125 \\
\hline 2,000-2.499 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{20
16} & 20 & 2 & 4.48 & 729 & 296 & 268 & 28 & 419 & 14 & 1,935 & 1,257 \\
\hline 2,500-2,998 & & 16 & 8 & 4.27 & 712 & 321 & 268 & 55 & 388 & , & 1, 843 & 1,238 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 16 & , & , & 4.50 & 682 & 308 & 290 & 18 & 374 & 0 & 1,935 & 1,351 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{South Dakota-Mon-tana-Colorado} \\
\hline All types & 447 & 447 & 82 & 3.36 & 630 & 261 & 238 & 23 & 262 & 7 & 1,174 & 766 \\
\hline 0-249 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{31
60} & 31 & 6 & 3.13 & 427 & 236 & 216 & 20 & 188 & 5 & 936 & 633 \\
\hline 250-499 & & 60 & 8 & 2.94 & 439 & 233 & 213 & 20 & 202 & 4 & 999 & 680 \\
\hline 500-749 & 75 & 75 & 7 & 3.14 & 472 & 243 & 231 & 12 & 226 & 3 & 964 & 614 \\
\hline \(750-999\) & 84 & 84 & 17 & 3.33 & 522 & 245 & 232 & 13 & 268 & 9 & 1,091 & 685 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 57 & 57 & 12 & 3.62 & 528 & 260 & 235 & 25 & 265 & 3 & 1,158 & 724 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 43 & 43 & 10 & 3.67 & 611 & 295 & 275 & 20 & 304 & 12 & 1,368 & 891 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & \(\stackrel{23}{ }\) & 23 & 3 & 3.42 & 557 & 247 & 230 & 17 & 303 & 7 & 1,334 & 872 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 28 & 28 & 6 & 3.97 & 691 & 318 & 261 & 57 & 363 & 10 & 1,352 & 1,010 \\
\hline 2,000-2,490 & 26 & 26 & 8 & 3.70 & 680 & 324 & 268 & 56 & 337 & 19 & 1,576 & 1,058 \\
\hline 2,501-2,999. & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{13} & 13 & , & 3. 15 & 564 & 277 & 255 & 22 & 284 & 3 & 1,534 & 1,103 \\
\hline 3,000-3,990 & & 9 ; & 2 & 3.56 & 646 & 344 & 282 & 82 & 290 & 12 & 1,678 & 1,194 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sec fuotnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \(1935-36\)-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 1]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Familles} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Famplies obtaining food without direst expenditure}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) number of persons per tamily} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value of fond \({ }^{s}\) per famlly per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) valde of family living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
food \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Obtain } \\
& \text { withou } \\
& \text { direc } \\
& \text { expendit }
\end{aligned}
\] & ned out ct iture & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{All

(12)} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & Home produced & \begin{tabular}{l}
Girt \\
or \\
pay \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & & & Ail purchased food (7) & Food at home
(8) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Food away from home \({ }^{7}\) \\
(9)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Home produced \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & Gift or pay (11) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
PLAINS AND \\
MOUNTAIN-con. \\
South Dakota-Mon-tana-Colorado-Con.
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
130
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
Num- & Num- \\
ber & ber \\
130 & 18
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { bet } \\
2.00
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol- \\
lars 414
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol- \\
lats 211
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
196
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
15
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
199
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol. } \\
{ }^{\text {lars }} \\
4
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol- \\
lats 968
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol- \\
lars \\
630
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \(0-249\) & 10 & 10 & 3 & 2.00 & 403 & 211 & 201 & 10 & 188 & B & 830 & 542 \\
\hline 250-199 & 24 & 24 & 2 & 2.00 & 357 & 183 & 176 & 7 & 172 & 2 & 828 & 559 \\
\hline 500-749. & 28 & 28 & 2 & 2.00 & 402 & 218 & 205 & 13 & 180 & 4 & 832 & 536 \\
\hline 750-993 & 24 & 24 & 4 & 2.00 & 443 & 228 & 209 & 17 & 215 & 2 & 966 & 631 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 14 & 14 & 1 & 2.00 & 416 & 206 & 202 & 4 & 209 & 1 & 996 & 615 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 8 & 8 & 3 & 2.00 & 457 & 196 & 188 & 7 & 241 & 20 & 1, 154 & 675 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 2.00 & 411 & 193 & 163 & 30 & 216 & 2 & 1, 108 & 754 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 2.00 & 465 & 232 & 143 & 89 & 233 & 0 & 1,343 & 783 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 8 & 6 & 1 & 2.00 & 492 & 262 & 226 & 36 & 227 & 3 & 1, 374 & 964 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 2.00 & 394 & 225 & 200 & 25 & 165 & 4 & 1,170 & 835 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 3 & 3 & 0 & 2.00 & 474 & 190 & 176 & 14 & 284 & 0 & 1, 444 & 969 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3....... & 136 & 136 & 14 & 3.47 & 519 & 24.5 & 233 & 12 & 272 & 2 & 1,128 & 725 \\
\hline 0-249.. & 12 & 12 & & 3.45 & 432 & 228 & 212 & 16 & 198 & & 1,015 & 696 \\
\hline 250-499 & 16 & 18 & 1 & 3.31 & 471 & 245 & 234 & 11 & 223 & 3 & 973 & 849 \\
\hline 5001749 & 27 & 27 & 1 & 3. 49 & 490 & 229 & 226 & 3 & 259 & 2 & 911 & 645 \\
\hline 750-999 & 29 & 29 & 4 & 3.42 & 512 & 237 & 226 & 11 & 271 & 4 & 1, 129 & 714 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 15 & 15 & 1 & 3.47 & 515 & 241 & 222 & 19 & 272 & 2 & 1,172 & 725 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 15 & 15 & 3 & 3.58 & 630 & 301 & 278 & 23 & 324 & 5 & 1,255 & 810 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 9 & 9 & 0 & 3.44 & 531 & 202 & 199 & 3 & 329 & 0 & 1,340 & 887 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 4 & 4 & 0 & 3.67 & 570 & 288 & 28.5 & 3 & 282 & 0 & 1,234 & 814 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 7 & 7 & 1 & 3.57 & . 598 & 252 & -228 & 24 & 342 & 4 & 1,582 & 1,056 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999. & 2 & 2 & 1 & 84.00 & \({ }^{8} 705\) & \({ }^{6} 335\) & \({ }^{8} 317\) & \({ }^{5} 18\) & \({ }^{8} 367\) & \({ }^{8} 3\) & 81.918 & \({ }^{8} 1,366\) \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 ----- & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 181 & 181 & 50 & 4. 26 & 621 & 309 & 272 & 37 & 300 & 12 & 1,357 & 894 \\
\hline 0-249. & & 9 & 1 & 3. 95 & 449 & 276 & 239 & 37 & 171 & 2 & 948 & 651 \\
\hline 250-199 & 20 & 20 & 5 & 3.78 & 512 & 283 & 239 & 44 & 222 & 7 & 1,227 & 850 \\
\hline 500-749 & 20 & 20 & 4 & 4. 28 & 544 & 296 & 271 & 25 & 244 | & 4 & 1,221 & 818 \\
\hline 750-999 & 31 & 32 & 9 & 4.26 & 594 & 268 & 255 & 13 & 308 & 18 & 1,151 & 698 \\
\hline 1,006-1,249 & 28 & 28 & 10 & 4.51 & 582 & 297 & 257 & 40 & 288 & 6 & 1,233 & 778 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499..... & 20 & 20 & 4 & 4. 40 & 658 & 330 & 308 & 22 & 315 & 13 & I, 538 & 1,037 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & \(y\) & 9 & 2 & 4.19 & 665 & 324 & 299 & 25 & 324 & 17 & 1,453 & 923 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 19 & 19 & 6 & 4.34 & 753 & 339 & 278 & 61 & 401 & 13 & 1,652 & 1,087 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 13 & 13 & 6 & 4.58 & 811 & 392 & 310 & 82 & 385 & 34 & 1.66\% & 1,103 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 3.83 & 8158 & 301 & 279 & 22 & 355 & 2 & 1,709 & 1,239 \\
\hline 3,000-3,909. & 6 & 6 & 2 & 4.33 & 731 & 420 & 334 & 86 & 294 & 17 & 1,785 & 1,306 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Ser footnotes at end of table.

T'able 42--all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of jamily living, by fanily type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 Stater, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-36-Continued
[Nonrelief farm ramilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born²]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family typle. and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Families} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Families obtaining food with out direct expenditure}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) nimber of persotus per family \({ }^{4}\)} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value of food \({ }^{5}\) fer fanily per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{A verane \({ }^{8}\) valwe of ramily living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { All } \\
& \text { food }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Obtained without inirect expenditure} & \multirow{2}{*}{All} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
& Gome \\
\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
gro & or \\
duced & ray
\end{tabular} \\
(3) & (1)
\end{tabular}}} & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{All charfood} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & Food away from & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Home prodinced \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Gift } \\
\text { or } \\
\text { pay } \\
\text { (11) }
\end{gathered}
\]} & & \\
\hline & (2) & & & & (6) & & & (9) & & & (12) & (13) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
padiec \\
Whshington-Oregon \\
All types
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Num-1 } \\
& \text { ber } \\
& \operatorname{G48}
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num-1 } \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text { ier } \\
4,8
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{|c}
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c}
\text { Num mor } \\
\text { orer }
\end{array}\right. \\
189
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
3.34
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\underset{\substack{\text { Dol- } \\ \text { lary } \\ 493}}{ }
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 207
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol } \\
\text { lars } \\
190
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
17
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Tol- } \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Tars } \\
279
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
\]} & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
7
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 1,188
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol-
lars} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & 744 \\
\hline \(0 \cdot 249\) & 17 & 17 & 4 & 2. & 299 & 121 & 119 & 2 & 163 & 15 & 609 & 346 \\
\hline 250-499 & 63 & 63 & 12 & 2.90 & 311 & 125 & 121 & 7 & 180 & \({ }^{8}\) & 621 & 2 \\
\hline 500-749 & 142 & 142 & 26 & 3. 00 & 382 & 161 & 154 & 7 & 211 & 10 & 770 & 439 \\
\hline 750-999 & 117 & 117 & 24 & 3.29 & 446 & 282 & 174 & 8 & 20.4 & 10 & 950 & 553 \\
\hline 1,000-1.249 & 120 & 120 & 26 & 3.37 & 490 & 196 & 182 & 14 & 290 & 4 & 1,073 & \({ }_{730}\) \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 113 & 113 & 23
21 & 3.51
3.58 & 523
568
56 & 230 & 19.5 & 17 & 328 & 8 & 1, 1,413 & 911 \\
\hline 1,600 1,749 & 100 & 1 m & 21
10 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3.58 \\
3.48 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 560 & 257 & 224 & 33 & 294 & 9 & 1, 443 & 958 \\
\hline 1,730-1,999 & 102 & 102 & 17 & 3.41 & 564 & 236 & 208 & 28 & 32 h & 2 & 1,560 & 1,1749 \\
\hline 2,500-2 & 43 & 43 & 8 & 3.62 & 652 & 310 & 2 n 4 & 46 & 339 & 2 & 1, 860 & 1,242 \\
\hline \(3,000-3,190\) & 46 & 46 & 17 & 3.70 & 603 & 266 & 226 & 40 & 323 & 14 & 1,735 & 1,201 \\
\hline 4,000-4,499 & 14 & 14 & a & 1. 00 & 621 & 249 & 231 & 18 & 370 & , & 1,885 & 1. 251 \\
\hline Type 1 & 216 & 266 & 43 & 2.02 & 364 & 162 & 150 & 12 & 197 & 5 & 91 & 587 \\
\hline 0-249 & 11 & 11 & 4 & 2.00 & 279 & 112 & 110 & 2 & 143 & 24 & 575 & 327 \\
\hline 250-19\% & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{640)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{124
24
60} & , & 2.10 & 262 & 111 & 108 & 3 & 150 & 1 & 487 & 252 \\
\hline 500-749 & & & 11 & 2.02 & 332 & 145 & 141 & 4 & 180 & 7 & 676 & 375 \\
\hline 751)-499 & & \[
33
\] & 5 & 2.06 & 372 & 169 & 157 & 12 & 201 & 2 & 840 & 505 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 33
37 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 37 \\
& 30
\end{aligned}
\]} & 7 & 2.01 & 381 & 184 & 144 & 20 & 210 & 5 & 923 & 540 \\
\hline 1,250-1.499 & 37
20 & & 4 & 2.00 & 387 & 137 & 133 & 4 & 245 & (9) \({ }^{5}\) & 1, 117 & \({ }_{0}^{657}\) \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 19 & 20
19
19 & 1 & 2. 00 & 438 & 195 & 184 & 11 & 235
186 & (9) & 1,327 & 904 \\
\hline 1,750)-1,499 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 15 \\
& 25
\end{aligned}
\] & 15 & 4 & 2. 200 & 384
389 & 198 & 184
189 & \begin{tabular}{l}
14 \\
24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 186 & \({ }^{(1)}\) & 1,268 &  \\
\hline 2,001)-2,49 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{27} & 27 & 4 & 2.00 & 513 & 261 & 220 & 41 & 252 & 0 & 1,642 & 1,184 \\
\hline \(3,000-3,949\) & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{9} & 3 & 2.09 & 414 & 189 & 176, & 13 & 219 & 6 & 1. 239 & 819 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & , & & , & \({ }^{5} 2.00\) & 8399 & \({ }^{8} 124\) & 8114 & \({ }^{810}\) & \({ }^{8} 275\) & \({ }^{8} 0\) & - 1,732 & \({ }^{8} 989\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Types 2 and 3...... 298} & 293 & 50 & 3.46 & 435 & 202 & 188 & 14 & 286 & 7 & 1,164 & 723 \\
\hline 0-249. & 6 & 6 & & 3.15 & 338 & 138 & 138 & 0 & 200 & 0 & 672 & 380 \\
\hline 250-409 & 20 & 20 & 4 & 3. 27 & 345 & 133 & 127 & 6 & 203 & & 740 & 416 \\
\hline 500.749 & 37 & \begin{tabular}{l}
20 \\
37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 6 & 3.46 & 434 & 176 & 165 & 11 & 252 & 6 & 858 & 199 \\
\hline 750-999. & 42 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{42} & 9 & 3.41 & 447 & 184 & 178 & & 258 & 5 & 968 & 567 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 38 & & 7 & 3. 56 & 509 & 198 & 192 & 6 & 309 & 2 & 1,053 & 80 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{41
38} & 41 & 9 & 3.46 & 541 & 202 & 191 & 11 & 327 & 12 & 1.170 & 680 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{38
23} & 8 & 3.48 & 523 & \({ }_{215}\) & 202 & 13 & 304 & 4 & 1,325 & 847 \\
\hline 1,750-1,499 & 23 & & \({ }_{5}^{2}\) & 3. 46 & \({ }_{547}^{539}\) & 268 & 228 & 30 & \({ }_{332}^{268}\) & 3 & 1,390 & -937 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{22
12} & 22 & 5
3
3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3.47 \\
3.45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
547 \\
598 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 212
303 & 181
269 & 31 & 332
287 & 8 & 1, 1,795 & 1, 1,286 \\
\hline 2,500-2,499 & & \[
12
\] & 3
2
2 & 3.45
3.54 & 598 & 301 & 188 & 13 & 356 & 15 & 1,624 & 1, 005 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & , & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11 \\
3
\end{array}
\] & 0 & 3.67 & 516 & 230 & 223 & 7 & 256 & 0 & 1,727 & 1,288 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Types 4 and 5...... 389} & 389 & 91 & 4.17 & 581 & 241 & 217 & 24 & 330 & 10 & 1.376 & 868 \\
\hline 0-249 & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{0 : 0} & 0 & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{--.---} & .-. & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{--1-----1-3} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{8} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{652} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }^{3} 4\)} \\
\hline 250493 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{19
45} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{49} & 6 & 3. 53 & 338 & 136 & 133 & 3 & \({ }^{194}\) & & & \\
\hline 500-749 & & & 9 & 3.94 & 406 & 170 & 163 & 17 & 220 & 16 & 823 & 47 \\
\hline \(750-999\) & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 42 \\
& 45
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{42} & 10 & 4. 15 & 502 & 191 & 184 & 7 & 290 & 21 & 1,019 & 57 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & & & 12 & 4.32 & 564 & 221 & 204 & 17 & 338 & 5 & 1,214 & 71 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 52 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\left.\begin{array}{|c}
40 \\
1 \\
1 \\
13 \\
43
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\]} & 10 & 4. 13 & 560 & 244 & 221 & 23 & 319 & 13 & 1,232 & 79 \\
\hline 1,500 & 43 & & 12 & 4.38 & 667 & 263 & 240 & 23 & 351 & 13 & 1,520 & 97 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sea footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without dired expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money yalue per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food oblained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 Stales, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-85-Continued
[Nonrelisf farm farnilies that inchude a hushand and wife, hoth native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

sure foolnotfe at und of talble.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-86--Continued
(Nonrelief farm families that inelinde a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text { }}\) ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Numbet of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States. \({ }^{1}\) 1935-S6-Continucd
[Nonrelief farm farnilies that faclude a hushand and wife, both astive.born \({ }^{\text {a }}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Kegion, ancilysis ualt, family type. and ineome class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Famlies} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Fandlies obtaining food without direct expenditure}} & \multirow{3}{*}{A ver: age \({ }^{3}\) nulimber of persons per farnily 4} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{A perage' value of food s per family per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Averape value of tamily living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Obtained } \\
\text { without } \\
\text { direct } \\
\text { expenditure }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{All

(12)} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & Home produced & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Gift } \\
\text { or } \\
\text { pay }
\end{gathered}
\] & & &  & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Food } \\
\text { st } \\
\text { home }
\end{gathered}
\] & Food away from & Home
pro-
duced & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Qift } \\
& \text { or } \\
& \text { pay }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & & (13) \\
\hline pacmic-contd. & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Caifforniu-Contd. \\
Types 2 and 3 .
\end{tabular}} & Num- & Num- & Num- & Num- & Dot- & Dol- & Dol- & Dot- & Dol- & Dol- & Dol- & \\
\hline & ber & ber & ber & ber & lars & lars & lars & Iars & lart & lars & lars & lars \\
\hline & 296 & 285 & 55 & 3.50 & 532 & 430 & 388 & 31 & 108 & , & 1,625 & 1,301 \\
\hline 0-249 & 5 & 5 & & 3.50 & 538 & 400 & 395 & 5 & 137 & I & 1,192 & 939 \\
\hline 250-499 & 13 & 13 & 2 & 3.38 & 362 & 274 & 251 & 13 & 97 & 1 & 1,965 & 754 \\
\hline 500-748 & 23 & 21 & 4 & 3. 39 & 415 & 318 & 307 & 11 & 95 & 2 & 1.080 & 840 \\
\hline 750-890 & 30 & 29 & 2 & 3.45 & 471 & 338 & 323 & 10 & 131 & 2 & 1. 106 & 834 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249. & 24 & 22 & 1 & 3. 44 & 473 & 338 & 307 & 31 & 135 & (9) & 1,244 & 943 \\
\hline 1,230-1,439.. & 26 & 24 & 6 & 3. 52 & 503 & 401 & 383 & 18 & 03 & 0 & 1, 496 & 1. 188 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749.. & 31 & 30 & 8 & 3. 24 & 532 & 414 & 396 & 18 & 116 & 2 & 1,480 & L, 172 \\
\hline 1,750-1,898. & 29 & 29 & 7 & 3. 89 & 504 & 430 & 392 & 38 & 129 & 5 & 1, 86.3 & 1,325 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 58 & 55 & 13 & 3. 46 & 571 & 471 & 425 & 46 & 95 & 5 & 1,878 & 1. 525 \\
\hline 2.500-2,699 & 29 & 28 & \({ }^{6}\) & 3. 72 & 610 & 508 & 473 & 35 & 101 & 1 & 2,148 & 1,740 \\
\hline 3,000-3,099 & 18 & 18 & 3 & 3.44 & 637 & 534 & 466 & 68 & 100 & 3 & 2.269 & 1,849 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 8 & 7 & 2 & 3. 56 & 649 & 548 & 521 & 27 & 06 & & 2,584 & 2, 261 \\
\hline 6,000-9,909 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 3.75 & 719 & (660 & 573 & 87 & 58 & 0 & 3, 118 & 2.727 \\
\hline rypes 4 and 5.....- & 342 & 329 & 74 & 4.13 & 611 & 468 & 428 & 45 & 136 & 7 & 1, 810 & 1, 425 \\
\hline 0-249 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 3.80 & 450 & 385 & 298 & 67 & 82 & 3 & 1,222 & 970 \\
\hline 250-499 & 18 & 18 & 1 & 3. 61 & 402 & 323 & 310 & 7 & 78 & 1 & 2068 & 739 \\
\hline 500-749. & 24 & 24 & 7 & 3.48 & 439 & 309 & 297 & 12 & 126 & 4 & 1,095 & 806 \\
\hline 751)-999. & 32 & 31 & 4 & 3. 92 & 551 & 399 & 351 & 18 & 147 & 5 & 1,311 & 1,004 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249. & 21 & 21 & 10 & 4.33 & \(55^{50}\) & 417 & 399 & 18 & 155 & & 1, 225 & 1,093 \\
\hline 1.250-1.499..... & 34 & 34 & 6 & 4.42 & 591 & 425 & 396 & 28 & 160 & 6 & 1. 138 & 1.281 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & \begin{tabular}{l}
36 \\
39 \\
\hline 29
\end{tabular} & \(\begin{array}{r}36 \\ 35 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & & 4.08 & 578 & 429 & 4088 & 42 & 140 & 10 & 1,623 & 1,244 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 \(2.000-2,490\) & 29 & 25 & 4 & 4.10 & 568 & 475 & 433 & 42 & 103 & 10 & 1,887 & 1. 425 \\
\hline \(2.000-2,499\) & 57 & 57 & 13 & 4.45 & 649 & 479 & 434 & 45 & 165 & 5 & 1, 0382 & 1,528 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 33 & 32 & \({ }_{10}{ }^{1}\) & 4.30 & \({ }_{6}^{662}\) & 537 & 489 & 48 & 118 & 9 & 2,160 & 1.764 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 34 & 29 & 10 & 4.01 & 747 & 020 & 518 & 102 & 119 & 8 & 2, 446 & 2, 021 \\
\hline \(4,000-4,989\)
\(5,000-9,989\) & 12 & 12 & 3 & 4.15 & 850 & 632 & 522 & 110 & 200 & 18 & 2,677 & 2,12t \\
\hline 5,000-9,990 & 8 & 6 & I & 4.25 & 908 & 815 & 594 & 221 & 92 & 1 & 4,205 & 3, 067 \\
\hline SOTTHEAST-WHITE OPERATORS & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{607} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{607} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{200} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{4. 25} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{559} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{89} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{82} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{7} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{460} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{10} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{888} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{305} \\
\hline North Carolina selfsuffeing counties & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 4ll types....-n.-.-- & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \(0-249\) & 10 & 10 & 4 & 3.00 & 157 & 37 & 37 & 0 & 116 & 4 & 262 & 94 \\
\hline 250-499 & 78 & 78 & 28 & 3. 41 & 301 & 49 & 48 & 1 & 244 & 8 & 453 & 130 \\
\hline \(500-749\) & 138 & 138 & 48 & 3.73 & 444 & 88 & 67 & 1 & 306 & 10 & 671 & 197 \\
\hline 750-090 & 158 & 158 & 58 & 4. 61 & 598 & 86 & 80 & 6 & 50 I & 9 & 885 & 262 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 10\% & 107 & 38 & 4. 48 & 670 & 105 & 97 & 8 & 553 & 12 & 1,048 & 355 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 63 & 63 & 18 & 4.78 & 715 & 126 & 114 & 12 & 580 & 9 & 1, 244 & 409 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 38 & 39 & 7 & 4.80 & 752 & 142 & 113 & 29 & 604 & 8 & 1, 379 & 021 \\
\hline 1,750-1,099. & 16 & 16. & 3 : & 5.31 & 820 & 128 & 110 & 18 & 685 & 7 & 1,600 & 767 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-- all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct axpenditure, averuge number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtainet without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 Stales, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-56-Continued
[Nourelief farm families that include a husband and wife, boll native-born']


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, averagc money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditare, and average value of family living, by fanily type and income, 19 anolysis units in 20 Slates, \({ }^{\text {: }}\) 1995-36-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both nativo-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footnotes at end of lable.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-86-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Families \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Families obtaining food without direct expenditure}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) מumber of persons per family 4} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value of fond \({ }^{3}\) per family per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value of family living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{2}{*}{\[
\stackrel{\text { All }}{\text { food }}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Obtained without direct expenditure} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{All

(12)} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Home produced \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Gift \\
or \\
pay \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & & & \begin{tabular}{l}
All purchased food \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & Food at bome \({ }^{-1}\) (8) & Food away from bomet & \begin{tabular}{l}
Home produced \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Gift or pay \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{SOUTHEAST-WHTTE OPERATORS-COD.} \\
\hline North CarolinaSouth C'molinaContinued & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
733
\end{gathered}
\] & Num-
bet
733 & Number 235 & Numn ber 4. 52 & Tollars 671 & TholIn7s 187 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
L_{278} \\
158
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Doi- } \\
\text { lars } \\
29
\end{gathered}
\] & Dollars 478 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 6
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 1,477
\end{aligned}
\] & Dollars 817 \\
\hline 0-249 & 7 & 7 & 2 & 4.55 & 192 & 94 & 94 & (9) & 90 &  & 305 & 208 \\
\hline 250-499 & 31 & 31 & 9 & 4.38 & 295 & 115 & 112 & 3 & 177 & 3 & 800 & 348 \\
\hline 500-749 & 68 & 68 & 16 & 4. 23 & 417 & 127 & 123 & 4 & 287 & 3 & 710 & 330 \\
\hline 750-999 & 92 & 92 & 30 & 4.44 & 489 & 130 & 125 & 5 & 354 & 5 & 901 & 425 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 95 & 95 & 28 & 4.48 & 581 & 167 & 154 & 13 & 411 & 3 & 1,115 & 575 \\
\hline 1,250-1,409 & 98 & 48 & 29 & 4. 70 & 852 & 167 & 153 & 14 & 481 & 4 & 1,355 & 715 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 75 & 75 & 26 & 4.63 & 702 & 180 & 158 & 22 & 517 & 5 & 1,495 & 798 \\
\hline 1,750-1,993 & 48 & 48 & 8 & 4.17 & 768 & 189 & 155 & 34 & 577 & 2 & 1,654 & 896 \\
\hline 2,000-2,449 & 92 & 92 & 32 & 4.58 & 828 & 213 & 171 & 42 & 610 & 5 & 1,932 & 1,101 \\
\hline 2,500-2,099 & 51 & 51 & 15 & 4. 58 & 911 & 252 & 182 & 60 & 653 & 6 & 2, 103 & 1,218 \\
\hline 3,000-3,499. & 43 & 43 & 27 & 4.82 & 998 & 297 & 225 & 72 & 687 & 14 & 2, 5886 & 1,557 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 \(\ldots\) & 22 & 22 & 9 & 4. 68 & 877 & 294 & 188 & 98 & 573 & 10 & 2,725 & 1,744 \\
\hline 5,000-9,909 . . . & 11 & 11 & 3 & 4.47 & 1,298 & 558 & 30 O & 248 & 738 & 2 & 3,999 & 2, 609 \\
\hline Tyjes 6 and 7 . & 588 & 688 & 204 & 6.53 & 727 & 195 & 175 & 20 & 527 & 5 & 1,456 & 781 \\
\hline 0-249. & 3 & 3 & 1 & 6. 52 & 252 & 125 & 123 & 2 & 119 & 8 & 407 & 238 \\
\hline 250-499 & 27 . & 27 & 7 & 6. 35 & 344 & 111 & 110 & 1 & 224 & 9 & 570 & 263 \\
\hline 500-749 & 57 & 57 & 21 & 6. 21 & 422 & 151 & 145 & 6 & 267 & 4 & 770 & 416 \\
\hline 750-988. & 84 & 84 & 26 & 6. 29 & 531 & 142 & 134 & 8 & 386 & 3 & 963 & 475 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 82 & - 82 & 28 & 6.48 & 627 & 174 & 164 & 10 & 449 & 4 & 1,165 & 598 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 69 & - 69 & 23 & 6. 58 & 751 & 100 & 179 & 11 & 556 & 5 & 1,375 & 67 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 80 & 60 & \(2 \%\) & 6. 56 & 793 & 187 & 176 & 11 & 601 & 5 & 1,484 & 735 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 42 & 42 & 12 & 6.80 & 837 & 198 & 185 & 13 & B31 & 8 & 1, 727 & 900 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 73 & 73 & 22 & 6.85 & 901 & 232 & 206 & 26 & 6193 & 6 & 1,907 & 1,070 \\
\hline 2,500-2,919 & 33 & 33 & 11 & 6.81 & 986 & 239 & 212 & 27 & 742 & 5 & 2,103 & 1,157 \\
\hline 3,000-3,499 & 3 f & 36 & 19 & 6.78 & 1.126 & 353 & 271 & 82 & 762 & 11 & 2, 5888 & 1,556 \\
\hline 4,009-4,999 & 14 & 14 & 5 & 6. 86 & 1,099 & 304 & 219 & 85 & 789 & 6 & 2,655 & 1,620 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999. & 8 & 8 & 3 & 6.55 & 1,121 & 280 & 178 & 102 & 834 & 7 & 2,972 & 1,873 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Georgia-Mississippi} \\
\hline All types.. & 1,255 & 1,255 & 340 & 3.96 & 510 & 154 & 137 & 17 & 351 & 5 & 1,145 & 65.5 \\
\hline 0-249 & 8 & 8 & 2 & 2. 62 & 232 & 68 & 68 & () & 156 & 8 & 470 & 249 \\
\hline 250-499 & 1188 & 188 & 38 & 3.46 & 281 & \(6{ }_{6} 5\) & 64 & 1 & 213 & 3 & 467 & 187 \\
\hline 500-749 & 360 & 3010 & 68 & 3. 90 & 388 & 91 & 89 & 2 & 293 & 4 & 667 & 289 \\
\hline 750-999 & 240 & 249 & 64 & 4.11 & 472 & 114 & 109 & 5 & 354 & 4 & 875 & 417 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 140 & 140 & 31 & 4. 33 & 571 & 148 & 140 & 8 & 417 & 6 & 1, 078 & 532 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 \(\ldots\) & 102 & 102 & 30 & 4.38 & 605 & 188 & 152 & 16 & 430 & 7 & 1, 251 & 691 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749.. & 62 & 62 & 18 & 4. 03 & 615 & 190 & 170 & 20 & 420 & 5 & 1,364 & 781 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 45 & 45 & ! & 4. 19 & 628 & 210 & 179 & 31 & 416 & 2 & 1,405 & 849 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499.. & 42 & 42 & 17 & 3. 73 & 638 & 234 & 189 & 45 & 398 & 6 & 1,697 & 1,135 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 44 & 44 & 19 & 4. 04 & 896 & 298 & 226 & 42 & 422 & 6 & 2.073 & 1,384 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 38 & 38 & 16 & 3. 72 & 775 & 332 & 284 & 48 & 427 & 16 & 2, 5.48 & 1, 782 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 24 & 24 & 10 & 3. 48 & 858 & 399 & 298 & 101 & 449 & 10 & 2,803 & 2,057 \\
\hline 5,000-9,699 & 28 & 28 & 13 & 3. 75 & 1, 015 & 537 & 409 & 128 & 468 & 10 & 3, 9668 & 3,074 \\
\hline 10,000-19,999. & 14 & 14 & 7 & 3.32 & 1,256 & 647 & 498 & 149 & 541 & 18 & 5,770 & 4,187 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 42--all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Nomrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Region, analysis unit, fariily type and income clasa (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Finm-} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Families obtaining rood without direct expendi ture}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) num-
ber of Dersons per ily"} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value of food \(\begin{gathered}\text { per ycar }\end{gathered}\) per family per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A verage } \begin{array}{l}
\text { val- } \\
\text { ue flamily } \\
\text { living }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { All } \\
& \text { food }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Ohtained without direct expenditure} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{All
(12)} & \multirow{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{array}{|}
\text { Home } \\
\text { pro } \\
\text { duced }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Gift } \\
& \text { or } \\
& \text { pay }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { All } \\
\text { Alur- } \\
\text { chased } \\
\text { food }
\end{gathered}
\] & & Food away rrom & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Gift } \\
& \text { or } \\
& \text { pay }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & & (6) & (7) & & & & (11) & & (13) \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{SOUTHEAST-white opebatorg-con} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Georgia-Missis- \\
sippi-Continued \\
Type 1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { fer } \\
261
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Num- } \\
& \text { ter } \\
& 260
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber }
\end{array} \\
59
\end{gathered}
\] & Number & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { nar } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 402
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dot. } \\
& \text { lays } \\
& \hline 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { nat } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& 111
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
6
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { pol- } \\
& \text { nots }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { Dol } \\
\operatorname{lark} \\
2
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { pol- } \\
& \text { lars } \\
& \text { of }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dal- } \\
& \text { late }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 0-244 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 2.00 & 196 & 4 & 44 & 0 & i.52 & - & 310 & 122 \\
\hline 250-4999 & \(5{ }^{56}\) & \(5^{56}\) & 11 & \({ }^{2} .08\) & 230 & 57 & \({ }^{66}\) & 1 & 200 & 3 & \({ }^{446}\) & 176 \\
\hline 500 749 & 75 & 74 & 10 & 2. 2.18 & 315
415 & 74 & \({ }^{73}\) & 1 & \({ }^{265}\) & 1 & 634 & 277 \\
\hline \(1,0000-1,249\) & 19 & \(\stackrel{19}{19}\) & - & 2.010 & 505 & 167 & 160 & 7 & 340 & 1 & \({ }_{1}^{831}\) & \({ }_{630}^{43}\) \\
\hline \(1,2501-1,490\) & 14 & 14 & 5 & 2.08 & 414 & 109 & 100 & 9 & 301 & 4 & 1,082 & 653 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 13 & 13 & 2 & 2.06 & 544 & 221 & 212 & 9 & 320 & 3 & 1,245 & 745 \\
\hline 1,750-1.999 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2.00 & 350 & 148 & 142 & & 200 & 2 & 1,020 & 701 \\
\hline 2,400 2,449 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 2.00 & 127 & 145 & \({ }^{140}\) & & 20 & 2 & 1,699 & 1,211 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & & & , & 2.02 & 523 & 278 & 284 & 14 & 245 & & 1,706 & 1,223 \\
\hline 3,000)-3,999 & 12
4 & & & 2.00 & \({ }_{6}^{641}\) & 1268 & \({ }_{187}^{235}\) & & & & & \\
\hline 4,000-4,999. & 4 & 4 & 3
2
2 & 2.00
2.00 & \({ }^{621} 88\) & 188 & \({ }_{495}^{187}\) & 52 & \({ }_{325}^{427}\) & \({ }_{10}^{6}\) &  & ¢, \begin{tabular}{l}
1,789 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 10,000-19,90 & 4 & 4 & & 2.00 & 1,022 & 538 & 495 & 43 & 481 & , & 3,575 & 2,405 \\
\hline Types 2 and & 02 & 302 & 92 & 3.52 & 482 & 157 & 141 & 16 & 319 & 6 & 1,064 & 626 \\
\hline 0-219. & 3 & 3 & & 3.00 & \({ }^{264}\) & & 82 & (\%) & 101 & & 651 & 398 \\
\hline \({ }_{5010}^{250-799}\) & 88 & \({ }_{81}^{48}\) & 11
21 & 3.
3. 72
2 & \({ }_{392}^{285}\) & 68
108 & \(\begin{array}{r}67 \\ 105 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }_{3}^{1}\) & \({ }_{281}^{213}\) & \({ }_{3}^{4}\) & \({ }_{6}^{464}\) & 190 \\
\hline \({ }^{5150-799}\) & 81
59 & \(\stackrel{81}{59}\) & \({ }_{18}^{21}\) & 3. 42
3.4 & 342
449 & 119 & 112 & \({ }_{6}\) & \({ }_{321}^{281}\) & 3
5 & 654
887 & 288
427 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 25 & 25 & 8 & 3.41 & 532 & 116 & 110 & 6 & 410 & 6 & 993 & 464 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 25 & \({ }^{25}\) & 11 & 3.47 & 598 & 175 & 16.5 & 10 & 403 & 14 & 1,382 & 815 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 13 & 13 & 7 & 3. 64 & 606 & 209 & 195 & 14 & 386 & 1 & 1,338 & 811 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & & & 0 & 3. 25 & \({ }^{624}\) & 263 & 209 & 54 & 361 & 0 & 1,514 & 1,043 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 9 & 9 & 4 & 3.44 & 663 & 285 & 253 & 32 & 369 & g & 1,619 & \({ }^{1,114}\) \\
\hline 2,500-2.999 & 10 & 10 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 3.25 & 544 & 211 & 196 & 15 & & 2 & 2,002 & 1,445 \\
\hline 3,006)-3,999 & \({ }_{5}^{5}\) & \({ }_{6}^{5}\) & & & \({ }_{8}^{811}\) & & & \({ }_{132}^{73}\) & & 13 & & 1, 1111 \\
\hline \% \(6,0000-0,999\) & & ¢ & \({ }_{4}^{2}\) & 3. 30 &  & ¢ 638 & 404
408 & \({ }_{1}^{132}\) & \({ }_{424}^{427}\) & 13 & 2,966 & 2, \({ }_{\text {2, }}^{3} \mathbf{1 9 9}\) \\
\hline \(10,000-19,989\) & 5 & 5 & 1 & 3.40 & 1,03s & 514 & 404 & 110 & 492 & 32 & 4,688 & 3,568 \\
\hline Types 4 and & 528 & 528 & 148 & 4.36 & 574 & 182 & 156 & 26 & 385 & 7 & 1,346 & 798 \\
\hline \({ }_{20}^{0-249-499}\) & & & & \({ }^{8} 4.00\) & \({ }^{8} 280\) & \({ }^{1} 120\) & 120 & \({ }^{8} 0\) & \({ }_{8} 160\) & \({ }^{10}\) & 569 & \({ }^{313}\) \\
\hline 250-499 & & & 11 & & 306 & & & & & 2 & 501 & 203 \\
\hline 750-749... & \({ }_{9}^{99}\) & & & 4. 44 & 410 & & & & 3 & \({ }^{6}\) & 697 & 300 \\
\hline & \({ }^{99}\) & 99 & \({ }^{23}\) & 4. 54 & 492 & 119 & 114 & & 370 & 8 & 899 & 420 \\
\hline & 48
26
28 & 48
26 & & 4.688 & 630
604 & 194 & \({ }_{151}^{171}\) & 23
34 & 431
414 & 5 & 1,217 & 888 \\
\hline 1,7501-1,999 & 30 & 30 & 7 & 4. 29 & 646 & 204 & 180 & 24 & 439 & 3 & 1, 421 & 825 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 25 & 25 & 11 & 3.84 & 686 & 249 & 188 & 61 & 411 & 6 & 1,754 & 1,174 \\
\hline \({ }_{3}^{2,5000-2,999}\) & \({ }_{19}^{27}\) & 27
19 & \({ }_{9}^{14}\) & 4. 4.48 & 762
851
851 & 296
329 & \({ }_{272}^{238}\) & 57
57 & 457
493
4 & 29 & 2, 158 & 1,429 \\
\hline 4,000-4,909 & 14 & 14 & 5 & 3.89 & \({ }_{876}\) & 400 & 284 & 116 & 465 & 11 & 2,890 & 2,159 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 18 & 19 & 7 & 4. 21 & 1,037 & 517 & 391 & \({ }^{126}\) & 510 & 10 & 3,835 & 2,892 \\
\hline 10,000-19,909 & 5 & 5 & 4 & 4.30 & 1, e860 & 868 & 596 & 273 & 778 & 14 & 8,609 & 6, 244 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-ali food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and anerage value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1930-36-Continued
[ Norretief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footnotes at end of toble.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States \({ }^{1}{ }^{1} 1995-36\)-Continued
[Nonrelief farm familes that include a husband and wife, both native-horn ?


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 42.-all rood: Number of familics having food obtained without direct ex penditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-96-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, hoth native-born ']
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{\[
\underset{\text { Filics- }}{\text { Fam- }}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Families \\
obtaining food without direct expend ture
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Avernum. ber of persons fer ily \({ }^{4}\)} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value of food
per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A verage }{ }^{\text {s yal }} \text { ve of family } \\
& \text { living }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{2}{*}{Alf} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Obtained without direct expenditure} & \multirow{2}{*}{All} & \multirow{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pur- } \\
& \text { chased }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & &  & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Gift } \\
\text { or } \\
\text { pay }
\end{gathered}
\] & & & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Alr } \\
\text { char } \\
\text { chased } \\
\text { food } \\
\text { (7) }
\end{array}\right|
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Fond \(\stackrel{\text { at }}{\text { at }}\) \\
(8)
\end{tabular} & Food away from (9) &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Gift } \\
& \text { or } \\
& \text { pay }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
sovtheast-white \\
SHAKECROPREEScontinued
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline MississippiContinued Types 6 and 7. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
70
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num. } \\
\text { ber } \\
70
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ocr } \\
6.60
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{\substack{\text { Dol- } \\ l_{\text {pres }}^{434}}}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { larg } \\
85
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dor- } \\
\text { lars } \\
84
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Hot. } \\
\text { lars }_{1}^{2}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lary } \\
& 348
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dor- } \\
\text { lars } \\
646
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
{ }_{\text {lars }}^{225}
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \(0-249\) 250-499 750-999 750-999 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 19 \\
& 39 \\
& 33 \\
& 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \\
& 19 \\
& 33 \\
& 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 4 \\
& 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.50 \\
& 6.166 \\
& 6.68 \\
& 6.68
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
168 \\
311 \\
437 \\
607
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
74 \\
74 \\
85 \\
103
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
48 \\
74 \\
75 \\
98
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 80 \\
& (8) \\
& (8))_{5}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\left[\begin{array}{l}
1196 \\
236 \\
346 \\
504 \\
504
\end{array}\right.
\] &  & 8307
467
468
894
8 & 8140
182
182
218
300 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-NEGRO OPERATORS North CarolinaSoudh Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Il type & 433 & 433 & 131 & 5.01 & 397 & 128 & 122 & 6 & 265 & 4 & 710 & 353 \\
\hline 0-249- & 28 & \({ }^{28}\) & 13 & 4.34 & 176 & 87 & 87 & (8) & 82 & & 307 & \\
\hline Stu) 79 & 108 & 108 & 35 & 4.89 & \({ }_{365}\) & 131 & 127 & 4 & \({ }_{288}\) & \({ }^{6}\) & \({ }_{6}^{4} 40\) & \\
\hline \(750-999\) & 84 & 84 & 18 & 5. 20 & 485 & 134 & 128 & 6 & 329 & 2 & 816 & 392 \\
\hline 1,1000-1.249 & 54 & 54 & 8 & 5.17 & \({ }_{5}^{530}\) & 127 & 121 & \({ }^{6}\) & 402 & 1 & 967 & 458 \\
\hline 1,500-1,9 & \(2{ }^{24}\) & \({ }^{24}\) & & 5.53
6.83 & \({ }_{730}^{613}\) & 181 & 1160 & 24 & \({ }_{547}^{423}\) & \({ }_{2}^{4}\) & 1, 142 & 㐌 695 \\
\hline Type 1-- & 49 & 49 & 12 & 2.03 & 276 & 89 & 86 & 3 & 185 & 2 & 531 & 272 \\
\hline (0)249 & & & & 2.0 & \({ }^{138}\) & 71 & 71 & 0 & 66 & & 227 & \\
\hline 250-499 & 13 & 13 & 5 & 2.06 & \({ }^{213}\) & 86 & \({ }^{83}\) & 3 & 115 & 2 & \({ }^{398}\) & 226 \\
\hline 500 & 10 & 12 & \({ }^{2}\) & 2.05 & \({ }_{383}\) & 14 & 818 & 8 & 17 & \(\stackrel{5}{8}\) & \({ }^{543}\) & \({ }^{298}\) \\
\hline \(1,000-1,24\) & 3 & 3 & , & 2.00 & 342 & 83 & 80 & 3 & \({ }_{257} 2\) & 2 & 752 & \\
\hline 1,250-i,499 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 52.00 & \(\cdot 370\) & - 104 & \({ }^{1} 102\) & 8 & \({ }^{2} 262\) & \({ }_{4}\) & \({ }_{8979}\) & 5620 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 2 & 2 & 0 & :2.00 & \({ }^{4} 408\) & \({ }_{6} 50\) & 848 & 82 & \({ }^{3} 358\) & \({ }^{0}\) & \({ }^{766}\) & 318 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3...... & 65 & 65 & 19 & 3.43 & 332 & 120 & 116 & 4 & 208 & 4 & 587 & 297 \\
\hline 0 -249. & & & & 3.10 & \({ }^{338}\) & 65 & 64 & & 71 & & 265 & 140 \\
\hline \({ }^{250-499}\) & 25 & 26 & & 3.48 & 230 & 116 & \({ }^{112}\) & & 107 & 7 & 408 & \\
\hline \(5150-79\). & 15 & 15 & \({ }_{1}^{4}\) & 3.43 & 390
397 & \({ }_{157}^{137}\) & \({ }_{149}^{135}\) & 2 & 2298 & 4
2
2 & 627
662 & 306
325
3 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & \(\stackrel{8}{9}\) & 9 & \(\stackrel{1}{2}\) & 3. 12 & \({ }_{506}^{39}\) & \({ }_{95}\) & & 3 & 440 & & \({ }_{931} 93\) & 418 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499. & 2 & 2 & 1 & & 8500 & & \({ }_{\text {A }}{ }_{8} 159\) & \({ }_{8}^{22}\) & \({ }^{8} 316\) & & 81,032 & \% 5.56 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999.. & 2 & 2 & 0 & \({ }^{8} 3.63\) & \({ }^{8} 741\) & '183 & \({ }^{1} 775\) & 8 & \({ }_{4} 558\) & \({ }^{0}\) & \({ }^{6} 1,409\) & \% 703 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 .-...-- & 164 & 164 & 47 & 4.75 & 418 & 129 & 123 & 6 & 284 & 5 & 748 & 370 \\
\hline \(0-249-\) & & & & & & & 100 & & & & 409 & 227 \\
\hline 250-499 & 33 & 33 & \({ }^{15}\) & 4.47 & 267 & 102 & 100 & 2 & 162 & 3 & 450 & \\
\hline 500-749 & 49 & 49 & 15 & 4. 779 & 364
471
47 & 1330 & \({ }_{126}^{124}\) & \({ }_{6}^{6}\) & & 10 & +636 & 316 \\
\hline 1, 7000111.249 & \begin{tabular}{l}
36 \\
26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 36
26
26 & \({ }_{4}^{7}\) & 4. \({ }_{46}^{4.73}\) & 471
512 & \({ }_{123}^{132}\) & 118 & \({ }_{5}^{6}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
335 \\
388 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }_{1}^{4}\) & - 838 & 404
454 \\
\hline \({ }_{1}^{1,250-1,498}\) & 10 & 10 & \(\frac{1}{2}\) & 4.76
4.97 & \({ }_{6}^{623}\) & \({ }_{201}^{169}\) & 145
182 & 24
19 & 474
448 & (1) & 1, 140 & \({ }_{5}^{552}\) \\
\hline 1,\%m0-1,999 & & & & & & & & & & & 1,289 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of tible.

Table 42.-arl food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expcnditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1085-86-Continued
[Nonreliel farm families that include a hustrand and wife, boih native-born 2]


Sue footnotes at end of table.

Thble 42.- adl foob: Number of families having food obtained without direct expendithe, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food oblained without direct expenditure, ame anerage value of frmily living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-30-Continued
[Nonrelief farm camilies that include a husband and wile, both native-born 4\(]\)


Sre fonturles at end of table.

Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food oblained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis unils in 20 States \({ }^{1}\), \(1935-36-\cdots\) Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a hushand and wite, both native-born?]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Regior, analysis tunt, fanilly type. and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Families} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Families obtaining fond without direst expenditure}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Average \({ }^{\prime}\) ber of persons per family 4} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value of tood 'per family per year} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average' value of family living} \\
\hline & & & & & \multirow{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { All } \\
& \text { food }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Obtained without dircet expenditure} & \multirow{2}{*}{All} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Purchased} \\
\hline & & Home
jroduced & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Gift } \\
& \text { pay }
\end{aligned}
\] & & &  & Food at home & Food away from home & Hone 1roduced & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Gift } \\
\text { or } \\
\text { jogy }
\end{gathered}
\] & & \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{southeast-negro SHARPCROPPEREcontinued} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Georgia- \\
Mississippi \\
All types \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\substack{\text { br } \\
626}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Num- } \\
& : \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text { HeT } \\
625
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
\] & Num-
ber
162 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Num- } \\
& \text { ber } \\
& 3.97
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
l_{\text {larg }} \\
256
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
100
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dal- } \\
\text { lars } \\
98
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { Curs } \\
2
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { lars } \\
152
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { larg } \\
4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol } \\
& { }_{\text {Dars }} \\
& 418
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol- } \\
& \text { lark } \\
& 210
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-249 \\
& 250-499
\end{aligned}
\] & 127
308 & 127
307 & \({ }_{72}^{49}\) & 3. 48
3. 79

3 & 133
224
28 & 71
93 & 70
92 & 1 & \(\begin{array}{r}56 \\ 128 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 6
3 & \({ }_{363}^{231}\) & 129 \\
\hline \(5000-749\) & 144 & 144 & 35 & 4. 53 & 354 & 119 & 116 & 3 & 232 & 3 & 572 & 270 \\
\hline 750-399. & 47 & 47 & 6 & 4.95 & 499 & 174 & 166 & 8 & 324 & 1 & 814 & 415 \\
\hline Type 1. & 125 & 125 & 35 & 2.02 & 199 & 82 & 80 & 2 & 114 & 3 & 324 & 162 \\
\hline 0-249 & 40 & 40 & 11 & 2.01 & 124 & 67 & 66 & , & 5 f & 1 & 213 & 118 \\
\hline 500-749 & 11
13 & 7 & 21 & 2. 122 & 216 & 86 & 84 & 2 & 125 & 5 & 341 & 166 \\
\hline 750-499 & 13 & 1.3
1 & \(\stackrel{3}{0}\) & 82.00 & \({ }^{3} 428\) & - 108 & * 1.52 & \(8_{6}^{4}\) & 8 2174 & \({ }^{\circ}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}537 \\ 8754 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & ¢ 2549 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 18.5 & 184 & 50 & 3.44 & 225 & 95 & 93 & 2 & 127 & 3 & 380 & 201 \\
\hline 0-249 & 41 & 41 & 17 & 3. 36 & 130 & 74 & 73 & 1 & 47 & & & \\
\hline 250-499 & 99 & 98 & 23 & 3.47 & 213 & 93 & 91 & 2 & 118 & 2 & 352 & 184 \\
\hline 500-749 & 37 & 37 & 10 & 3.41 & 314 & 111 & 107 & & 202 & 1 & 541 & \({ }_{276}\) \\
\hline 75i-3:39 & 8 & 8 & 0 & 3. \(\mathrm{f}^{2}\) & 453 & 168 & 161 & 7 & 285 & 0 & 776 & 408 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5...... & 221 & 221 & 58 & 4. 40 & 290 & 119 & 116 & 3 & 167 & 4 & 478 & 250 \\
\hline 0-249 & 28 & 28 & 9 & 4.18 & 147 & 77 & 76 & 1 & 58 & 12 & 262 & \\
\hline \(25051-499\) & 99 & 99 & \({ }^{29}\) & 4. 30 & 230 & 103 & 101 & 2 & 124 & 3 & 380 & 203 \\
\hline 502-749 & \({ }^{6} 7\) & 67 & 15 & 4.59 & 354 & 129 & 128 & 3 & 221 & , & 579 & 283 \\
\hline 750-999 & 27 & 27 & 5 & 4.54 & 493 & 19. & 183 & 11 & 298 & 1 & 811 & 444 \\
\hline TYpes 6 and 7 & 95 & 95 & 19 & B. 58 & 315 & 95 & 95 & \({ }^{(6)}\) & 217 & 3 & 478 & 195 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & 18 & 18 & 5 & 5. 59 & 139 & 59 & 39 & (9) & 74 & & 238 & \\
\hline & 38 & 39 & 6 & 6. 51 & 254 & 86 & 86 & (9) & 165 & 3 & 387 & 163 \\
\hline & 27 & 27 & 7 & 7.10 & 423 & 116 & 115 & 1 & \(30{ }^{\prime}\) & 1 & 613 & 236 \\
\hline & 11 & & & 7. 19 & 550 & 132 & 131 & 1 & 418 & (i) & 853 & 349 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

I See Glossary for definitions of terms such as family, food-expenditure unit, family type, income, analysis
unit.
2This table includes families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the States and countics studied in each region. Familics of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studits of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for recrional comparisons.
\({ }^{3}\) A verapes are based an the number of families in each class (column 2).
\({ }^{4}\) Year-equivalent persons, See Glossary, Family Type.
\({ }^{3}\) Exchudes prorated value of food for boarders and farm heip.
\({ }^{6}\) Includes meals carried from home as well as food and drink purchased for meal and between-meal consumption at home. The number of families buving expense for purchased food at home is the same as tho totul number of families (column 2).
P Excludes food carried from home. See table 43 for the number of familles having cxpense for food away from bome.
A veraze based on fewer than 3 cases.
\({ }^{4} .30 .50\) or less.

Table 43.-rood away from home: Number of families having expenditutes for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1935-86\)
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wite, both native-born y

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline middif. atlantic and nokth
GFntral.
New Jersey & 497 & 132 & 2 & 130 & 10 & 40 & 22 & 42 & 70 & 17 & 7. 14 & . 40 & 6. 74 & 1. 43 & 1. 63 & . 68 & . 99 & 1. 24 & 77 \\
\hline 0-249 & 11 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6. 09 & . 00 & 6.09 & . 00 & 4.73 & 1.36 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline 250-499 & 30 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1.67 & . 00 & 1. 67 & . 00 & . 56 & . 83 & . 28 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline 500-749. & 41 & 11 & 0 & 11 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 6 & 1 & 3.07 & . 00 & 3.07 & . 96 & . 68 & . 49 & . 29 & 63 & . 02 \\
\hline 750 & 49 & 9 & 0 & 9 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 3. 26 & . 00 & 3.26 & 1.32 & . 31 & . 00 & . 16 & . 57 & . 90 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 73 & 21 & 0 & 21 & 2 & 8 & 2 & 6 & 15 & 6 & 6.71 & . 00 & 6. 71 & 1.38 & 2.07 & . 19 & . 58 & 2. 05 & . 44 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 513 & 11 & 0 & 11 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 1 & 5. 40 & . 00 & 5. 40 & 2.63 & . 64 & . 30 & . 26 & 1. 53 & . 04 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 51 & 13 & 1 & 12 & 0 & 4 & 1 & 4 & 8 & 1 & 6. 22 & 2. 36 & 3.86 & . 00 & . 51 & . 98 & . 35 & 1. 51 & . 51 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 50 & 17 & 0 & 17 & 1 & 5 & 2 & 5 & 11 & 0 & 5.74 & . 00 & 5.74 & 2. 10 & 1. 62 & . 20 & . 56 & 1. 26 & . 00 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 62 & 21 & 0 & 21 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 8 & 9 & 3 & 11. 94 & . 00 & 11.94 & 1. 26 & 1. 40 & . 71 & 2. 58 & 1. 61 & 4. 38 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 33 & 13 & 0 & 13 & 0 & 5 & 4 & 4 & 8 & 1 & 12.58 & . 00 & 12.58 & . 00 & 4.34 & 3.49 & 2. 30 & 2. 30 & . 15 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 38 & 11 & 1 & 10 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 6 & 2 & 1 & 15. 79 & 2.05 & 13.74 & 4. 79 & 4.58 & . 66 & 3.26 & . 42 & . 03 \\
\hline All types & 2,254 & 594 & 26 & 580 & 47 & 68 & 66 & 192 & 305 & 133 & 6. 72 & 1.56 & 5. 16 & 1. 12 & . 46 & 92 & 99 & 1. 01 & . 66 \\
\hline 0-249. & 21 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2.76 & . 00 & 2. 76 & . 00 & . 00 & 2.00 & . 00 & (ii) & . 76 \\
\hline 250-499 & 100 & 17 & 1 & 16 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 6 & 4 & 5. 03 & 1.28 & 3.75 & . 39 & . 45 & . 06 & . 22 & . 73 & 1. 90 \\
\hline \(500-749\) & 209 & 43 & 0 & 43 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 10 & 25 & 10 & 1.59 & . 00 & 1.59 & . 00 & . 09 & . 56 & . 30 & . 33 & . 31 \\
\hline \(750-999\) & 304 & 75 & 0 & 75 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 24 & 40 & 20 & 3.34 & .00 & 3.34 & . 18 & . 10 & . 58 & 1.08 & . 86 & . 54 \\
\hline 1,000 1,249. & 294 & 70 & 0 & 70 & 6 & 8 & 5 & 21 & 37 & 21 & 3.25 & .0 & 3.25 & .46 & . 62 & . 69 & . 39 & . 72 & . 37 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 312 & 75 & 2 & 74 & 4 & 7 & 5 & 19 & 47 & 19 & 3. 43 & .27 & 3. 16 & . 40 & . 33 & . 40 & . 62 & . 98 & . 43 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 267 & 75 & 0 & 75 & 9 & 16 & 6 & 19 & 44 & 23 & 6. 95 & . 00 & 6. 95 & 2.14 & . 77 & . 91 & . 89 & 1. 42 & . 82 \\
\hline 1,750-1,909 & 197 & 61 & 6 & 56 & 3 & 5 & 9 & 22 & 30 & 10 & 8.43 & 2.77 & 5. 66 & 1.47 & . 43 & 1.38 & . 78 & 1. 02 & . 58 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 254 & 87 & 7 & 84 & 12 & 8 & 13 & 38 & 40 & 15 & 12. 30 & 3.74 & 8. 56 & 2. 96 & . 56 & . 76 & 1. 95 & 1. 19 & 1. 14 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 135 & 41 & 5 & 38 & 4 & 5 & 5 & 17 & 17 & 5 & 17.64 & 7.30 & 10.34 & 2. 52 & . 95 & 1.88 & 1. 95 & 1.98 & 1.06 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 116 & 33 & 3 & 32 & 2 & 3 & 10 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 9.93 & 2.97 & 6. 96 & . 14 & . 70 & 1.38 & 2. 79 & 1. 55 & . 40 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999. & 26 & 6 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 25. 46 & 18.61 & 6.85 & . 00 & . 23 & 4.88 & 1. 54 & . 12 & . 08 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 19 & 7 & 0 & 7 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 19.63 & . 00 & 19.63 & 10.00 & . 32 & 8.16 & 10 & 1. 0.5 & . 60 \\
\hline Type 1 & 428 & 98 & 0 & 98 & 4 & 0 & 8 & 39 & 46 & 29 & 3.31 & . 00 & 3.31 & . 72 & . 00 & . 95 & . 63 & . 52 & . 49 \\
\hline 0-249. & 13 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & , & 4. 46 & . 00 & 4.46 & . 00 & . 00 & 3. 23 & (10) & . 00 & 1.23 \\
\hline 250-499 & 44 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & . 75 & . 00 & . 75 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & (19) & . 07 & . 68 \\
\hline 500-749. & 63 & 14 & 0 & 14 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 9 & 5 & 1.02 & . 00 & 1.02 & . 00 & . 00 & - 24 & . 03 & 35 & . 40 \\
\hline 750-999 & 87 & 18 & 0 & 18 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 9 & 5 & 1. 67 & . 00 & 1. 67 & . 13 & . 00 & . 00 & . 15 & 57 & . 82 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 50 & 19 & 0 & 19 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 11 & 8 & 8 & 4.70 & . 00 & 4. 70 & . 68 & . 00 & 1.16 & 1.84 & 54 & . 48 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 47 & 14 & 0 & 14 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 9 & 5 & 3. 98 & . 00 & 3. 98 & . 06 & . 00 & 1.71 & . 62 & . 85 & . 74 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 46 & 9 & 0 & 9 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 7.52 & . 00 & 7. 52 & 5. 66 & . 00 & . 00 & . 56 & 1. 24 & . 06 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 32 & 6 & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 1. 78 & . 00 & 1. 78 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & 1.06 & . 56 & . 16 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 24 & 6 & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 3.37 & . 00 & 3. 37 & . 00 & . 00 & \({ }_{16.42}\) & 2. 95 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 12 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 17.33 & . 00 & 17.33 & . 00 & . 00 & 16. 66 & . 00 & 67 & . 00 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 8 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & . 25 & . 00 & . 25 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & . 25 & . 00 & \(\stackrel{.00}{14}\) \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{11.00}\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11.00}\) & 11. 00 & \({ }^{11.00}\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }_{11}^{11.00}\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & 11.00
11.00 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 112.00 & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11} 2.00\) & \({ }^{11.00}\) & \({ }^{11 .} 00\) & \({ }^{11.00}\) & \({ }^{11} 2.00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
See footnot.s at end of table.
}

TABLE 13.-FOOD AWAY FROM HoME: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis wnits in 90 States, \({ }^{1} 1995-96\)-Continued
\{Nourelief farm families that inelude a husband and wife, boith native-borat?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 54 & 8 & 0 & 8 & 0 & 4 & 0 & I & 3 & 3
2 & 1. 6.32 & 00
.00 & 1. 67
6.32
3. & \(\begin{array}{r}.00 \\ .09 \\ \hline 00\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}\text { r } \\ \text { 1.3 } \\ \hline 29\end{array}\) & . 61 & 2. \(\begin{array}{r}30 \\ \hline 9\end{array}\) & .52
1.61 & . 22 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 31 & 10 & 0 & 10 & 0 & 4 & 2 & 5 & 5 & 2 & 6. 32 & . 00 & 6. 32 & . 010 & 1. 29 & .61
186 & 2. 59 & 1. 61 & - 22 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 14 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 3.14 & . 00 & 3.14 & . 00 & . 00 & 1. 86 & - 57 & .71
.710 & . 00 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 25 & 8 & 0 & 8 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 5 & 3 & 5.84 & . 00 & 5.84 & . 00 & . 96 & . 40 & 2. 72 & 1. 20 & . 56 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999. & 15 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 6.80 & . 00 & 6.80 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & 5.07 & 1. 73 & . 00 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 12 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 4. 42 & . 00 & 4. 42 & . 00 & . 00 & 1. 00 & 3.09 & . 33 & . 00 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1. 20 & . 00 & 1. 20 & . 00 & . 00 & 1.00 & 00 & . 20 & . 00 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999. & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & - -- \\
\hline Type 4 & 475 & 136 & 13 & 127 & 12 & 18 & 18 & 33 & 67 & 31 & 10.92 & 3.66 & 7. 26 & 1.46 & . 87 & 1. 69 & . 93 & 1. 23 & 1.08 \\
\hline 0-249 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & (10) & . 00 & (10) & . 00 & 00 & . 00 & . 00 & (10) & . 00 \\
\hline 250-499 & 19 & 4 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 8.37 & 6.74 & 1. 63 & . 00 & 00 & . 00 & 1. 16 & . 26 & . 21 \\
\hline 500-749 & 50 & 8 & 0 & 8 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 2.74 & . 00 & 2. 74 & . 00 & . 16 & 1. 56 & . 20 & . 18 & . 64 \\
\hline 750-999 & 64 & 21 & 0 & 21 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 7 & 13 & 5 & 7.61 & . 00 & 7.61 & . 00 & . 22 & 2. 74 & 2.70 & 1. 56 & . 39 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 59 & 10 & 0 & 10 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 2.97 & . 00 & 2.97 & . 00 & 2. 20 & . 00 & . 08 & . 59 & . 10 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 76 & 17 & 2 & 16 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 4 & 11 & 5 & 5.10 & 1. 10 & 4.00 & 1. 56 & . 00 & . 26 & . 82 & . 95 & . 41 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 44 & 11 & 0 & 11 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 8 & 3 & 5.66 & . 00 & 5. 66 & 1. 5.5 & . 61 & 1. 43 & . 18 & 1. 48 & 41 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 42 & 19 & 4 & 16 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 2 & 19.52 & 10.28 & 9.24 & . 00 & . 90 & 4. 77 & . 64 & 1. 50 & 1. 43 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 56 & 25 & 2 & 24 & 6 & 2 & 3 & 8 & 12 & 5 & 25. 36 & 7.14 & 18.22 & 7.41 & 1.04 & 1. 57 & 1. 86 & 2. 39 & 3. 95 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 28 & 9 & 2 & 7 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 27.75 & 16.61 & 11.14 & 3.32 & 1. 78 & . 04 & 1.11 & 2.11 & 2. 78 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 25 & 8 & 2 & 7 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 19. 12 & 9. 20 & 9.92 & . 00 & 3.24 & 3.56 & . 00 & 1.68 & 1.44 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 31. 33 & . 00 & 31.33 & . 00 & 2.00 & 29.33 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & . 60 & . 00 & . 60 & . 00 & . 60 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline Type 5 & 300 & 94 & 9 & 91 & 7 & 12 & 8 & 37 & 49 & 20 & 11. 75 & 5.04 & 6. 71 & 1.83 & . 54 & . 45 & 1.97 & 1. 26 & . 66 \\
\hline 0-249 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{1 i} .00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11 .} 00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11} .00\) & \({ }^{11.00}\) & 11.00 \\
\hline 250-499 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & . 25 & . 00 & . 25 & . 00 & . 25 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 \\
\hline 500-749 & 18 & 5 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & . 56 & . 00 & . 56 & . 00 & . 11 & . 00 & . 34 & . 11 & . 00 \\
\hline 750-999 & 30 & 9 & 0 & 9 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 & 4.73 & . 00 & 4.73 & 1. 20 & . 10 & . 00 & 1.93 & . 93 & 57 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 32 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & . 66 & C0 & . 66 & . 00 & . 00 & . 00 & . 16 & . 22 & 23 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499. & 33 & 8 & 0 & 8 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 2 & 3.21 & . 00 & 3.21 & . 00 & 1.21 & . 00 & . 54 & . 82 & . 64 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 42 & 18 & 0 & 18 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 10 & 8 & 9.57 & . 00 & 9.57 & 3.35 & 1. 71 & . 24 & . 12 & 2. 10 & 2.05 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 24 & 9 & 1 & 8 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 7.67 & 4.17 & 3. 50 & . 00 & . 17 & . 00 & . 62 & 2. 71 & . 00 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 42 & 12 & 2 & 11 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 13.74 & 6.98 & 6. 76 & 2. 48 & . 00 & . 64 & 2. 67 & . 40 & . 57 \\
\hline 2,500-2,499 & 31 & 14 & 3 & 13 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 6 & 7 & 1 & 32. 48 & 16.77 & 15.71 & 5.84 & 1.22 & 1. 71 & 3.00 & 2.84 & 1.10 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 30 & 10 & 1 & 10 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 9 & 7 & 1 & 14. 50 & 3.83 & 10.67 & . 50 & . 00 & . 23 & 7.91 & 1.83 & . 20 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 7 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 80.14 & 69.14 & 11.00 & . 00 & . 00 & 4. 86 & 5. 58 & . 28 & . 28 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 6 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 13.33 & . 00 & 13.33 & 12.00 & . 50 & . 83 & . 00 & .00 & . 00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 43.- food away from home: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average experditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1985-86\)-Continued
[Nonrelief furm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



See footnotes at end of table.

TAble 43.- Food away from home: Number of familics having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36--Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that inctude a husband and wife. buih native-born \({ }^{3}\) ]



\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 43.- Food away from home: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-96-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, hoth native-born \({ }^{\text {1 }}\) ]



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 43.-Food away from homp: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by fanily type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-96-Continued

〔Nonrelief farm farnilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born \(\left.{ }^{7}\right]\)



See footuotes at end of table.

TAble 43.-FOOD AWAY FROM home: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per \({ }^{f}\) amily in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-36-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born?]



Table 43.… rood away from home: Number of families having expenditures for food consumed away from home, and average expenditures per family in a year, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, loth native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



1 See diossary for definition of terms such as family, family type, income, analysis unit.
\(\underset{\sim}{\text { Thas table imelnctes gamilies in the sonsumplion sample whose expenditures were ana- }}\) lyzed in detail. Sce Melhodology for the Stutes and counties sudied in each reaion Fanilios of white operators only were stadied in all regions except the Southenst whero sperial studies of white sharecropters and Nerro families were made Seo Methodology before using these data for regional comparisoms.
\({ }^{3}\) Does not include meals carried fromi home.
- Excludes board for children away at school.
© Includes meds for which employer did not reimburse traveler on a business trip. Jneludes meals bought and eaten away from horoe, not clsewhere classified: Restallrant meals (and tins) for family members and guests; expense for food bouglit to be eaten with meals carried from home, such as ice cream to complete a pievie lunch.
- Includes ice cream, candy, popern, and sandwichem.

8 Includes soft drinks and alcoholic beverages.
- A verages are baved on the number of families in each class (column 2).
o \(\$ 0.0050\) or less.
11 A perage based on fewer than 3 cases.

Table 44.- money value of food per meal (12-month schedole): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-expenditure unil, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1985-86\)
[Households of nonrelief farm families that inchude a husband and wife, both native-born²]



See footnotes at end of table.

 and income, 19 analysis umits in 30 States, \({ }^{1} 1935-36\)-COnLinued
[Households of nonrelief farm farmilies that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 44.-money value of food fer meal (22-monta schedule): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money valuc of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-expenditure unit, by family type and income, 19 analysis unils in go Slates, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelicf farm families that include a husband and wife, botb native-born 2 ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{IRegion, analysis unit, tamily type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{House-} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
A ver- & A verage \({ }^{3}\) money \\
gges & yalue of food per \\
money & food-cxpeuditure \\
value & unit-meaj
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Households baving food (all food excluding board at sehool and mesals while traveling or on vacation) per meal per food-expenditure tunit of -} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Households \({ }^{5}\) having home-produced food with value per meal per food-expenditure unit of-} \\
\hline & & food per & & & Hotne & Urider & & & & & & & \$0. 2215 & Un- & & & & & & \$0.14 \\
\hline & & person-
meal & All food & Purchased & duced & \({ }_{\text {(i) }}^{80.0316}\) & \$0.0316- & \$0.0948 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\$ 0.0949- \\
\$ 0.1265
\end{gathered}
\] & \$0.1266. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0.1582- \\
& \$ 0.1898
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\$ 0.1899-\)
\(\$ 0.2214\) & or
orer & der \({ }_{\text {der }}^{\text {de }}\) & \(\$ 0.02-\)
\(\$ 0.03\) & \(\$ 0.04-\)
\(\$ 0.05\) & \({ }^{80.06-}\) & \$0.05- & \$0.10- & or \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
MDDOLE ATLANTIC AND NORTH CENTRAL- COD. \\
Pentsylnania-OhigContinued \\
Type 7 \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 288} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.085
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.082
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
L_{0} L_{i} \\
0.029
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
D \cdot l \\
0.053
\end{gathered}\right.
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No.} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 56} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 159} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 62} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Na . 10} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. \({ }_{1}\)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 0} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\({ }^{\text {No. }}{ }_{0}\)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 3} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 42} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 121} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 87} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 30} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 5} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\mathrm{No}
\] \\
0
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 0-249. & 1 & 6.080 & \({ }_{6} 6090\) & \({ }^{5} .130\) & \({ }^{6} .960\) & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(2501-499\) & 1 & 6. 066 & 6. 060 & \({ }^{5} .030\) & -. 030 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \(\frac{1}{5}\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 500-749 & 14 & . 0103 & . O 66 & . 023 & . 043 & 0 & 8 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 7 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 750-999 & 28 & . 067 & . 058 & . 0225 & . 041 & 0 & 13 & 14 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 14 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1,0001-1,249 & 33 & . 070 & . 068 & . 025 & . 043 & 0 & 15 & 16 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 7 & 22 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1,250 1,490 \(\ldots\).....- & 36 & . 083 & . 079 & . 028 & . 050 & 0 & 5 & 24 & 6 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3
3
2 & 20
12 & 10 & 1
3 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749.......-- & 30 & . 088 & . 083 & . 028 & . 054 & 0 & 3 & 20 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
0 & 2
6 & 12 & 12 & 3
3 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1,750-1,989 ........ & 36 & . 086 & . 083 & . 030 & . 053 & 0 & 5 & 22 & 7
15 & \(\stackrel{2}{1}\) & 0 & 0
0 & 0 & 0
1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
6 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 12 & 15 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3 \\
\(B\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 2 & \({ }_{6} 6\) \\
\hline 2,000-2,489 \(\ldots \ldots \ldots\) & 18 & . 093 & . 040 & . 031 & . 058 & 0 & 3 & 29 & 15 & 1 & 0
0 & 0
0
0 & 0
0 & 1 & \(\stackrel{3}{2}\) & 18
8
8 & 18
8
8 & 1
4
4 & \(\stackrel{2}{1}\) & 0 \\
\hline 2,500 2,999...-----. & 23 & . 093 & . 090 & . 032 & . 058 & 0 & 1 & 13 & 6 & 3
3
3 & 0
0 & 0
0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 8
5
5 &  & 11 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 29 & . 103 & . 099 & . 034 & . 0 fi5 & 0 & 2 & 11 & 13 & 3
0 & 0 & 0
0
0 & 0 & 0
0 & 3
0 & 5
2
2 & 10 & 11 & 1
1 & 0 \\
\hline \(4,000-1,999\)
\(5,000-1\). & \begin{tabular}{l}
6 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .108
.107 & .105
.100 & . 040 & .065
.063 & 0
0 & 0
0 & 3
1 & 2
2 & 0
0 & 1 & 0
0 & 0
0 & 0
0 & 0
0 & 2
1 & 3
1 & 1
1 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 5,000-0,899 \(\ldots\).-...-- & 3 & . 107 & . 100 & . 037 & . 063 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & & & & & & & & & 二. \(=\) \\
\hline Michigan-Wiseonsin & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 1,067 & , 114 & . 102 & . 050 & . 050 & 0 & 100 & 406 & 355 & 153 & 29 & 15 & 9 & 10 & 255 & 423 & 254 & 86 & 36 & 3 \\
\hline 0-240 & 13 & . 126 & . 107 & . 050 & . 057 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline \(250-499\) & 53 & .100 & . 086 & . 014 & . 042 & 0 & 14 & 21 & 14 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 20 & 20 & 7 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 500-749. & 115 & . 101 & . 089 & . 046 & . 042 & 0 & 25 & 46 & 28 & 14 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 44 & 37 & 23 & 8 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 750-499. & 176 & . 105 & . 643 & , 044 & . 047 & 0 & 26 & 80 & 48 & 14 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 62 & 69 & 32 & \({ }^{6}\) & 6 & 1 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 196 & . 111 & . 100 & . 049 & . 050 & 0 & 14 & 86 & 64 & 21 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 43 & 87 & 43 & 10 & 5 & 1 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 ........ & 169 & . 119 & . 108 & . 051 & . 052 & 0 & 10 & 65 & 56 & 26 & 6 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 32 & 73 & 41 & 14 & 8 & 0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749, .-....--- & 115 & . 121 & .106 & . 053 & . 052 & 0 & 3 & 40 & 46 & 22 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 21 & 50 & 29 & 10 & 5 & 0 \\
\hline 1.750-1.960 & 80 & .120 & .107 & . 051 & . 056 & 0 & 1 & 25 & 34 & 17 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 7 & 35 & 24 & 9 & 3 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 44--money vadue of rood phir meal (12-month sohbotie): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expendilure unit meal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-expenditure unit, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 Stotes, \({ }^{1} 1995-96^{-}\)Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born :]



Table 44.-money value of food per meal (12-month schedule): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-expenditure unit, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born²]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Honsebolds \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A verage \({ }^{2}\) money value of all food per personmeal} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Average: money value of food per tood-expenditure unit-meal} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Households having food (all food excluding board at school and meals while traveling or on vacation) per meal per food expenditure unit of-} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Housebolds: having home-produced food with value per meal per food-expenditure unit of -} \\
\hline & & & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Pur-
chused \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & Home produced & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
\text { Under } \\
\text { so. } 0316 \\
\text { (4) } \\
(7)
\end{gathered}\right.
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.0316-\)
\(\$ 0.0632\) \\
(8)
\end{tabular} & \[
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\$ 0.0633- \\
\$ 0.0948 \\
(9)
\end{array}\right.
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.0949\)
\(\$ 0.1265\) \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\$ 0.1266- \\
\$ 0.1581 \\
(11)
\end{array}\right|
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.1582-\)
\(\$ 0.1898\) \\
(12)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
80.1899
\(\$ 0.2214\) \\
(13)
\end{tabular} & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
\text { on. } 2215 \\
\text { or } \\
\text { over } \\
\text { (14) }
\end{gathered}\right.
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\sigma \mathrm{n}- \\
\text { der } \\
\$ 0.02 \\
(15)
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0.02- \\
& 50.03
\end{aligned}
\] \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0.04-\)
\(\$ 0.05\) \\
(17)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \$0.06- } \\
& \hline 0.07
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\$ 0.08- \\
\$ 0.09 \\
(19)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0.10-10 \\
& \$ 0.13
\end{aligned}
\] & \$0. 14 or (21) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
PACTIC \\
Washington-Oregon \\
All types \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\underset{948}{\mathrm{No}}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.138
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.122
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{0.051}{D_{0}}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.070
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No. } \\
0
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{\mathrm{No}} \mathrm{C} 40\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
2233
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
N_{3 O S}
\] & \[
{ }_{205}^{N o .}
\] & No. \({ }_{\text {S9 }}\) & \(\mathrm{No}_{42}\) & No. 23 & \[
\underset{1 i}{\mathrm{No}}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
118
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
247
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{216}{N o .}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
16 i
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
143
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 52 \\
\hline  & \(\begin{array}{r}17 \\ 63 \\ 142 \\ 117 \\ 120 \\ 113 \\ 100 \\ 72 \\ 102 \\ 42 \\ 48 \\ 14 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
.114 \\
.114 \\
.123 \\
.128 \\
.140 \\
.139 \\
.151 \\
.150 \\
.153 \\
.170 \\
.150 \\
.146 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
.096 \\
.089 \\
.106 \\
.114 \\
.122 \\
.122 \\
.134 \\
.131 \\
.132 \\
.149 \\
.129 \\
.125 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .041
.035
.045
.048
.050
.048
.066
.054
.071
.055
.049 & .054
.054
.064
.0664
.072
.074
.078
.071
.078
.076
.073
.075 & 0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 & 3
12
14
3
3
2
0
1
1
0
0
1 & 7
24
24
49
37
24
28
14
11
14
6
7
7 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
21 \\
44 \\
38 \\
48 \\
43 \\
41 \\
41 \\
26 \\
31 \\
6 \\
18 \\
6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2 \\
4 \\
26 \\
27 \\
25 \\
21 \\
18 \\
18 \\
33 \\
15 \\
14 \\
2
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
2 \\
4 \\
8 \\
10 \\
13 \\
15 \\
9 \\
9 \\
15 \\
8 \\
4 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 1 \\
& 0 \\
& 3 \\
& 2 \\
& 8 \\
& 2 \\
& 2 \\
& 7 \\
& 7 \\
& 5 \\
& 5 \\
& 2 \\
& 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 2 \\
& 2 \\
& 2 \\
& 4 \\
& 4 \\
& 4 \\
& 0 \\
& 5 \\
& 2 \\
& 1 \\
& 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 0 \\
& 4 \\
& 2 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 1 \\
& 1 \\
& 1 \\
& 1 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3 \\
16 \\
16 \\
21 \\
12 \\
14 \\
14 \\
13 \\
9 \\
7 \\
4 \\
4 \\
4 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
20 \\
46 \\
39 \\
31 \\
28 \\
18 \\
17 \\
24 \\
5 \\
6 \\
5 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
15 \\
15 \\
31 \\
29 \\
29 \\
20 \\
18 \\
18 \\
13 \\
12 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
2 \\
8 \\
83 \\
16 \\
18 \\
24 \\
23 \\
9 \\
18 \\
5 \\
13 \\
2
\end{array}
\] & 1
4
13
15
19
19
16
16
13
23
14
7
7 & 0
0
4
4
9
9
11
5
6
1
1 \\
\hline Type 1. & 266 & . 161 & 134 & 060 & . 074 & 0 & 7 & 39 & 91 & 64 & 30 & 24 & 11 & 5 & 25 & 63 & 64 & 45 & 41 & 23 \\
\hline  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 11 \\
& 24 \\
& 60 \\
& 33 \\
& 37 \\
& 20
\end{aligned}
\] & .124
.118
.146
.161
.168
.168 & .101
.098
.123
.135
.138
.138 & .044
.041
.055
.061
.060
.046 & .053
.057
.068
.074
.078
.092 & 0
0
0
0
0
0
0 & 2
2
2
0
0
1 & 4
6
14
4
5
3 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
14 \\
20 \\
10 \\
12 \\
6
\end{array}
\] & 0
2
17
12
9
5 & 0
0
3
4
5
3 & 1
0
2
1
5
0 & 0
0
2
2
1
1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 0 \\
& 2 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] & 2
4
5
3
5
1 & \begin{tabular}{r|r|}
3 \\
8 \\
21 \\
8 \\
5 \\
1
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
6 \\
10 \\
11 \\
10 \\
60
\end{array}
\] & 0
5
11
5
6
5 & 1
1
7
4
6
6 & 0
4
2
5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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See footnotes at end of table.

Table 44.-money value of rood per meal (12-month sohedule): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food expenditure unit, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \(1985-86\)-Continued
[ F ouseholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-borri 2]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SODTHEAST-WHITE OPERATORS \\
North Carolina self-sufficing counties \\
All types. \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & 607 & . 128 & . 116 & . 018 & . 098 & 5 & 39 & 159 & 187 & 128 & 54 & 23 & 12 & 3 & 14 & 40 & 118 & 144 & 198 & 90 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0-249 & 10 & . 051 & . 047 & . 011 & . 036 & & & 33 & 19 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 9 & 15 & 27 & 14 & 11 & 1 \\
\hline 250-499 & 78 & . 089 & . 079 & . 012 & . 067 & 3
0 & 18
9 & 33
55 & 37 & 24 & 10 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 11 & 40 & 34 & 38 & 13 \\
\hline 500-749 & 138 & . 119 & . 107 & . 017 & . 090 & 0
0 & 9
3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
55 \\
38 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 61 & 35 & 10 & 5 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 25 & 51 & 52 & 23 \\
\hline 750-999 & 156
107 & . 129 & . 119 & . 017 & .101
.116 & 0 & 1 & 15 & 35 & 25 & 19 & 7 & 5 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 12 & 22 & 46 & 25 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 \(\ldots \ldots \ldots\) & 107
63 & . 151 & .138
.131 & . 022 & . 1109 & 0 & 2 & 9 & 18 & 20 & 9 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 7 & 15 & 24 & 15 \\
\hline 1,250-1,489 \(\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots\) & 39 & . 150 & . 137 & . 022 & . 115 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 14 & 14 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 7 & 21 & 8 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 16 & . 140 & . 131 & . 019 & . 112 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 6 & 5 \\
\hline Type 1 & 99 & . 177 & . 149 & . 022 & . 127 & 0 & 4 & 15 & 19 & 21 & 18 & 11 & 11 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 11 & 12 & 31 & 39 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 142 & . 126 & . 121 & . 021 & . 100 & 1 & 8 & 27 & 36 & 47 & 20 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 6 & 28 & 19 & 60 & 23 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 244 & . 126 & . 111 & . 017 & . 094 & 1 & 13 & 67 & 94 & 45 & 14 & 10 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 16 & 44 & 76
37 & 28 & 25
3 \\
\hline Types 6 and \(7 .-\) & 122 & . 096 & . 094 & . 015 & . 079 & 3 & 14 & 50 & 38 & 15 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 14 & & 37 & & \\
\hline North Carolina-South Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All typ & 1,944 & . 129 & . 118 & . 031 & . 087 & 11 & 199 & 474 & 542 & 357 & 206 & 84 & 71 & 31 & 138 & 295 & 379 & 373 & 490 & 238 \\
\hline 0-249 & 22 & . 065 & . 056 & . 022 & . 034 & 3 & 14 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 10 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline 250-499 & 123 & . 073 & . 067 & . 023 & . 042 & 7 & 56 & 44 & 15 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 45 & 33 & 23 & \(\stackrel{9}{4}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}3 \\ 36 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 0 \\
\hline 500-749. & 237 & . 099 & . 090 & . 027 & . 062 & 1 & 46 & 99 & 64 & 19 & 7 & 1 & 0 & 8 & 35
22 & 64
70 & 56
70 & 34
54 & 54 & 12 \\
\hline 750-999. & 284 & . 108 & . 100 & . 027 & . 072 & 0 & 44 & 101 & 75 & 45 & 15 & \({ }_{12}^{2}\) & 8 & 2 & 22 & 70
54 & 70
58 & 54 & 61 & 31 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 .....--- & 271 & . 126 & . 115 & . 029 & . 086 & 0 & 21 & 84
56 & 73 & 43 & 30
25 & 12 & 8 & 2 & 11 & \(\stackrel{54}{25}\) & 47 & 63 & 68 & 22 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 .-...--- & 237 & . 131 & . 121 & . 031 & . 090 & 0 & 9 & 56
32 & \begin{tabular}{l}
83 \\
55 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 53
41 & 25
37 & 6
3 & 5
4 & 1 & 11 & 13 & 43 & 28 & 59 & 29 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 ....---- & 177 & . 140 & . 129 & . 032 & . 096 & 0 & 5
3 & 32
15 & 55
39 & 41 & 37
22 & 3
9 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 11 & 16 & 32 & 35 & 27 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 \(\ldots \ldots\) & 121 & . 152 & . 140 & . 034 & . 106 & 0 & 3 & 15
20 & 39
68 & 26
55 & 22 & \(\begin{array}{r}9 \\ 18 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 7
20 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 33 & 51 & 65 & 45 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 \(\ldots \ldots\) & 204 & . 158 & . 144 & . 035 & . 108 & 0 & 1 & 20
12 & 68
27 & 55
29 & 22
16 & 18 & 10 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 14 & 20 & 42 & 24 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 \(\ldots\).-..... & 105
95 & \begin{tabular}{l}
167 \\
.168 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 152
.155
.15 & . 038 & . 114 & 0
0 & 0 & 12 & 27 & 29 & 17 & 14 & 8 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 10 & 20 & 32 & 27 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999......------ & 42 & . 159 & . 146 & . 039 & . 106 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 13 & 13 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 4 & 22 & 8 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 26 & . 196 & . 175 & . 046 & . 129 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 5 & 9 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & & 11 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 44.-money value of food per meal (12-month schedtle): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-cxpenditure unit, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-36- Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {2] }}\)



Table 44.-money valde of food per meal (12-month schedule): Average value of food per person-meal and per food-expenditure unitmeal, and distributions of households by money value of all food and of home-produced food per meal per food-expenditure unit, by family iype and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \(1995-96\)-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born²]



See footnotes at end of table.

 type and income, 19 analysis units in 00 States, \({ }^{1} 1995-36\)-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born²]


\({ }^{1}\) See Giossary for definitions of terms such as housenold, food-expenditure unit, family type.income. analysis unit
\({ }_{2}\) This table includes bousebolds of famisies in the cansumption sample whose bxpenditures were analyzed in detail. See Methodology for the States and countics studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families weremade. See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisons.

A verapes are based on the number of households in each class (column 2).
The intervals used in this classification differ from those appearing in tables 45 and 58
becanse of differences in the level of retail food costs during the periods covered. The intervals of this table are based on May 1, 1935-Apr, 30,1936 prices; those in tables 45 and \(5 \%\) on Juns-August 1936 prices. (See Methodology "Classification of families by level of food expenditure." Adjustments bave been made by use of the U. S. Hureau of Labor Statistios index of retail food costs.
Excludes a few households that had no horne-produced food. The number of such bouseholds can be obtained by subtracting the sum of columns 15-2l from column 2. Average based on fewer than 3 cases.

Table 45.-money value of food served at home (7-day estimate): Average value of food per week per household and per meal per food-expenditure unit, and distribution of households by money value of food per meal per unit, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both oative-born]


See fuotnotes at end of rable.

Table 45．－money value of food served at home（7－day estimate）：Anerage value of food per week per household and per meal per food－expenditure unit，and distribution of households by money value of food per meal per unit，by family type and income， 5 analysis units in 20 States，\({ }^{1}\) March－November 1936－Continued
［Households of nonreliet farm families that include a husband and wife，both nalive－born 2］
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit，family type， and income class（dollars）} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
苟
0
0
0
0
0 \\
（2）
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Households having food with money value（ad justed 10 June－Angust 1036 price levels \({ }^{5}\) ）per meal per unit \({ }^{4}\) of} \\
\hline & & & &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 8 \\
& 88 \\
& 88 \\
& 88 \\
& 8 \\
& 8 \\
& 8
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \\
& \text { 镸芯 } \\
& \text { 宛 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
（12）
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
rianns，morntaln，and lacive \\
All types． \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Num- } \\
& b \ell_{T} \\
& 1.007
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
\text { lars } \\
\times .99
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol－ \\
lars \\
0． 126
\end{tabular} & \[
\left\{\begin{array}{r}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
0
\end{array}\right.
\] & \[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Num } \\
\text { bry } \\
\mathbf{4 9}
\end{array}\right|
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Nhm- } \\
b e r \\
219
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Nim } \\
\text { ber } \\
337
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num. } \\
\text { bet } \\
240
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
94
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
N u m- \\
b \in T \\
40
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
28
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline Net losses．．－ Net incomes． & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36 \\
971
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
9.24 \\
8.98 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .128
.126 & 0 & 0
49 & \({ }_{211}^{8}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
16 \\
321
\end{array}
\] & 236 & 4 & 3
37 & 1 \\
\hline 0－409． & 170
272 & 7． 28 & ． 115 & 0 & 18 & 47 & 51 & 31 & 14 & 6 & 3 \\
\hline 50010999 & 272 & 7．88 & ． 119 & 0 & 19 & 74 & 81 & 66 & 17 & 11 & \\
\hline 1，000－1，499． & 222 & 9． 63 & ． 125 & 0 & 7 & 46 & 82 & 55 & 22 & 6 & \\
\hline 1，500－1，649 & 154 & 0.96 & ，139 & 0 & 3 & 25 & 45 & 46 & 22 & 6 & 7 \\
\hline 2，006－2，949． & 112 & 10.79 & ． 138 & 0 & 2 & 14 & 44 & 29 & 13 & 4 & fid \\
\hline 3，010－4，999 & 35 & 11． 54 & ． 140 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 15 & 9 & 1 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 6 & 12． 30 & ． 133 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline Type 1. & 282 & 7.36 & ． 149 & 0 & 6 & 30 & 72 & 86 & 43 & 24 & 21 \\
\hline Net losses． & 15 & 8.08 & ． 130 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline Net incomes & 267 & 7.31 & ． 150 & 0 & 6 & 27 & 66 & 83 & 41 & 23 & 21 \\
\hline 1）－499 & 60 & 6． 19 & ． 134 & 0 & 2 & 7 & 20 & 19 & 7 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline 500－699． & 93 & 6.81 & ． 114 & 0 & & 12 & 18 & 33 & 11 & 9 & 4 \\
\hline 1，010）－1，499 & 48 & 8． 814 & ． 149 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 14 & 15 & 8 & 4 & 3 \\
\hline 1，500－1，044 & 34 & ¢． 0.06 & ． 170 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 7 & 7 & 10 & 3 & 5 \\
\hline 2，706－2，964 & 26 & 8.37 & ． 169 & 0 & \(1)\) & 2 & 5 & 7 & 5 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline 3， \(5106-4,949\) & 7 & 8． 48 & ． 184 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ， & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 5，000 or aver & 1 & 69.87 & \({ }^{8} .108\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & － & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Types 2 a & 306 & 8.02 & ． 124 & 0 & 12 & 58 & 114 & 83 & 26 & 10 & 3 \\
\hline Net Insses Net incomes & \[
\begin{array}{r}
10 \\
290
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
8.15 \\
8.94 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .123
.124 & 0
0 & 0
12 & 3
55 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
3093
\end{array}
\] & 89 & 1
25 & 0
10 & \(\frac{1}{2}\) \\
\hline 0－490． & ． 55 & 7.50 & ． 111 & & & 17 & 19 & 7 & 5 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline 500－849 & 88 & 8.33 & ． 119 & 0 & 4 & 19 & 33 & 25 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 1，010－1，199 & 72 & 9.44 & ． 126 & 0 & 2 & 12 & 28 & 21 & 7 & 1 & ， \\
\hline 1，500－1，949 & 49 & 9.88 & ． 139 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 17 & 21 & 7 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 2，000－2，994 & 23 & 10.04 & ． 130 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 8 & 7 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 3，000－4，699 & 10 & 10.67 & ． 129 & \(1)\) & 0 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 5，000 or over & 1 & \({ }^{6} 15.67\) & a． 203 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ， & & 0 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 419 & 10． 17 & ． 112 & \(1)\) & 31 & 131 & 151 & 71 & 25 & 6 & 4 \\
\hline Net losses & 11 & 11.82 & ． 128 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline Net incomes & 408 & 10.12 & ． 112 & 0 & 31 & 129 & 146 & 70 & 24 & & 4 \\
\hline 0－499 & 55 & 7.92 & ． 093 & 0 & 12 & 23 & 12 & 5 & 2 & & 9 \\
\hline 500－919 & 0 \％ & 8.46 & ． 097 & 0 & 11 & 43 & 30 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，469 & 102 & 10.52 & ． 113 & 0 & 5 & 30 & 40 & 18 & 7 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999． & 71 & 10.92 & ． 124 & 0 & 3 & 20 & 21 & 18 & 5 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 2，000－2，999 & 63 & 12． 136 & ． 128 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 31 & 10 & 6 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 3，000－4，999 & 18 & 13． 19 & ． 128 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 10 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 4 & 12．05 & ． 121 & 0 & 0 & 1 & ， & 1） & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table．

Table 40．－moner value of food served at home（7－day estimate）：Average value of food per week per houschold and per meal per food－expenditure unit，ana distribution of households by money value of food per meal per unit，by family type and income， 5 analysis units in 20 States，\({ }^{1}\) March－November 1936 －Continued
［Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a bushand and wife，both native－born ？］
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Analysis unit，family type， and income class（dollars）} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
哭
0
0
0
0
0
0 \\
（2）
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Households having food with money value（ad． justed to June－August 1936 price levels \({ }^{5}\) ）per meal per unit＇of} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \[
5
\] &  &  &  &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 吕 } \\
& \text { 筑菏 } \\
& \text { Co }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & & & & （5） & （6） & （7） & （8） & （9） & （10） & （11） & （12） \\
\hline soUTHEAST－－WHITE operatora & Num－ & Dol－ & nol－ & Num． & Num－ & Num－ & Num－ & Num－ & Num－ & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{All types} & ber & lar8 & lara & ber & ber & ber & ber & ber & ber & ber & ber \\
\hline & 2，350 & 9.07 & 0． 10.5 & 9 & 326 & 826 & 660 & 324 & 126 & 53 & 26 \\
\hline 0－490 & 270 & 6． 01 & ． 088 & 4 & 70 & 119 & 53 & 21 & 8 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 500－899 & 916 & 7.48 & ． 097 & 5 & 16.3 & 351 & 246 & 101 & 29 & 13 & 8 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 52.3 & 9.78 & ． 109 & 0 & 49 & 188 & 1.51 & 82 & 34 & 14 & 6 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 270 & 10.87 & ． 115 & 0 & 18 & 74 & 104 & 44 & 17 & 11 & 2 \\
\hline 2，000－2， 199 & 222 & 11．23 & ． 114 & 0 & 22 & 60 & 66 & 38 & 21 & 4 & 4 \\
\hline 3，000－4，999 & 101 & 12．66 & ． 128 & 0 & 4 & 21 & 32 & 27 & 12 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 29 & 14.88 & －150 & 0 & 0 & 7 & 8 & 10 & 5 & 7 & 2 \\
\hline  & 382 & 6.57 & ． 126 & 0 & 20 & 00 & 118 & 77 & 43 & 22 & 12 \\
\hline 0－409． & 93 & 5． 18 & ． 108 & 0 & 6 & 35 & 33 & & 5 & 2 & \\
\hline 500－999． & 155 & 6． 20 & ． 122 & 0 & 9 & 38 & 51 & 34 & 12 & 7 & 4 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 74 & 7.24 & ． 139 & a & 3 & 14 & 16 & I8 & 15 & 4 & \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 22 & 7.41 & ． 143 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 8 & 3 & 4 & 4 & \\
\hline 2，000－2，998 & 18 & 9．42 & ． 155 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 7 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,898\)
5,000 or ave & 13 & 7.82 & ． 153 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 5，000 or ave & 7 & 13.39 & ． 155 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3．－．．．．．．．－－－－－－－－ & 511 & 8.13 & ． 112 & 0 & 37 & 161 & 171 & 100 & 29 & 9 & 4 \\
\hline 0－499 & 79 & 6.04 & ． 090 & 0 & 11 & 46 & 14 & & & & \\
\hline \(500-999 .-\) & 241 & 7． 88 & ． 110 & 0 & 22 & 74 & 89 & 38 & 11 & 5 & 2 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 92 & 8.76 & ． 118 & 0 & 2 & 23 & 36 & 2 f & 4 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 44 & 10.07 & ． 129 & 0 & \(\stackrel{0}{0}\) & 8 & 17 & 11 & 6 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 2，000－2，999 & 33 & 9．96 & ． 124 & 0 & 2 & 7 & 11 & 8 & 4 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline \(38.000-4,999\) & 16
6 & 10． 79
13.11 & .140
.159 & 0 & 0 & 3
0 & 3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
6 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 3 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 4 and 5.} & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & 1，018 & 9.61 & ． 100 & 4 & 161 & 395 & 26.3 & 124 & 45 & 19 & 7 \\
\hline 0－409 & 71 & 6.29 & ． 074 & 3 & 29 & 29 & 5 & 3 & & & \\
\hline 500－990－ & 359 & 8.15 & ． 086 & 1 & 79 & 169 & 79 & 25 & 5 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 242 & 9.90 & ． 104 & 0 & 28 & 94 & 70 & 30 & 12 & 7 & 1 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 146 & 10.54 & ． 113 & 0 & 11 & 41 & 55 & 27 & 6 & 6 & 0 \\
\hline 2，0001－2，909． & 121 & 10．98 & ． 111 & 0 & 10 & 47 & 31 & 19 & 11 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,890\)
5,000 or over & 55 & 13．82 & ． 124 & 0 & 4 & 10 & 19 & 14 & 5 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 24 & 16.01 & ． 150 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 1 & 6 & ， & 3 & 2 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 439 & 11.06 & ． 088 & 5 & 108 & 180 & 108 & 23 & 9 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 0－499 & 36 & 7.47 & ． 083 & 1 & 24 & 9 & 1 & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 500－999 & 161 & 9.22 & ． 078 & 4 & 53 & 70 & 27 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 115 & 12． 04 & ． 094 & 0 & 16 & 57 & 29 & 8 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 58 & 13．39 & ． 098 & 0 & 5 & 24 & 24 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 2，000－2，999 & 50 & 13． 40 & .101 & 0 & 10 & 12 & 19 & 5 & 3 & & 0 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,999\)
5,000 or over & 17
2 & － 14.38 & & 0 & 0 & 7 & 7 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 5，000 or ove & & －11．80 & ¢． 098 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sotMREAST—WHITE } \\
& \text { SHARECROPPERS }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 873 & 7.14 & ． 087 & 12 & 224 & 351 & 200 & 77 & 12 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-4,99 \\
& 500-989
\end{aligned}
\] & 236
462 & 5.57
7.20 & ． 080 & 9 & 79 & 89
186 & 44 & 14 & & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 462 & 7.20 & ． 088 & 3 & 114 & 186 & 108 & 42 & 8 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline \(1,000-1,499\)
\(1,500-1,999\) & 134 & 8.88 & ． 0904 & 0 & 22 & 59 & 35 & 15 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，998 & 46 & 9.55 & ． 098 & 0 & 9 & 17 & 13 & 6 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Seu footnotes at end of table．

Table 45．－money value of food served at home（7－day estimate）：Average value of food per week per houschold and per meal per food－expenditure unit，and distribution of households by money value of food per meal per unit，by family type and income， 5 analysis units in 20 States，\({ }^{1}\) March－November 1936－Continued
［Housebolds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife，both native－born \({ }^{2}\) ］
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit，family type， and incone class（dollars）} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Househnlds having food with money value（ad－ justed to Jume－August 1936 price levels \({ }^{5}\) ）per meal per unit＇of－} \\
\hline & & & &  & （6） &  & （8） &  &  &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
넝管品宛 \\
（12）
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHEAST－WHITE \\
RHAKECROPFERS－continued
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num. } \\
\text { ber } \\
1: 0
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol－ \\
lars \\
‥ 45
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol- } \\
\text { larg } \\
0.108
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num } \\
\text { ber } \\
\vdots
\end{gathered}
\] & Num．
ber
16 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
39
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
49
\end{gathered}
\] & Num ber 20 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { Num. } \\
\text { ber }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Num- } \\
\quad \begin{array}{r}
1
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|}
\text { Num- } \\
\text { ber } \\
0
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \(0-499 . .-\)
\(600-990\)
\(1,000-1,499\)
\(1,500-1,999\) & 53
74
9
4
4 & 4.79
5.67
6.98
6.89
6.8 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.094 \\
.113 \\
.134 \\
.146 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 0 & 14
2
0
0 & 17
21
1
0 & \(\begin{array}{r}13 \\ 30 \\ 4 \\ 4 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}7 \\ 16 \\ 16 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \\
& 2 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] & 1
0
0
0
1 & 0
0
0
0 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292 & 6． 35 & ． 093 & 1 & 54 & 121 & 78 & 33 & ！ & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 0－480 & 104 & 6.45 & ． 083 & 1 & 29 & 47 & 21 & \(B\) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 500－999 & 144 & 6.6 .1 & ． 097 & 0 & 22 & 58 & 41 & 19 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，490 & 34 & 7.18 & ． 104 & 0 & 3 & 13 & 12 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 10 & 8.60 & ． 116 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 4 & f & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 270 & 8.18 & ． 082 & 6 & 70 & 130 & 53 & 17 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0－489． & 51 & 6． 17 & ． 068 & 6 & 18 & 18 & 8 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(500-989\) & 150 & 8.07 & ． 081 & 0 & 42 & 72 & 29 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 53 & 9.75 & ． 094 & 0 & 5 & 30 & 11 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 22 & 9.91 & ． 089 & 0 & 5 & 10 & 5 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 170 & 8.20 & ． 068 & 4 & 84 & 61 & 20 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0－499 & 28 & 6． 29 & ． 081 & 1 & 18 & 7 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 600）－999 & 94 & 7.91 & ． 065 & 3 & 48 & 35 & 8 & 0 & ， & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 38 & 3． 63 & ． 076 & 0 & 14 & 15 & 8 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 10 & 10.79 & ． 078 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline soutireasi－negro familie．？ & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 64 & 5.37 & ． 065 & 126 & 782 & 460 & 12.4 & 62 & 6 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 0－499． & 730 & 4.22 & ． 060 & 87 & 379 & 201 & 17 & 14 & & 1 & \({ }^{0}\) \\
\hline 500－999 & 657 & 5.97 & ． 068 & 35 & 328 & 204 & 57 & 30 & 2 & ， & \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 149 & 7． 77 & ． 080 & 4 & 60 & 49 & 17 & 15 & 3 & 0 & \\
\hline 1，500－1，649 & 20 & 8． 17 & ． 073 & 0 & 11 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2，000－2，999 & \({ }_{6}^{6}\) & 7． 91 & ． 090 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 3，000－4，999 & 1 & \({ }^{8} 10.92\) & － 0.064 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 5，200 or ov & 1 & 16． 84 & 9． 293 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline Type & 266 & 3.95 & ． 086 & 6 & 78 & 97 & 49 & 33 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 0－499． & 172 & 3.41 & ． 075 & 6 & 67 & 64 & 27 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline bun－9ca & 80 & 5． 03 & ． 108 & 0 & 8 & 29 & 19 & 22 & 2 & 0 & \\
\hline 1，0001－1，499 & 11 & 4． 77 & ． 114 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 1，500－1，999 & 2 & 93． 39 & － 044 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2，000－2，499 & 1 & \({ }^{5} 3.60\) & \({ }^{\circ} .082\) & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 3，000－4，989 & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \(\stackrel{0}{0}\) & \\
\hline 6,000 or over & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 ． & 357 & 4． 64 & ． 068 & 18 & 163 & 138 & 26 & 10 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0－499 & 213 & 4． 07 & ． 062 & 14 & 109 & 74 & 11 & 4 & 1 & 0 & \\
\hline \(500-999\) & 121 & 5.02 & ． 069 & 4 & 51 & 56 & 10 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 1，000－1，499 & 18 & 7.71 & ． 108 & 0 & 2 & 8 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 0 & \\
\hline 1，500－1，999． & 4 & 8． 94 & ． 114 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2．000－2，969 & 1 & \({ }^{\circ} 9.90\) & \({ }^{6} .159\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 3，000－4，900 & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 5,000 or over． & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sce footnotes at end of table．

Table 45-money valde of food served at home (7-day estimate): Average value of food per week per houschold and per meal per food-expenditure unit, and distribution of households by money malue of food per meal per unil, by family type and income, 5 analysis unts in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wite, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


I Ste Clossary for definitions of terms such as household, family type, income, analysis unit.
\({ }^{2}\) This table includes households of amilies in the consumption surpipe that rurnished supplementary sthedules (food check listis). Spe Methotology for the states and counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all reqions exeept the Southeast where special studfers of white sharecropprs and Neqro families were made. See Mrethotology before using these fato for regional comparisons.
\({ }^{3}\) Averages are hased on the number of households in each class (column 2).
1 See (flossary, Foot-expendíture Unit.
\({ }^{5}\) Figures for cech 3-month period adjusted to June-August 1936 level by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index of retail lood costs.
\({ }^{6}\) Average hased on fewer than 3 cases.
- Negro oferators and sharecroppers.

Table 46.-family income (12-month schedele): Average family income, by family lype, 18 analysis units in 20 States, with regional combinations, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36
[Nonrelicf farmilies that include a husband and wif, both native-born *]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Region and analys & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) income of families of types-} \\
\hline (1) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Al \\
(2)
\end{tabular} & (3) & \begin{tabular}{l}
2 nad 3 \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
4 and 5 \\
(b)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
6 and 7 \\
(6)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline North and West \({ }^{\text {4 }}\). & \begin{tabular}{l}
Hol. \\
1, 418
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
1, 298
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Dol} . \\
& 1,351
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& P(t) \\
& 1,544
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 1,630
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Npw England, Middle Athatic, and North for resion) & 1,458 & 1,183 & 1,393 & 1,590 & 1,630 \\
\hline Vermont & 1,177 & J, 1226 & 1, 188 & 1,282 & \\
\hline New Jersey. & 1, 5.53 & 1,242 & 1. 579 & 1, 683 & 1,703 \\
\hline Pennsylvania-Ohio. & 1, 577 & 1,196 & 1, 480 & 1,709 & 1.778 \\
\hline Miebigan-Wisconsin
Inlinois-Iowa & 1,325
1.446 & 1,139
1,238 & 1,327 & 1,402 & 1. 380 \\
\hline & & & 1,344 & 1,04 & 1. 48.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
six lootactes at end of table.

Table 46- Family income (12-month schedtile): Average family income, by family type, 18 analysis units in 20 States, with regional combinations, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36Continued
[Nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, hoth native-bora 1]

\({ }^{1}\) Sce Glossary for definitions of terms such as income, family type, analysis unlt.
2 This table includes families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the counties in the States studied. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. This table excludes data from the Oregon part-time analysis unit since that unit is excluded from the consumption sample that furnished food check jists (table 66). See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisons.
* Averages are based on the number of familics in each analysis unit. Averages for the regions or colortenure groups in the Southeast are simple averages based on the number of families in the region or group.
\({ }^{4}\) New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mauntain, und Pacific regions.
Table 47.-household size (7-day estimate): Average household size, by family type and income, 6 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband nnd wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit and family-income class (dollars)} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) household sizo} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
All family types \\
(2)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Family type 1 \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Family types 2 and 3 \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Family types 4 and 5 \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Family types 6 and 7 \\
(6)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline  & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Persons } \\
4.05
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Persons } \\
2.44
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Persgns } \\
3.81
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Persong } \\
4.36
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Persons } \\
6.49
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline Net losses. Net incomes. & 3.69
4.06 & 2. 912 & 3.59
3.81 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4. } 50 \\
& 4.36
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.00 \\
& 6.49
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 0-499 & 3.29 & 2.38 & 3.46 & 4.00 & 6. 17 \\
\hline 500-909 & 3.62 & 2. 31 & 3.61 & 4. 13 & 6.11 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 4. 15 & 2. 56 & 3.85 & 4.34 & B. 35 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999. & 4. 26 & 2.48 & 3.86 & 4.40 & B. 55 \\
\hline 2,000-2,099 & 4.62 & 2. 53 & 4. 13 & 4. 55 & 6. 83 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 4. 97 & 2. 33 & 4. 52 & 5.02 & 7. 22 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 4. 46 & 2. 60 & 4. 18 & 4.47 & B. 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 47.-hocsehold gize (7-day estimate): Average household size, by family type and income, 6 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Con.
[Kouseholds of nonrelief farm families that include s husband and wife, both native-born 2]

\({ }^{1}\) See Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, famlly type, analysis umit.
1 This table includes households of tamilies in che consumption sample that furnished supplementary schedules (food check lists). See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisons.
8 Averages are based on the number of meals served to the households in each class (table 48 , column 2).
- New England, Middle Atlantic and Nortb Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.

A Average based on fewer than 3 cases.
- The highest income reported fell in this income class.
i Negro operators and sbarecroppers.

 go States, March-Novenber 1936
\{Housebolds of noureliof farm families that include a husband and wire, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) !
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis init, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Households consuming--} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {s }}\) quantity per household} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{A verage ' value per housebold} \\
\hline & & Eghs & Flizid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheese & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Crram, } \\
\text { ice } \\
\text { cresm }
\end{gathered}
\] & Fats 4 & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheess & Cream, ice cream & Milk rquivalent \({ }^{\text {s }}\) & Fats 4 & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheuse & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Cresm, } \\
& \text { ice } \\
& \text { ereum }
\end{aligned}
\] & Fatst \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (18) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline \multicolumn{21}{|l|}{} \\
\hline All types & 2,557 & [2, 433 & 2,443 & 119 & 1,171 & 1,281 & 2. 52.5 & 2.6 & 16.8 & 0.2 & 0.7 & 2.6 & 21.1 & 3.9 & 0.51 & 1.09 & 0.01 & 0.14 & 0.44 & 0.88 \\
\hline 0-499. & 164 & 151 & 154 & 18 & 51 & 75 & 160 & 2.0 & 13.2 & . 2 & . 4 & 2.1 & 15. 5 & 3.1 & . 38 & . 86 & . 02 & . 08 & . 38 & .73
.74 \\
\hline 500-999 & 625 & 592 & 591 & 26 & 243 & 204 & 609 & 2. 2 & 13.8 & . 1 & . 5 & 2. 3 & 16.3 & 3.2 & - 44 & .90
1.07 & . 01 & . 11 & . 38 & . 74
.88 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 757 & 716 & 725 & 31 & 340 & 987 & 749 & 2.5 & 16.4 & .2 & . 7 & 2.7 & 19.7 & 3.9
4.0 & . 50 & 1.07
1.19 & (\%) & .14
.16 & .45
.42 & .88 \\
\hline 1,500-1,909 & 493 & 478 & 478 & 21 & 248 & 263 & 189 & 2.8 & 18.4 & .1 & . 8 & 2.4 & 21.9 & 4. 0 & . 55 & 1.19
1.30 & (?) & .16
.19 & .42
.47 & .94
1.01 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 362 & 347 & 345 & 16 & 197 & 179 & 362 & 3.1 & 20.4 & . 2 & . 8 & 2.7 & 24.1 & 4. 6 & . 60 & 1.30 & . 01 & \(\cdot 19\) & . 61 & 1.01
1.17 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 13.5 & 130 & 130 & \({ }_{6}\) & 79 & 67 & 135 & 3.2 & 20.6 & (8) \({ }^{1}\) & . 9 & 3. 29 & 24.7
25.3 & 4.9
4.4 & . 62 & 1.32
1.51 & . 01 & .21
.18 & .68
.90 & 1.17
.97 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 21 & 19 & 20 & 1 & 13 & 16 & 21 & 2.9 & 20.7 & (8) & . 7 & 6.9 & 25.3 & 4.4 & . 54 & 1.51 & . 01 & .18 & . 90 & . 97 \\
\hline Type 1. & 553 & 520 & 519 & 33 & 241 & 277 & 546 & 2.0 & 10.9 & . 1 & . 5 & 2.2 & 13.3 & 2.9 & . 40 & . 75 & . 01 & 11 & . 38 & . 67 \\
\hline 0-499 & 74 & 68 & 188 & 10 & 25 & 29 & 73 & 1. 7 & 9.7 & . 3 & . 4 & 1.6 & 11.8 & 2.6 & . 33 & . 67 & . 02 & . 07 & . 28 & . 68 \\
\hline \(500-999\) & 191 & 179 & 175 & 11 & 68 & 88 & 188 & 1.8 & 10.3 & \(\mathrm{ci}^{2}\) & . 3 & 1. 6 & 12.0 & 2.6 & . 37 & . 68 & (1) & .07 & . 27 & . 81 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 135 & 126 & 132 & 4 & (i8) & 72 & 133 & 2.2 & 11.2 & (8) & -7 & 2.7 & 14.4 & 3. 0 & . 44 & .80
.78 & (1) & . 14 & .44
.44 & .69
.73 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 0.5 & 91 & 90 & 5 & 48 & 57 & 94 & 2.2 & 11.8 & . 1 & . 7 & 2.5 & 15.0 & 3. 1 & . 44 & . 78 & . 01 & . 15 & . 41 & .73
.79 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 41 & 39 & 37 & 2 & 21 & 24 & 41 & 2.2 & 13.2 & .1 & .fi & 2.2 & 16.0 & 3. 6 & . 43 & . 98 & . 110 & . 13 & . 81 & 79
74 \\
\hline \(3,009-4,999\)
5,000 & 13
4 & 13 & 13
4 & 1 & 7
4 & 9
4 & 13 & 2.0
2.8 & 11.2
8.0 & . 2 & i. 8.0 & 5. 0
8.0 & 15. 6
13.9 & 3.2
3.2 & .36
.53 & .68
.83
.83 & . 020 & 17
.27 & \(\begin{array}{r}.85 \\ 1.27 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 74
.78 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 4 & 1 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 2.8 & 8.0 & . 0 & 1.0 & 8.0 & 13. 9 & 3.2 & . 53 & . 83 & . 00 & . 27 & 1. 27 & . 78 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 603 & 577 & 581 & 17 & 283 & 318 & 594 & 2.5 & 16.7 & . 3 & . 6 & 2.5 & 19.6 & 3.6 & . 49 & 1.10 & . 01 & . 14 & . 44 & , 82 \\
\hline 0-499 & 29 & 26 & 27 & 4 & 12 & 13 & 27 & 2.0 & 11.6 & . 6 & -4 & 2.5 & 14. 3 & 3. 4 & . 39 & . 72 & . 05 & . 13 & .37 & . 78 \\
\hline 500-999 & 151 & 14.5 & 146 & 5 & 64 & 73 & 148 & 2.3 & 1fi. 0 & . 1 & - 5 & 2.1 & 18.4 & 3.3 & . 44 & 1.033 & , 01 & - 11 & . 35 & . 75 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 218 & 208 & 211 & 3 & 87 & 116 & 217 & 2.5 & 16.8 & (1) & . 5 & 2.7 & 19.4 & 3.8 & . 50 & 1. 12 & (7) & . 12 & . 40 & . 86 \\
\hline 1,500-1,998 & 104 & 102 & 302 & 3 & 62 & 66 & 101 & 2.7 & 17.4 & (3) & . 8 & 2.8 & 20.9 & 3.4 & . 53 & 1.12 & (7) & . 18 & . 47 & . 82 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 71 & 66 & 69 & 1 & 40 & 31 & 71 & 2.5 & 17.5 & (8) & . 8 & 2.2 & 20.8 & 3.8 & . 49 & 1.15 & (1) & . 18 & . 40 & . 83 \\
\hline 3,000-4.899. & 27 & 27 & 27 & 1 & 16 & 17 & 27 & 3.7 & 20.4 & .1 & . 8 & 3.3 & 24.2 & 4.3 & . 72 & 1.37 & . 01 & . 19 & .66
1.40 & 1.68 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 4.7 & 25.7 & . 0 & 1.0 & 3.9 & 30.2 & 7.3 & . 83 & 1.72 & . 00 & . 26 & 1. 40 & 1.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 48.-egge, datry products, and fats consumed at home doring one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming
 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Households consuming-} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {a }}\) quantity per houschold} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Avrage \({ }^{\text {s }}\) value per household} \\
\hline & & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheese & Cream, ice cream & Fats \({ }^{4}\) & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{2}\) & Cheess & Cream, ice cream & Milk equivalent" & Fats \({ }^{4}\) & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheese & Cream, ice cream & Fats \({ }^{4}\) \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & ( 2) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline NEW ENGLAND, Middle atlantic, AND NORTH CENTRAI-ccontd. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline  & No.
923 & No. 871 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
876
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 53 & No. 441 & No. 458 & No. 910 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Doz. } \\
2.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
Q t . \\
16.9
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
0.2
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
0.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
L b . \\
2.8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 20.6
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Lb. \\
4.3
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.53
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 1.10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.02
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.16
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.47
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.99
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 0-499 & 49 & 45 & 47 & 4 & 11 & 25 & 48 & 2.3 & 16.4 & . 1 & .3 & 3.2 & 18.5 & 3.8 & . 45 & 1.09 & . 01 & . 07 & . 49 & . 88 \\
\hline 500-999 & 193 & 180 & 182 & 9 & 79 & 93 & 184 & 2.2 & 13.3 & . 2 & . 8 & 2.7 & 17.0 & 3.6 & . 45 & . 87 & . 02 & . 14 & . 44 & . 82 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 264 & 248 & 251 & 18 & 124 & 135 & 261 & 2.5 & 16. 4 & . 3 & .9 & 2.7 & 20.5 & 4.2 & . 50 & 1.08 & 02 & . 16 & . 46 & . 97 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 183 & 175 & 177 & 9 & 94 & 85 & 183 & 2.8 & 19.1 & . 1 & . 8 & 2.2 & 22.5 & 4.5 & . 56 & 1. 28 & (') & . 16 & . 39 & 1.07 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 159 & 152 & 149 & 10 & 90 & 85 & 159 & 3.4 & 18.9 & . 4 & .7 & 3. 1 & 22. 6 & 4. 9 & . 64 & 1. 20 & . 01 & . 18 & . 56 & 1.08
1.18 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 66 & 62 & 61 & 3 & 39 & 28 & 66 & 3.1 & 17.7 & . 2 & . 9 & 2.6
10.7 & 21.7
29.3 & 5.1
3.8 & . 60 & 1.16
1.61 & .02
.00 & .20
.13 & .50
.92 & 1.18
.84 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 9 & 9 & 9 & 0 & 4 & 7 & 9 & 3.4 & 23.7 & . 0 & . 6 & 10.7 & 29.3 & 3.8 & . 64 & 1.61 & . 00 & . 13 & . 92 & . 84 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 478 & 465 & 464 & 16 & 206 & 228 & 475 & 3.1 & 23.3 & . 1 & . 7 & 2.7 & 26.6 & 4.5 & . 60 & 1.44 & . 01 & . 16 & . 46 & 1.00 \\
\hline 0-499 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 12 & 2.1 & 24.8 & \({ }^{8} 0\) & . 3 & 3.4 & 26.8 & 3.4 & . 39 & 1.47 & . \({ }^{00}\) & . 06 & . 56 & .76
.84 \\
\hline 500-999 & 90 & 88 & 88 & 1 & 32 & 46 & 89 & 3.0 & 18.4 & \({ }^{(8)}\) & . 4 & 3.4 & 20.8 & 3.8 & . 57 & 1.16 & \({ }^{(7)}\) & . 10 & . 54 & . 84 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 140 & 134 & 131 & 6 & 61 & 64 & 138 & 2.8 & 20.8
23.8 & .3 & .7 & 2.6 & \begin{tabular}{l}
24.2 \\
27.3 \\
\hline 3.8
\end{tabular} & 4.3
4.5 & .53
.65 & 1.28
1.46 & . 02 & . 15 & . 43 & .87
1.01 \\
\hline 1,500-1,909 & 111 & 110 & 110 & 4 & 44 & 55
39 & 111 & 3.4 & 23.8
28.7 & .1 & .8
1.1 & 2.4 & 27.3
32.8 & 4.5
5.1 & .65
.72 & 1.46
1.73 & . 01 & . 16 & . 42 & 1.01 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 91 & 90 & 90 & 3 & 46 & 39
13 & \({ }_{29}^{91}\) & 3.6 & 28.7
31.7 & .1 & 1.1 & 2.4
3.4 & 32.8
36.6 & 5. 1 & . 72 & 1.73
1.92 & . 01 & . 22 & . 42 & 1.11
1.40 \\
\hline 5,000-4,999
\(\mathbf{5 , 0 0 0}\) or ove & 29
5 & 28
3 & 29
4 & 1 & 17
3 & \begin{tabular}{r|r|}
13 \\
3
\end{tabular} & 29
5 & 3.5
1.2 & 31.7
22.6 & . 2 & 1.1
.5 & 3.4
1.0 & 36.6
24.7 & 5.9
4.5 & . 68 & 1.92
1.74 & . 01 & .26
.16 & .59
.26 & 1.40
1.05 \\
\hline s,000 or & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 1,007 & 963 & 968 & 56 & 375 & 709 & 996 & 2.8 & 16.6 & 2 & . 6 & 3.9 & 20.0 & 3.7 & . 45 & 1.23 & . 01 & . 11 & . 60 & . 91 \\
\hline Net losses. & 36 & 32 & 33 & 1 & 12 & 29 & 36 & 2.9 & 15.8 & . 1 & . 3 & 5.0 & 18.6 & 3.6 & . 45 & 1.01 & . 01 & . 07 & . 69 & . 80 \\
\hline Net incomes. & 971 & 931 & 935 & 55 & 363 & 680 & 960 & 2.8 & 16.7 & . 2 & . 6 & 3.9 & 20.1 & 3.7 & . 45 & 1. 25 & . 01 & . 11 & . 60 & . 91 \\
\hline 0-499. & 170 & 166 & 157 & 11 & 41 & 113 & 167 & 2.6 & 13.9 & . 2 & .3 & 3.2 & 16.1 & 3.0 & . 41 & . 88 & . 02 & . 06 & . 43 & . 68 \\
\hline 500-999 & 272 & 258 & 262 & 10 & 94 & 187 & 267 & 2.5 & 15.2 & . 1 & .4 & 3.5 & 17.8 & 3.2 & . 41 & 1.10 & . 01 & . 09 & . 52 & . 78 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 222 & 210 & 213 & 14 & 81 & 151 & 221 & 2.7 & 18.1 & .2 & . 6 & 4.3
3.8 & 21.7 & 4.2
4.0 & . 44 & 1.35
1.41 & . 02 & .12 & . 63 & 1.02
1.02 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 48.- -GGGS, DAIRY PRODUCTS, AND FATS CONSUMED AT HOME DURING one week (7-DAy estimate): Number of households consuming
 20 States, 1 March-November \(1936^{\circ}\)-Continued
[Honseholds of nonrelief farm families that inciude a husband and wife, both native-born²]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Horseholds} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Households consurning-} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {a }}\) quantity per household} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Averages value per household} \\
\hline & & Fggs & Fluid milk & \[
\left.\begin{gathered}
\text { Other } \\
\text { milk }^{3}
\end{gathered} \right\rvert\,
\] & Cheese & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cream, } \\
\text { ice } \\
\text { cream }
\end{gathered}
\] & Fats & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cherse & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Cream, } \\
\text { ice } \\
\text { cream }
\end{gathered}
\] & Milk equivalent 0 & Fats \({ }^{1}\) & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{2}\) & Cheese & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Cream, } \\
& \text { ice } \\
& \text { cream }
\end{aligned}
\] & Fats \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline  & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
2,350
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
2,082
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
N o . \\
2,087
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No. } \\
58
\end{array}
\] & \[
\underset{699}{N o .}
\] & No. 506 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
N i j \\
2,319
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{02} . \\
1.7
\end{gathered}
\] & Qt.
\[
23.7
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L 6 . \\
0.1
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
0.4
\end{gathered}
\] & r,b. 0.8 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Qt. } \\
& 25.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 5.5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.30
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& n \% . \\
& 1.74
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.08
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.16
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
1.01
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 0-498 & 279 & 220 & 235 & 4 & 40 & 28 & 272 & 1.0 & 19.1 & . 1 & . 1 & . 3 & 19.6 & 4.1 & . 19 & 1. 22 & \({ }^{(1)}\) & . 03 & . 05 & . 77 \\
\hline 500-999. & 916 & 787 & 814 & 19 & 170 & 133 & P10n & 1.4 & 24.9 & . 1 & . 2 & .6 & 24.9 & 5.4 & . 25 & 1.65 & . 01 & . 94 & . 12 & . 98 \\
\hline 1,0011-1,499 & 523 & 485 & 467 & 13 & 182 & 143 & 514 & 1.8 & 24.0 & . 1 & . 4 & 1.1 & 25.7 & 5. 6 & . 33 & 1.88 & . 01 & . 10 & . 23 & 1.02
1.14 \\
\hline 1,500)-1,949 & 270 & 256 & 245 & 10 & 109 & 72 & 266 & 2.2 & 26. 1 & 1 & . 5 & 1.0 & 28.1 & 6.2 & . 40 & 2.04 & . 01 & . 13 & . 21 & 1. 14 \\
\hline 2,000-2,099 & 222 & 204 & 290 & 5 & 113 & 74 & 222 & 2.4 & 25.1 & (8) & . 7 & 1.2 & 27.7 & 6.0 & . 42 & 2.02 & (\%) & . 15 & . 24 & 1.06
1.23 \\
\hline 3,000-1,998 & 101 & 93 & 92 & 4 & 51 & 37 & 110 & 2.4 & 22.9 & \(\cdot 1\) & .7 & 1.2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
25.6 \\
29 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 6.8 & - 44 & 1.92 & . 01 & . 16 & .25
.21 & 1.23
1.28 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. & 39 & 37 & 34 & 3 & 34 & 19 & 39 & 3.1 & 25.6 & . 3 & 1.1 & 1.1. & 29.8 & 6.8 & . 56 & 2.05 & . 04 & . 28 & . 21 & 1.28 \\
\hline Type 1. & 382 & 340 & 337 & 10 & 106 & 88 & 373 & 1.4 & 15.6 & 1 & . 3 & . 6 & 16. 9 & 4.1 & . 25 & 1.08 & . 01 & 0.3 & . 15 & . 76 \\
\hline 0-499. & 93 & 79 & 84 & 0 & 15 & 12 & 91 & . 9 & 15.5 & - 0 & . 2 & . 3 & 16. 2 & 3. 6 & . 17 & 1.01 & .00 & . 04 & . 07 & 69
.73 \\
\hline 500-999 & 165 & 138 & 134 & 5 & 37 & 23 & 151 & 1.3 & 15.9 & .\(^{2}\) & .2 & . 6 & 16.9 & 4.0 & . 24 & 1.05 & (1) & . 08 & .12
.19 & .73
.75 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 74 & 70 & 66 & 2 & 25 & 23 & 71 & 1.7 & 14.8 & (3) & . 3 & .9 & 16.1 & 4.0
5.0
5.0 & .31
.86 & 1.18
1.20 & (7)
.00 & . 08 & . 197 & .75
.89 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 22 & 18 & 21 & 0 & 10 & 5 & 22 & 1.4 & 17.4 & . 0 & . 5 & . 3 & 19. 1 & 5.0 & . 26 & 1.20
1.16 & . 00 & . 11 & . 16 & .89 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 18 & 16 & 16 & 0 & 9 & 8 & 18 & 2.1 & 15.9 & . 0 & .7 & . 7 & 18.4 & 5.2 & . 39 & 1. 16 & . 00 & . 10 & . 16 & . 93 \\
\hline 3,000-4,990 & 13 & 13 & 10 & 2 & 5 & 8 & 13 & 1.8 & 10.2 & . 2 & . 4 & 1.0 & 12.0
25.2 & 4. 6.6 & .36
.40 & 1.72
1.42 & . 01 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.10 \\
.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 21 & .91
1.22 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 7 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 7 & 2.2 & 22.6 & . 3 & . 6 & 1.2 & 25.2 & 6.6 & . 40 & 1. 42 & . 06 & . 17 & . 21 & 1.22 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 . & 511 & 437 & 411 & 17 & 134 & 108 & 504 & 1.5 & 21.6 & 1 & 3 & . 7 & 22.9 & 5.1 & . 27 & 1. 62 & . 01 & . 07 & . 14 & . 91 \\
\hline 0-499 & 79 & 63 & [i:3 & 1 & 10 & 10 & 77 & . 9 & 19.4 & (9) & . 1 & . 5 & 19.9 & 4. 1 & . 16 & 1. 20 & \({ }^{(7)}\) & . 03 & . 09 & 75 \\
\hline 500-909 & 241 & 200 & 210 & 5 & 38 & 48 & 240 & 1.4 & 22.6 & (s) & .2 & . 6 & 23.4 & 5.1 & . 24 & 1. 68 & (7) & . 04 & , 12 & . 98 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 92 & 86 & 83 & 3 & 29 & 24 & 91 & 1.7 & 20.6 & (i) & . 4 & . 9 & 22.2 & 5. 5 & . 31 & 1.65 & (7) & . 08 & 18 & . 94 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 44 & 41 & 37 & 4 & 19 & 13 & 41 & 1.9 & 22.0 & .2 & . 6 & .8 & 24.4 & 5. 6 & . 36 & 1. 65 & . 02 & . 14 & . 17 & 1. 14 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 33 & 29 & 30 & 2 & 21 & 11 & 33 & 2.5 & 22.3 & . 1 & . 8 & . 9 & 25.3 & 5.0 & . 45 & 1.87 & . 01 & . 18 & 19 & 80 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 16 & 12 & 12 & 2 & 12 & 7 & 16 & 1.5 & 17.1 & . 6 & . 9 & . 9 & 20.8 & 4.9 & . 28 & 1.39 & . 05 & . 22 & . 19 & 87 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. & 6 & 6 & 6 & 0 & 5 & 2 & 6 & 2.7 & 33.7 & . 0 & 1.2 & . 5 & 37.7 & 5.0 & . 54 & 3. 39 & . 00 & . \(3 \%\) & . 13 & . 87 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\footnotetext{
See foot rotes at end of table.
}

Tabie 48.-EgGs, dairy productb, and fats congdmed at home during one wehe (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming eggs, dairy products, and fats, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, 1 March-November 1936--Continued
[Households of nonreilef farm families that include a husband and wife, hoth native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Anglysis unit, ramily type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Households consuming-} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Averages \({ }^{\text {a }}\) quantity per housohold} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value per household} \\
\hline & & Engs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheese & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Crim, } \\
& \text { ico } \\
& \text { cream }
\end{aligned}
\] & Fits \({ }^{1}\) & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \({ }^{3}\) & Cheese & Ctparn, ice cream & Milk cruaivalent: & Fats \({ }^{1}\) & Eggs & Fluid milk & Other milk \(^{3}\) & Choese & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Cream, } \\
& \text { ice } \\
& \text { ertam }
\end{aligned}
\] & Fats \({ }^{1}\) \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (2i) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHKAST--WHITE \\
BHARECROPPERS-continued \\
Types 6 and 7 .
\end{tabular} & No.
170 & No.
137 & No.
119 & No.
10 & No.
41 & No. \({ }_{11}\) & \(\stackrel{N}{\text { No. }}\) & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Doz. } \\
1.0
\end{array}
\] & Qt. & \(\stackrel{L b}{\text { b }} \mathrm{S}\) & \(L b\).
0.4 & Lb. \({ }_{0}\) & Qt. & Lb
5.4 & Dol.
0.19 & Dol.
1.48 & Dol.
0.01 & Dol.
0.08 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.02
\end{aligned}
\] & Dol.
\[
1.01
\] \\
\hline 0-499. & 28 & 22 & 20 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 28 & . 7 & 21. 1 & . 1 & . 0 & . 1 & 21.1 & 4.2 & . 33 & 1. 31 & . 00 & . 00 & . 02 & . 80 \\
\hline 5009990 & 94 & 73 & 67 & 5 & 16 & 4 & 92 & . 9 & 22.4 & . 2 & . 2 & (9) & 23.2 & 5.7 & . 16 & 1. 52 & . 01 & . 05 & . 01 & 1.06 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 38 & 33 & 25 & 4 & 18 & 5 & 38 & 1.5 & 19.1 & -1 & . 7 & . 3 & 21.8 & 5. 5 & . 27 & 1. 56 & . 02 & . 18 & . 06 & .99
1.17 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 10 & 9 & 7 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 10 & 1.4 & 17.4 & . 3 & 1.2 & . 0 & 21.5 & 6. 7 & . 26 & 1.20 & . 03 & & & \\
\hline All types. & 1,564 & 1.039 & 1,0\%7 & 33 & 311 & 72 & 1,528 & . 8 & 11.6 & (3) & . 2 & , 1 & 12.3 & 3.9 & . 14 & . 72 & (7) & . 05 & . 63 & . 68 \\
\hline 0-499. & 730 & 419 & \({ }_{4}^{478}\) & 12 & 119 & 19 & 708 & .6 & 9.3 & (9) & . 2 & (4) 2 & 9.9
13.3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3.3 \\
4.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 11 & .55
.75 & (7) & .04
.04 & .01
.04 & .55
.7 \\
\hline 500-999-- & 657
149 & 468 & 428 & 15 & 134
47 & 35 & 645
147 & .8
1.8 & 12.6 & (9) 1 & . 2 & \(\begin{array}{r}.2 \\ .4 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 13.3
17.5 & 4.3
5.0 & .16
.21 & .75
1.14 & \({ }^{(1)}\) & . 06 & -04 & .77
.87 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 149
20 & 125
19 & 106
17 & B
0 & 47
8 & 16
2 & 147
20 & 1.2 & 16.0
22.1 & .1
.0 & . 4 & . 4 & 17.5
24.2 & 5. 0 & . 21 & 1.14
1.45 & .01
.00 & .09
.14 & . 08 & . 86 \\
\hline 2,000-2,998 & - 6 & - 6 & 17 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 6 & 1.5 & 22. 2 & .0 & . 8 & . 0 & 24.8 & 4.8 & . 32 & 1. 70 & . 00 & .18 & .00 & . 88 \\
\hline 3,010-4,999. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 01.0 & 921.0 & 0.0 & 9.0 & 0.0 & 921.0 & 14.0 & -. 18 & \({ }^{4} 2.10\) & - .00 & \(\bigcirc .00\) & -. 00 & \({ }^{6} .60\) \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & Q 5.0 & \({ }^{6} 48.0\) & - . 0 & -. 0 & 0.0 & - 48.0 & -9.0 & \({ }^{8} 1.00\) & -3.80 & - 60 & 0.00 & '. 00 & \({ }^{1} 1.89\) \\
\hline Type 1 & 266 & 181 & 183 & 13 & 41 & 18 & 257 & . 7 & 8.0 & . 1 & . 2 & . 1 & 8.8 & 3.1 & . 13 & . 47 & , 01 & . 03 & . 03 & . 53 \\
\hline 0-199 & 172 & 104 & 118 & 6 & 21 & 6 & 167 & . 6 & 7.3 & (8) & . 1 & . 1 & 7.7 & 3.0 & . 12 & . 39 & . 02 & . 03 & . 02 & . 50 \\
\hline 800-999 & 80 & 63 & 56 & 6 & 16 & 10 & 77 & . 8 & 9.9 & . 1 & .2 & . 3 & 10.7 & 3.3 & . 15 & . 61 & . 01 & . 05 & . 06 & . 58 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 11 & 11 & 7 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 10 & 1.3 & 5. 4 & . 6 & . 4 & . 1 & -7.3 & -2.9 & -. 28 & 0.41 & .06
.00 & . 08 & . 02 & \(\begin{array}{r}.45 \\ \hline .52\end{array}\) \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & \({ }^{9} 1.2\) & 04.0 & \(\bigcirc\) & \(\cdots\) & 1.0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
9 \\
9.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{0} 3.5\) & \({ }^{\bullet} .22\) & \(\bigcirc\) & 4.00
\(-\quad 00\) & \(\bigcirc\) & \(\bigcirc\) & 1.52 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & \(\pm\) & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \(\bigcirc 2.0\) & -7.0 & 9.0 & 0.0 & 3.0 & 97.0 & 12.5 & -.36 & - .28 & -. 00 & -. 00 & - 00 & 1. 38 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & - -- \\
\hline 5,0100 or over & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & ---- \\
\hline Types 2 and 3.-. & 357 & 226 & 234 & 5 & 67 & 21 & 353 & . 6 & 9.8 & (3) & . 2 & . 1 & 10.5 & 3.6 & I2 & . 59 & (\%) & . 04 & . 02 & . 61 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 0-499. & 213 & 124 & 137 & 4 & 351 & 7 & 212 & . 5 & 8.fif & (c) & . 2 & \(\left.{ }^{8}\right)\) & 9.2 & 3. 4 & . 10 & . 481 & \({ }^{(7)}\) & .04
.05 & . 011 & . 57 \\
\hline 500-999. & 121 & 81 & 77 & 1 & 22 & 8 & 118 & . 7 & 9.4 & \({ }^{(5)}\) & . 2 & . 2 & 10.1 & 3. 7 & . I3 & . 59 & ( \({ }^{(1)}\) & . 05 & . 04 & . 64 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 18 & 16 & 15 & 0 & 8 & 4 & 18 & 1.4 & 20.9 & . 0 & . 4 & . 2 & 21.3 & 4. 4 & . 20 & 1.51 & . 00 & . 10 & . 06 & . 77 \\
\hline 1,500 1,999. & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 1.4 & 32.4 & . 0 & . 2 & 1.9 & 33.7 & 5.2 & . 25 & 1. 72 & . 00 & . 05 & . 39 & . 92 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \(\bigcirc .5\) & - 42.0 & - 0 & -1.0 & 1.0 & 9 45. 2 & -6.0 & -. 09 & - 3.36 & 9. 00 & P. 25 & 9.00 & +1.10 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & - & & & & & & & ----- & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 6. & 602 & 419 & 409 & 13 & 144 & 20 & 590 & . 9 & 13.0 & (3) & .3 & . 2 & 14.0 & 4.3 & . 16 & . 80 & (7) & . 06 & . 04 & 76 \\
\hline 0-499 & 218 & 120 & 145 & 1 & 46 & 5 & 209 & .6 & 10.8 & (8) & . 2 & (8) & 11.4 & 3.5 & . 11 & . 64 & (7) & . 04 & 01 & 58 \\
\hline 500.999 & 290 & 221 & 193 & 8 & 69 & 9 & 283 & 1.0 & 13.4 & (8) & . 3 & . 2 & 14.4 & 4.7 & . 18 & . 77 & (7) & . 06 & . 04 & . 81 \\
\hline 1,000-1,449 & 82 & 67 & 59 & 4 & 25 & 6 & 81 & 1.1 & 15.8 & ()) & . 4 & . 5 & 17.2 & 5.1 & . 21 & 1.15 & (7) & . 10 & . 11 & . 91 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 8 & 7 & 8 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 8 & . 8 & 22. 6 & . 0 & . 5 & .0 & 24.2 & 6. 1 & . 15 & 1. 35 & . 00 & . 12 & . 00 & 1. 18 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999. & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1.7 & 23.3 & . 0 & . 7 & .0 & 25.5 & 4.8 & . 40 & 1. 72 & . 00 & . 14 & . 00 & . 93 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 15.0 & \(9 \mathrm{4}, 6\) & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & - 48.0 & 99.0 & Q 1.00 & 93.80 & 0.00 & 0.00 & - 00 & \(\bigcirc 1.89\) \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 339 & 213 & 211 & 2 & 59 & 13 & 328 & . 7 & 13.7 & (3) & . 2 & . 1 & 14.4 & 4.2 & . 14 & . 88 & (7) & . 05 & . 02 & 74 \\
\hline (1-489. & 127 & 71 & 78 & 1 & 17 & 1 & 120 & , 6 & 10. 9 & \(\left.{ }^{6}\right)\) & . 1 & \(\left.{ }^{8}\right)\) & 11.2 & 3.2 & . 11 & . 73 & (7) & . 03 & (i) & . 56 \\
\hline 500-999 & 166 & 103 & 102 & 1 & 27 & 8 & 162 & . 7 & 14.7 & (5) & . 2 & . 1 & 15.4 & 4. 6 & . 14 & . 92 & (7) & . 04 & . 02 & . 83 \\
\hline 1,000 1 -1,499 & 38 & 31 & 2.5 & 0 & 10 & 4 & 38 & 1.1 & 17.7 & . 0 & . 3 & .1 & 18.7 & 5. 5 & . 19 & 1.16 & . 00 & . 07 & . 03 & . 95 \\
\hline 1,5001-1,919 & 6 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1.8 & 20.5 & . 0 & 1.3 & . 0 & 24.7 & 5. 3 & . 34 & 1. 55 & . 00 & . 27 & . 00 & . 86 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1.5 & -14.0 & 1.0 & \({ }^{1} 1.5\) & 1.0 & \({ }^{2} 18.8\) & -6.0 & 9.27 & P1.40 & -. 00 & -. 38 & -. 00 & 91.02 \\
\hline 3,000-4,448 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1.0 & P21.0 & Q. 0 & 8.0 & 1.0 & \({ }^{4} 21.0\) & -4.0 & -. 18 & 22.10 & . .00 & -. 00 & \(\bigcirc .00\) & - 60 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 0 & 0 & \(1)\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1 See Glossary for definitions of terms sueh as household, family type, ineome, analysis unit. The consumption figures given in this trable include food consumed by paid farm or household help, boarciers, and guests as well as by members of the economic family.
\({ }_{2}\) This tanle includes households of fatuilies in the consumption sample that furristhed supplementary sohedules (fool cherv lists). See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisons.
includes dried, evaporsted, and coudensed mik.
\(81267^{\circ}-41-13\)

Does not include bncon and salt pork
A verages are based on the number of households in each elass (column 2)
- Approximately the quantity of fluid milk to which the various dairy products except miti'r (eolumos 10-13) are equivalent in minerals and protein.
\(\$ 0.0050\) or less
Average based on fewer thsa 3 cases
\({ }^{2}\) Negro operators and sharecroppers.

Table 49.-meat, podliry, and fish constimed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming meat, poultry, and fish, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-
[Households of nonrefief farm tamilies that inchude a hasband and wife, both native-born²]



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 49.-meat, poultry, and fish consumed at home during one week ( 7 -day estimate): Number of households consuming meat, poultry, and fish, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) MarchNovember 1936-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 49.-meat, poultry, and fish consumed at home during one week ( 7 -day egtimate): Number of households consuming meat, poultry, and fish, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) MarchNovember 1996-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born²;



See footnotes at end of table.


[Households of noarelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both ontive-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\({ }^{1}\) See Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, farnily type, income, analysis unit. 'The consumption figures given in this table include food consumed by paid farm or household help, boarders, and guests as well as by mennbers of the economice family. 2This table includes households of families in the consumption sample that furaished supplementary scbedules (food check lists). See Methodology for the States and counties except the Southerast where special studics of white sharecre studied in all regions were made. See Methodoloyy before using these data for regional comparions.

Includes bacon and salt pork.
Averages are based on the number of bouseholds in each class (column 2).
Ineludes veal, lamb, mutton. and miscellantous meat products.
Average based on fewer than 3 casts.
Negro operators and sharecroppers.

TABLE 50.-GRATN PRODUCTS AND SUGARS CONSUMED AT HOME DUHING ONE WREK (7-DAY ESTIMATE): Number of households consuming grain products and sugars, and avcrage quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936
[Households of nourelief farm tamilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis unit, farmily type, and incone class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Mouse-} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Households consuming-} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {s }}\) quantity per household} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Average 'value per household} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugat, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain produets} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Baked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour. meals, cereals \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves \\
(6)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equivalent \({ }^{6}\) \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
J3aked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(8)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals. cereals \\
(9)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves" \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(12)
\end{tabular} & Baked goods \({ }^{3}\) (13) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals. cereals \\
(14)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(15)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups. preserves \\
(17)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
new engiland, middie atlantic, and \\
All types. north cienthal.
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{No.} \\
& 2,557
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathrm{Nin}_{2,164}
\] & No.
\[
2,505
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 2,539
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
No. \\
1, 905
\end{tabular} & \[
{ }_{14.5}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 7.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\stackrel{L b_{9 .}}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Lb. } \\
6.3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
2.4
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Doit, } \\
\text { 1.3 }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.73
\end{tabular} & Dol.
\[
0.60
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.73
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.35
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.38
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \(0-499\)
600.989 & \({ }_{6}^{164}\) & 130
517 & 159
609 & 164
621 & 104
424
4 & 12.2
12.6 & 5. 7 & 8.4 & 5.6
5. 6 & 1.6
1.9 & 1.07 & . 57 & \begin{tabular}{|l}
.50 \\
52 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 55 & \(\begin{array}{r}.30 \\ .30 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 25
27 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 757 & \(6{ }_{6} 29\) & 735 & 750 & 561 & 14.3 & 6.7 & 9.8 & 6.3 & 2.4 & 1.28 & . 69 & 59 & . 71 & . 35 & . 36 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 493 & 428 & 486 & 488 & 384 & 16.0 & 8.0 & 10.6 & 6. 6 & 2.7 & 1.46 & . 82 & . 84 & . 79 & . 36 & . 43 \\
\hline 2,00火 2 2,499 & 362 & 321 & 361 & 360 & 297 & 16.3 & 8.6 & 10.5 & 7. 4 & 3.3 & 1. 57 & . 88 & - 69 & . 91 & . 41 & . 49 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
3,000-4,009. \\
5,000 or over
\end{tabular} & 135 & 121 & 134 & 135
21 & 118 & 17.6
13.6 & 10.5
8.9 & 10.6
7.6 & 7.3
6.5 & 3.4
2.6 & 1. 76
I. 46 & & . 71 & . 94 & . 37 & . 54 \\
\hline Type 1. & 553 & 489 & 533 & 545 & 366 & 10.0 & 5.6 & 6.2 & 4.6 & 1.7 & . 96 & . 57 & . 39 & . 51 & . 25 & 26 \\
\hline 0-409 & 74 & 60 & 72 & 74 & 46 & 10.1 & 4.7 & 7.0 & 4.1 & 1.4 & . 87 & . 47 & . 40 & . 43 & . 24 & . 19 \\
\hline \(500-999\). & 191 & 171 & 184 & 190 & 116 & 9.2 & 5.4 & 5. 6 & 4.2
4.9 & 1.6 & \(\begin{array}{r}.90 \\ .98 \\ \hline 80\end{array}\) & .55
.59 & .35
.39
. & . 48 & - 23 & . 25 \\
\hline 1, \(1,5000001,499\) & 135 & \(\begin{array}{r}119 \\ 87 \\ \hline 8\end{array}\) & 127
93 & 132
92 & \({ }_{68}^{91}\) & 10.1 & 5.5
6.6 & 6. \({ }_{\text {6. }}\) 5 9 & 4.9 & 1.6 2.1 & .98
1.05 & . 59 & .39
.410 & . 51 & . 27 & . 24 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 4 & 38 & 40 & 10 & 32 & 12.0 & 6. 5 & 7. 6 & 4.9 & 2.1 & 1.14 & . 6.5 & .49 & . 60 & . 27 & . 33 \\
\hline 3,000-4,994. & 13 & 11 & 13 & 13 & \(\stackrel{10}{3}\) & 11.2
7 & 5.0
3.4 & 7.9
5.1 & 5.5
5.0 & 2.0 & 1. \({ }^{1} 72\) & . 35 & . 517 & . 62 & \(\begin{array}{r}.29 \\ .29 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 33
.18 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 4 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 7.4 & 3.4 & 5.1 & 5.0 & & \(\cdot 72\) & & & & & . 19 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 603 & 528 & 589 & 601 & 461 & 13.1 & 7.0 & 8.4 & 6.0 & 2.4 & 1.20 & . 72 & . 54 & . 70 & . 33 & . 37 \\
\hline O-499 & 29 & 21 & 28 & 29 & 21 & 11.9 & 4.8 & 8.7 & 5.4 & 2.3 & 1.03 & . 49 & . 54 & . 61 & . 29 & . 38 \\
\hline 1500-6099, & 151 & 129 & 147 & 1.51 & 106 & 12.0 & 6.1 & 7.9 & 5.4 & 1.8 & 1. 12 & . 63 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.59 \\
.51 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & & & . 28 \\
\hline 1,000 1,599 & 218 & 191 & 212 & 216 & 162 & 12.7 & 6.9 & 8.1 & 6.0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2.3 \\
2.5 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & 1.22
1.39 & . 71 & . 51 & . 70 & . 34 & . 36 \\
\hline 1,560-1,999. & 104
71 & 94 & 101
71 & 104
71 & 81
64 & \begin{tabular}{l}
13.9 \\
14.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 8.2
7.6 & 8.4
9.4 & 6. 6 & 2.5
3.1 & 1.39
1.42 & . 88 & .64 & . 86 & . 36 & . 49 \\
\hline 3,004-4,999 & 27 & 24 & 27 & 27 & 24 & 14.7 & 8.1 & 9.3 & 6.0 & 3.1 & 1. 58 & . 91 & , 17 & . 82 & . 33 & . 49 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 16.6 & 5.7 & 12.8 & 6. 3 & 3.1 & 1.31 & . 53 & . 78 & . 89 & . 36 & . 53 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sce footnotes at end of table.

Table 50.-ghain prodects and sugars consumej at home during one weer (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming grain products and sugars, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, March-November 1986-Continued
[Honsehoids of nonrelief farm fomilies that include a busbend and wife, both native-born 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income chass (dollars)
(1)} & \multirow{3}{*}{House-
bolds} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Housebolds consurning-} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Averene 'quadity per househeld} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{A verage s value per household} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugre, siflups, preserpes} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Haked goods \({ }^{2}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & Fhour, meals, cereals & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves \({ }^{4}\) \\
(6)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equiva leat \({ }^{\circ}\) \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & Baked goodsa & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meats, ceresls \\
(1)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirujs, preserves \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(12)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Bakert goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(13)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flonar, monts. cereals \\
(14)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(15)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & Sirups, pre serves (17) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
new engiand, middlif atiantic, and NORTH \& ENTBAL-conlinued \\
Types 4 and 5 .
\end{tabular} & \[
\underset{923}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
{ }_{7 T O}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No}, \\
\mathrm{gio}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{\mathrm{gl},}{\mathrm{No}}
\] & \[
\underset{\text { G80 }}{\text { No }}
\] & Lo. & \[
\stackrel{L D}{7.8}
\] & \[
I b_{3}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \mathrm{sb} \\
7.0
\end{array}
\] & \[
\stackrel{L b}{2.4}
\] & \[
\text { Dol. }_{\text {L. } 42}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { BoI. } \\
& 0.79
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.63
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dot. } \\
& 0.70
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dot. } \\
& \text { f.3B }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& \quad 0.38
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline  & 69
163
204
264
183
159
68
98 & 38
163
213
160
138
60
8 & 47
190
290
188
182
169
65
9 & 49
190
262
181
158
68
98
9 & \(2 k\)
123
123
201
139
113
59
6 & 14.2
14.5
14.9
16.6
16.5
17.3
14.5 & \(\begin{array}{r}8.8 \\ 8.1 \\ 6.2 \\ 78.0 \\ 8.5 \\ 88.5 \\ 11.6 \\ 9.8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 8.8
10.3
10.2
10.9
10.8
8.5
7.9 & 7.4
8.6
6.7
7.0
7.7
7.5
7.5 & 1.5
1.7
2.4
2.4
2.6
2.9
3.0
2.3 & 1.32
1.22
1.33
1.49
1.58
1.80
1.34 & .77
.62
.71
.86
.89
1.14
1.01 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.55 \\
.60 \\
.62 \\
.83 \\
.69 \\
.68 \\
.58 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
.63 \\
.58 \\
.75 \\
.82 \\
.87 \\
.83 \\
.87 \\
\hline 8
\end{tabular} & .37
.33
.36
.39
.42
.43
.43 & \(\begin{array}{r}.26 \\ .25 \\ .39 \\ .43 \\ .45 \\ .52 \\ .44 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 478 & 377 & 473 & 478 & 398 & 19.6 & 8.1 & 14.2 & 7.6 & 3.5 & 1.67 & . 82 & . 85 & . 92 & 42 & . 50 \\
\hline 0-499 & 12 & 8 & 12 & 12 & , & 18.4 & 5.0 & 15.1 & 7.2 & 1.9 & 1. 34 & 57 & 77 & 71 & . 43 & . 31 \\
\hline \(5100-4899\). & 10 & \({ }^{6}\) & 888 & 90 & 73 & 18.9 & 5.9 & 12.8 & 6.7 & 28 & 1.31 & . 57 & . 74 & . 72 & . 36 & . 36 \\
\hline 1,0000.1,4199 & 160 & \({ }^{1096}\) & 138 & 140 & 107 & 19.5 & 6. 9 & 14.9 & 7.2 & 3.0 & 1.57 & . 78 & - 86 & . 85 & . 40 & . 45 \\
\hline 1, \(1.5060-1.499\). & 111 & 87 & 110
91 & 111 & \% 83 & 21.8
19.1 & \(\begin{array}{r}\text { 8. } \\ \text { to. } \\ \text { \% } \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
18.2 \\
12.1
\end{tabular} & 7.7
8.7 & 3.5
4.8 & 1.81
1.85 & - 8.88 & . 88 & 1.94
1.12 & . 47 & . 52 \\
\hline 3,000-4,899 & 29 & 26 & 29 & 2 & 25 & 24.2 & 12.8 & 35.6 & 8.7 & 3. 1 & 2.18 & 1. 23 & . 85 & 1. 22 & . 47 & . 76 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 15.1 & 13.7 & 5.8 & 6.2 & 3.9 & 1.98 & 1.50 & . 48 & 1.12 & . 33 & . 79 \\
\hline All types. & 1,007 & 687 & 986 & 1,000 & 676 & 12.7 & \({ }_{6} 13\) & 9.8 & 4.0 & 1.7 & 97 & 45 & . 52 & . 54 & . 28 & 28 \\
\hline Net losses. . Net Hommes & \[
\begin{array}{r}
30 \\
971
\end{array}
\] & \[
68
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36 \\
850
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
36 \\
969
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
25 \\
651
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 14.3 \\
& 12.0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3.6 \\
4.3
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
11.9 \\
9.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 6.1 \\
& 4.8
\end{aligned}
\] & 1.9
1.7 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
96 \\
.97
\end{array}
\] & \[
.38
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .58 \\
& .52
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
.61
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.33 \\
.23
\end{array}
\] & . 28 \\
\hline \[
50-490 \ldots
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 170 \\
& 272
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 112 \\
& 177
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 165 \\
& 267
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 168 \\
& 269
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 109 \\
& 171
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
10.8 \\
1.5
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3.5 \\
& 3.4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 8.5 \\
& 9.2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4.8 \\
& 4.8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.3 \\
& 1.4
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .84 \\
& .84
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.38 \\
.35
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.46 \\
.49
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.46 \\
.48
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .26 \\
& .20
\end{aligned}
\] & . 22 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 50.-Grain producis and sugaks consumed at home during one week ( 7 -day fatimate): Number of households consuming grain products and sugars, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986-Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fouseholds} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Households consuming...} & \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Average \({ }^{\text {c quantity j per bousehold }}\)} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{A verage s value per household} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Gruin products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} \\
\hline & (2) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Raked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Fiour, meals, cereals \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preServes 4 \\
(6)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equivalent \({ }^{6}\) \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & Baked goods à
\[
\text { ( } 8 \text { ) }
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals, cereals \\
(9)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves \({ }^{4}\) \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & All
(12) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Baked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(13)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meats, coreals \\
(14)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(15)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves 4 \\
(17)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHEAST-WHITE OPERATORS \\
All types.
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 2,350 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 1,141
\end{aligned}
\] & No.
\[
2,342
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
N \mathrm{n}_{+} \\
2,330
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
No. \\
1,642
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(L b\). \\
29.7
\end{tabular} & Lb. 1. 4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 28.7
\end{aligned}
\] & Lb. 5.1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lb. } \\
& \text { 2. } \mathrm{f}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Doi. } \\
& \text { 1. } 21
\end{aligned}
\] & Dol. 0.15 & Dol. 1.06 & Dol. 0.59 & Dol.
\[
0.29
\] & Dol. 0.30 \\
\hline \(0-499\)
\(500-999\). & 279
915 & 83
303 & 279
916 & 277 & 168 & 2 2t. 0 & . 5 & 25.7 & 3.7 & 1.8 & .95 & . 08 & . 89 & . 40 & . 21 & . 19 \\
\hline 1,000-1.499 & 916
523 & 303
300 & 916
516 & 903 & 636
\(3 \times 5\) & 29.3
31.5 & .7
1.7 & 28.8
30.4 & 4.7
5.4 & 2.5
3.1 & 1.10
1.30 & . 078 & 1.03 & . 53 & . 26 & . 27 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 270 & 173 & 270 & 267 & 200 & 31.5
31.7 & 1.8 & 30. 5 & 5. 5 & 2. 8 & 1.30
1.33 & . 18 & 1.12 & . 66 & . 31 & .36
.32 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 222 & 165 & 221 & 222 & 148 & 30.0 & 2.4 & 28.4 & 5.8 & 2.2 & 1.39 & . 26 & 1.13 & . 63 & . 33 & . 32 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,999\)
5,000 or over & 101 & 79 & 101 & 101 & 78 & 28.3 & 3.3 & 26.1 & 6. 5 & 2.8 & 1. 42 & . 34 & 1.08 & . 74 & . 38 & . 36 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 39 & 88 & 39 & 39 & 27 & 28.7 & 5.7 & 24.9 & 6. 8 & 2.9 & 1.79 & . 58 & 1.21 & . 84 & . 40 & . 44 \\
\hline Type I & 382 & 187 & 339 & 377 & 237 & 20.0 & 1.1 & 19.3 & 3.9 & 1.5 & . 84 & . 32 & . 72 & . 42 & . 22 & . 20 \\
\hline 0-499. & 93 & 34 & 93 & 93 & 52 & 21.1 & . 6 & 20.7 & 3.1 & 1.3 & . 79 & . 07 & . 72 & . 33 & . 17 & . 16 \\
\hline -500-999 & 155 & 68
38 & 155 & 150 & 97 & 20.4 & . 8 & 19.9 & 3.8 & 1.5 & . 81 & . 08 & .73 & . 41 & . 22 & . 19 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 74
22 & 38
15 & 71
22 & 74 & 50
12 & 19.8 & 1.5 & 18.8 & 3.9 & 1. 7 & . 81 & . 16 & . 75 & . 43 & . 23 & . 20 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 18 & 16 & 18 & 18 & 11 & 17.4 & 2.4 & 15.8 & 4.9 & 1. 6 & . 81 & . 178 & . 64 & . 49 & . 28 & . 21 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 13 & 9 & 13 & 13 & 8 & 15.3 & 2.2 & 13.8 & 4.3 & 1.3 & . 89 & . 24 & . 65 & . 42 & . 25 & .20
.17 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 7 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 23.3 & 4.2 & 20.5 & 5.2 & 4.4 & 1. 51 & . 46 & 1.05 & .42
1.10 & . 31 & . 79 \\
\hline [ypes 2 and 3. & 511 & 268 & 510 & 510 & 373 & 24. 7 & 1.5 & 23, 7 & 4.6 & 2.2 & 1.07 & . 16 & . 91 & . 53 & . 26 & 27 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-499 \\
& 500-999
\end{aligned}
\] & 79
248 & \({ }_{95}^{22}\) & & 79
240 & & 24.7 & . 4 & 24.4 & 4. 1 & 1.9 & . 90 & . 04 & 86 & . 44 & . 24 & . 20 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 241
92 & 95
68 & 241 & 240 & 170 & 25.0 & . 88 & 24.5 & 4.5 & 2. 1 & 1.02 & . 09 & . 93 & . 51 & . 25 & . 26 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 44 & 39 & 91
44 & 92 & 75 & 24.9 & 2.6 & 23.2 & 4. 9 & 2.7 & 1.13 & . 23 & . 90 & . 60 & .27 & . 33 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999. & 33 & 28 & 33 & 44 & 39
21 & 22.9 & 2.8
2.9 & 21.0 & 5.1 & 2.3 & 1. 19 & . 33 & . 86 & . 63 & . 29 & . 34 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 16 & 16 & 16 & 16 & 11 & 24.3 & 4.6 & 21.2 & 5.1 & 1.7 & 1.22 & . 29 & . 93 & - 53 & . 30 & . 23 \\
\hline 5,000 or aver & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 3 & 21.0 & 5. 9 & 17.0 & 6.3 & 1.5 & 1, 47 & . 48 & . 96 & .56
.54 & .30
-38 & . 26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 50.-Grain products and sugars consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming grain products and sugars, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{\prime}\)
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis unit, tamily type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Housebolds} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Households consuming-} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Average s quantity per household} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {s value per household }}\)} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Sugar, sirups, preserves} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Grain products} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Sughr, sirups, preserves} \\
\hline & (2) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Maked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals, cereals \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves \({ }^{4}\) \\
(6)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equiva lent 6 \\
(7)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Baked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(8)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals, cereals \\
(9)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar \\
(10)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Sirups, preserves \({ }^{4}\) \\
(11)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(12)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Baked goods \({ }^{3}\) \\
(13)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Flour, meals, coreals \\
(14)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
(15)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Suger \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Stirups, preserves \\
(17)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHEAST-WHITE SHARECROPPERScontinued \\
Types 6 and 7 \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & No. 170 & No. 73 & No. 170 & No. 167 & No. 115 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 37.9
\end{aligned}
\] & Lb. 1.0 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 37.2
\end{aligned}
\] & Lb. 4. 7 & \(2 b\). 2.8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
1. 43
\end{tabular} & Dol. 0.12 & Dol. 1.31 & Dol.
\[
0.57
\] & Dol. 0.27 & Dal. 0. 30 \\
\hline 0-499. & 28 & 6 & 28 & 26 & 18 & 34.1 & . 5 & 33.8 & 4.0 & 2.4 & 1. 26 & . 05 & 1.21 & . 47 & . 22 & 25 \\
\hline 500-989 & 94 & 34 & 94 & 93 & 61 & 39.2 & . 9 & 38.6 & 4.6 & 2.6 & 1. 43 & . 09 & 1.34 & . 55 & . 27 & . 28 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 38 & 21 & 38 & 38 & 28 & 36.7 & 1.3 & 35.8 & 5.1 & 3.4 & 1. 47 & .16 & 1. 31 & . 63 & . 29 & . 34 \\
\hline 1,500-1, 6.95 & 10 & 9 & 10 & 10 & 8 & 40.7 & 2.8 & 38.8 & 5.8 & 3.8 & 1. 70 & . 32 & 1.3' & . 80 & . 35 & . 45 \\
\hline All types. & 1,564 & 347 & 1, 560 & 1,521 & 838 & 27.9 & . 4 & 27.6 & 3.6 & 2.2 & 1. 01 & . 04 & . 97 & . 37 & . 22 & . 15 \\
\hline 0-499 & 730 & 127 & 728 & 698 & 366 & 25.3 & . 3 & 25.1 & - 3. 1 & 1.9 & . 91 & .03 & . 88 & . 28 & . 18 & . 10 \\
\hline 500-999. & 657 & 155 & 655 & 648 & 365 & 30.0 & . 5 & 29.7 & 4.1 & 2.3 & 1.08 & . 05 & 1.03 & . 41 & . 24 & .17 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 149 & 53 & 149 & 147 & 89 & 30.8 & . 8 & 30.3 & 4.3 & 2. 6 & 1. 19 & . 08 & 1.11 & . 47 & . 25 & . 22 \\
\hline 1,500-1,989 & 20 & 7 & 20 & 20 & 13 & 28.7 & . 5 & 28.4 & 4.5 & 2.5 & 1.07 & . 05 & 1.02 & . 47 & . 26 & . 21 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999. & 6 & 5 & 6 & 6 & 4 & 26.3 & 1.7 & 25.2 & 6. 2 & 1.7 & 1. 09 & . 18 & . 91 & + 52 & - 30 & +22 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,999\)
5,000 or \(\mathbf{0} 5 \mathrm{cr}\) & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \(? 75.0\) & 7.0 & \({ }^{7} 75.0\) & 77.0 & 7.0
7.0 & 12.83
+1.20 & 7.00 & \({ }^{7} 2.83\) & +.42 & \%. 42 & \%.06 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 128.1 & ?. 0 & \({ }^{7} 28.1\) & 75.0 & ז2.9 & \({ }^{7} 1.20\) & 7.00 & \({ }^{7} 1.20\) & \({ }^{7} .50\) & \({ }^{\text {T. } 25}\) & '. 25 \\
\hline Type 1. & 268 & 61 & 264 & 259 & 142 & 18.3 & . 5 & 18.0 & 2.9 & 1.6 & . 70 & . 05 & . 65 & . 27 & . 17 & . 10 \\
\hline 0-499- & 172 & 24 & 170 & 167 & 87 & 18. 4 & . 3 & 18.2 & 2.7 & 1.7 & - 67 & . 02 & . 65 & . 25 & . 16 & . 09 \\
\hline \(50 \mathrm{~N}-899\) & 80 & 31 & 80 & 79 & 47 & 18.4 & . 8 & 17.9 & 3.1 & 1.7 & . 75 & . 10 & . 65 & . 32 & . 18 & . 14 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 11 & 5 & 11 & 10 & 6 & 16.7 & . 8 & 16.2 & 3.2 & 1.1 & . 69 & . 07 & . 62 & .33 & . 19 & . 14 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 1 & \(? 16.1\) & 7.0 & \({ }^{7} 16.1\) & 14.5 & 7.4 & \%. 64 & \%.00 & 7. 64 & T. 31 & 7.29 & ?. 02 \\
\hline 2,000-2,909. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \({ }^{7} 17.7\) & 22.6 & \({ }^{7} 16.0\) & ' 5.0 & \({ }^{7} 20\) & 7.83 & 7.20 & \({ }^{7} 63\) & \({ }^{7} .50\) & \({ }^{7} .30\) & 1.20 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline b,000 or over. & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


1 Sex (子lossary for definitions of terms such as household, family type, income, analysis unit. The consumption figures given in this tuthle include faod eonsumed by paid farm or household belp, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the econornic family.
:This table includes households of tamilies in the consumption sample that furnished supplementary schedules (food cheek lists). See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Gouthemst where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these datis for regional comparisons.
\({ }^{3}\) Includes breads, cakes, and pustries not baked at home.
Includes molasses, jams, jellies, candies.
Averages are based on the number of households in each class (column 2). - Two-thirds of the weight of baked goods has been added to that of flour, meals, cereals. 7 Average based on fewer than 3 cases.
- Negro operators and sharecroppers.
 potatocs and other vegetables, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 Stales, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936
[ifonsetholds of nonrelief farm families that include s busband and wife, both native-born a]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Amalysis unit, family type, and income class (dolfars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Iousebolds \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Households consuming -} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{A verages guantity yer houschald} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {a }}\) Walue ger household} \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any varetables, fruit, nuts \({ }^{2}\) \\
(i)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Potatoes, swert-potstoes} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potsleves, sweet-potatoes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Otber vegetables} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
A!
vegetables, fruit, nuts \({ }^{3}\) \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potstons, Swert-potatoes \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegrlahles} \\
\hline & & & & Fresh & Canmed & Đried & & Fresh & Canned & Drjed & & & Fresh & Canned & Dried \\
\hline & & & & (5) & (6) & (7) & & (9) & (10) & (11) & & & (14) & (15) & (16) \\
\hline \multicolumn{16}{|l|}{NEW RNGLAND, GIDDIE ATLANTIC, \(\triangle N D\) NORTH CENTRAL} \\
\hline  & No.
\[
2,357
\] & No. 2,504 & No.
\[
2,466
\] & No. 2, 163 & \begin{tabular}{l}
No. \\
1,687
\end{tabular} & No. 972 & LS. 22.9 & In. 9.0 & I. \(b\). 3.4 & \(L b\). 0.7 & Dol.
\[
1.80
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.32
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dot. } \\
0.38
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{01} . \\
0.25
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Doi. } \\
& 0.05
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 0-199 & 164 & 163 & 154 & 129 & 92 & 69 & 19.1 & 7. 6 & 2.2 & . 6 & 1.32 & . 28 & . 29 & .16 & . 04 \\
\hline 1,000-5199 & 625 & 625 & 601 & 500 & 388 & 198 & 18.5 & 7.0 & 3.0 & . 6 & 1. 43 & . 27 & . 30 & . 20 & . 04 \\
\hline 1,500-1,995 & 493 & 795
493 & 731
476 & 651 & 498
345 & 1801 & 23.1
23.0 & 8.2 & 3.4
3.6 & . 8 & 1.74
1.87 & .33
.33 & .35
.41 & . 25 & . 695 \\
\hline 2,0000-2,949 & 362 & 362 & 351 & 320 & 249 & 153 & 27.8 & 12.5 & 3.9 & . 8 & 2. 24 & +.38 & . 510 & . 28 & . 06 \\
\hline 3, \(0,00-4,999\). & 135 & 135 & 132 & 121 & 98 & 66 & 32.4 & 14.8 & 4.4 & . 9 & 2. 60 & . 45 & . 62 & . 32 & . 07 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 21 & 21 & 21 & 19 & 15 & 10 & 31.5 & 7.7 & 4.5 & . 8 & 2.40 & . 38 & . 37 & . 38 & . 07 \\
\hline Type i.. & 553 & 351 & 522 & 440 & 354 & \(1{ }^{16} 6\) & 14.0 & 5.9 & 2.7 & . 5 & 1.33 & . 22 & . 28 & . 19 & . 03 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-499 \\
& 500-999
\end{aligned}
\] & 74 & 73 & 70 & 559 & 45 & 19 & 13.4 & 4. 8 & 2.6 & . 4 & 1. 10 & . 21 & . 20 & , 18 & . 03 \\
\hline 1,000-1, 5098 & 191 & 191 & 181 & 349 & 114 & 43 & 13.3 & 5.0 & 2.4 & -4 & 1.15 & . 21 & . 23 & , 16 & . 03 \\
\hline 1,590-1,999- & 135
9.5 & 134 & 127
87 & 114 & 91 & 47 & 14.5 & 6. 2.4 & 2.9 & . 6 & 1. 48 & - 24 & -28 & . 21 & . 04 \\
\hline 2,000-2,949 & 41 & 41 & 41 & 33 & 25 & 17 & 16.4 & 9.4 & 2.6 & .6 & 1. 30 & . 26 & . 38 & . 27 & . 05 \\
\hline 3,600-4,999 & 13 & 13 & 12 & 9 & 10 & 5 & 14.2 & 7.7 & 3.5 & . 6 & 1.71 & . 28 & . 31 & .19 & . 03 \\
\hline 5.506 or over & 4 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 9.1 & 3.3 & 2.2 & .2 & 1.49 & . 21 & . 43 & . 13 & . 01 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 6013 & 603 & 587 & 503 & 411 & 221 & 20.9 & 8.6 & 3.5 & + 6 & 1.78 & . 31 & . 36 & . 25 & . 04 \\
\hline 0-199 & 29 & 29 & 29 & 25 & 20 & 15 & 21. 2 & 9.6 & 2.4 & . 8 & 1. 59 & -30) & . 33 & . 18 & . 05 \\
\hline 300-898 & 151 & 151 & 147 & 121 & 100 & 61 & 18.3 & 7.3 & 3.2 & . 5 & 1.51 & . 27 & . 33 & . 22 & +04 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 218 & 218 & 212 & 182 & 142 & 81 & 20.7 & 7.8 & 3.8 & .7 & 1. 72 & .32 & . 34 & . 26 & +05 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999. & 514 & 104 & 100 & 85 & 76 & 31 & 21.2 & 9.9 & 3.7 & . 5 & 1.93 & . 313 & . 37 & - 27 & . 04 \\
\hline 2,0100-2,999 & 71 & 71 & 70 & 63 & 52 & 30 & 24.4 & 10.6 & 3.7 & . 8 & 1.95 & . 33 & . 42 & . 26 & . 06 \\
\hline 3,000-4,909. & 27 & 27 & 26 & 24 & 18 & 11 & 26.8 & 14.2 & 3.2 & . 6 & 2. 52 & . 42 & . 59 & . 25 & . 05 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 26.7 & 5.5 & 9.8 & 1.3 & 2. 77 & . 48 & . 41 & . 98 & . 11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 51.-potatoes and other vegetables consumed at home duhing one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming
 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Households \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Households consumaing--} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{4}\) yturntity \(p\) cr household} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{A verage \({ }^{\text {a }}\) value per household} \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any vagetables, fruit, nuts \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, sweet-potstoes \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetalsles} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, sweet-potatoes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All vegetables, fruit, nuts \({ }^{3}\) \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Potatoes, sweet-potatoes
(13)} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} \\
\hline & & & & Fresh & Canned & Dried & & Fresh & Canned & Dried & & & Fresh & Canned & Jried \\
\hline & & & & (5) & (6) & (7) & & (3) & (10) & (11) & & & (14) & (15) & (16) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{flains, mountains, and pacific -con. Types 2 and 3. \(\qquad\)} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \[
306
\] & \[
304
\] & \[
295
\] & \[
261
\] & \[
231
\] & \[
105
\] & \[
12.0
\] & \[
7.0
\] & 3.1 & \[
0.6
\] & \[
1.66
\] & \[
0.24
\] & \[
0.32
\] & 0.27 & \[
0.04
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Net losses. \\
Net incomes
\end{tabular}} & 10 & 10 & 10 & 9 & 10 & 5 & 13.8 & 4.9 & 4.8 & . 4 & 1.89 & . 38 & . 25 & . 41 & . 02 \\
\hline & 296 & 294 & 285 & 252 & 221 & 100 & 12.0 & 7.1 & 3.0 & . 6 & 1.65 & . 24 & . 32 & . 26 & . 04 \\
\hline \(0-499 \ldots\)
\(500-999\) & 55
86 & 55
86 & 54 & 40 & 45
61 & 16 & 11.5 & 4.0 & 3.3 & . 5 & 1. 50 & . 26 & - 21 & . 29 & . 03 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 72 & 71 & 70 & 66 & 58 & 21 & 12.5 & 8.6 & 3.2 & . 5 & 1.74 & . 26 & . 41 & . 28 & . 03 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999. & 49 & 48 & 46 & 45 & 32 & 22 & 12. 1 & 8.9 & 2.6 & .9 & 1. 75 & . 22 & . 35 & . 23 & . 06 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 23 & 23 & 21 & 21 & 18 & 8 & 11.4 & 7.1 & 3.5 & . 5 & 2.07 & . 20 & . 40 & . 30 & . 03 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 10 & 10 & 10 & 9 & 6 & 4 & 14.2 & 9.4 & 2.1 & 1. 1 & 1. 71 & . 24 & . 39 & . 14 & . 08 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 86.0 & \({ }^{1} 18.0\) & : 2.2 & 81.0 & \({ }^{1} 3.14\) & ¢. 30 & \({ }^{5} 1.23\) & 1. 20 & 5. 10 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 419 & 418 & 402 & 364 & 288 & 152 & 14.9 & 8.9 & 3.3 & . 7 & 1.83 & . 29 & . 37 & . 28 & . 04 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Net losses \\
Net incomes
\end{tabular}} & 11 & 11 & 11 & 8 & 9 & 7 & 18.9 & 4.2 & 1.8 & . 7 & 1.85 & . 27 & . 30 & . 41 & . 04 \\
\hline & 408 & 407 & 391 & 356 & 279 & 145 & 14.8 & 9.0 & 3.2 & .7 & 1.82 & .29 & . 38 & . 27 & . 04 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-499 \\
& 500-999 .
\end{aligned}
\]} & 55 & 55 & 50 & 43 & 40 & 30 & 14.3 & 4.6 & 3.0 & . 9 & 1.52 & . 32 & . 23 & . 24 & . 06 \\
\hline & 95 & 94 & 93 & 84 & 64 & 37 & 14.0 & 7.0 & 3.3 & . 6 & 1.72 & . 30 & . 31 & . 27 & . 04 \\
\hline 1,900-1,499 & 102 & 102 & 97 & 87 & 67 & 33 & 15.6 & 8.8 & 3.3 & . 7 & 1.77 & . 28 & . 37 & . 27 & . 05 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 71 & 71 & 70 & 62 & 48 & 22 & 15.0 & 11.3 & 3.1 & .7 & 1. 98 & . 29 & . 44 & . 29 & . 04 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 63 & 63 & 59 & 59 & 43 & 17 & 14.0 & 12.5 & 3.3 & . 6 & 2.10 & . 27 & . 51 & . 29 & . 03 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 18 & 18 & 18 & 17 & I5 & 5 & 19.7 & 11.4 & 3.8 & .6 & 2.06 & .35 & . 44 & . 32 & . 04 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 11.2 & 15.5 & 1.2 & . 6 & 2.06 & . 34 & . 68 & . 08 & . 02 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 51.-potatoes and other vegetables constumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming potatoes and other vegetables, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2]}\)



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 51.-potatoes and other vegetables consumed at home during one week (7-day metimate): Number of houscholds consuming potatoes and other vegetables, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936--Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include s husband and wifa, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{ETouseholds} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Households consuming-} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{A verage 4 quantity per household} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{A frrage ' value per household} \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any vegetables, ruit, nuts \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, swect-potatoes \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetatiles} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Potatoes, sweet-potatoes
(8)} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All vegetables, fruit, nuts \({ }^{3}\) \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, sweetpota* toes \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Other vegetables} \\
\hline & & & & Fresh & Canned & Iried & & Fresh & Canned & Dried & & & Fresh & Canned & Dried \\
\hline (I) & (2) & & & (5) & (6) & (7) & & (9) & (10) & (11) & & & (14) & (15) & (16) \\
\hline SOUTHEAST NEGRO FAMILIES \({ }^{6}\)-con. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
339
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
{ }^{\mathrm{NO}} \mathrm{3} 16
\] & \(\stackrel{\text { No. }}{176}\) & 288 & \({ }_{\text {No. }}\) & \[
56
\] & \[
7.3
\] & \[
\stackrel{L b .}{11.2}
\] & IA. 0.3 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Lb. } \\
0.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
0.90
\] & \[
0.20
\] & \[
0.44
\] & 0.02 & 002
0.04 \\
\hline O-499 & 127 & 111 & 48 & 96 & 13 & 15 & 3.7 & 9.9 & .3 & . 8 & . 73 & . 10 & . 40 & . 02 & . 02 \\
\hline 500-999 & 166 & 159 & 88 & 148 & 20 & 28 & 7.8 & 11.4 & . 4 & . 5 & . 92 & . 22 & . 44 & . 03 & . 03 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 38 & 38 & 33 & 36 & 4 & 11 & 14.4 & 13.6 & . 2 & 1.4 & 1.31 & . 43 & . 50 & . 02 & . 08 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 2 & 19.0 & 13,5 & . 4 & 1.5 & 1. 28 & . 54 & . 54 & . 02 & . 09 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{24.0}\) & 54.0 & 3.0 & 8.0 & 3.86 & 6. 66 & 3.20 & 3.00 & 5.00 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 1 & 1 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 8.0 & \({ }^{5} 41.5\) & 8.0 & 0.0 & 82.80 & 6.00 & -2.40 & 3.00 & 3.00 \\
\hline 5,000 or over . & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

For fruit and nuts, see table 52.
Averages are based on the number of households in each class (column 2).
A verage based on ewer than a cases.
Negro operators and sbarecroppers.

Table 52.-fritt, nots, and miscellaneods foods consumpd at home during one weer (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming fruit, nuts, and miscellaneous foods, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936
[Households of nonrelief farm families that includo a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{House. holds} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Housebolds consuming-} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{A verage s quantity per household} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Averages value per houschold} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Nuts, mut butter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Miscellaneous foods} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruit} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Nuts, nut butter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Miscellaneous roods} \\
\hline & & Fresh & Canned & Dried & & Coffee, tea, cocoa \({ }^{3}\) & Other \({ }^{1}\) & Fresh & Canned & Dried & Fresh & Canned & Dried & & CotTee, teq, \(\operatorname{cocos}{ }^{3}\) & Other \({ }^{4}\) \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
NEW ENGLAND, MIDDEE ATLANTIC, AND NORTH CENTRAL \\
All types. \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 2,557
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Na.} \\
& 2,171
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{No.} \\
& 1,398
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 778 & No. 619 & No. 2,388 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 2,487
\end{aligned}
\] & Lb. 10. 5 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
L b . \\
2 .
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
L b . \\
0.6
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.53
\end{gathered}
\] & Dot.
\[
0.17
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.06
\end{gathered}
\] & Dol. 0. 04 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.25
\end{aligned}
\] & Dol. 0.25 \\
\hline 0-499 & 625 & 116
499 & 81
302 & \(\begin{array}{r}44 \\ 154 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 27
107 & 154
581 & 160
604 & 8. 8 & 2. 0 & .4
.4 & .34
.40 & 13
.14 & . 05 & . 03 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.23 \\
.82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 21 \\
\hline 5001-14,99, & 625
757 & 499
634 & 302
400 & 154 & 107
186 & 581
709 & 604
789 & 7.7
9.6 & 3. 9 & . 4 & . 40 & .14
.15 & .05
.06 & . 03 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.22 \\
.25 \\
\hline 28
\end{tabular} & . 24 \\
\hline 1,506-1,999 & 493 & 446 & 293 & 162 & 146 & 469 & 479 & 11.5 & 2. 6 & .6 & . 60 & .19 & . 07 & . 015 & . 27 & . 29 \\
\hline 2,000-2,009 & 362 & 330 & 223 & 118 & 99 & 340 & 353 & 14.4 & 2.7 & . 7 & . 69 & . 20 & . 08 & . 05 & . 29 & . 32 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 135 & 125 & 86 & 158 & 45 & 125 & 131 & 16.8 & 3. 0 & \(\begin{array}{r}.9 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & . 75 & . 22 & . 11 & . 06 & . 30 & - 27 \\
\hline \(5,0 \mathrm{KH}\) or over. & 21 & 21 & 13 & 11 & 9 & 20 & 21 & 12.6 & 3.3 & 1.3 & . 75 & . 25 & .12 & . 08 & . 31 & . 28 \\
\hline Type 1. & 553 & 453 & 257 & 146 & 80 & 501 & 527 & 7.8 & 1.9 & . 4 & . 42 & . 14 & . 05 & . 02 & . 22 & . 19 \\
\hline 0-499. & 74 & 51 & 37 & 21 & 8 & 68 & 72 & 6. 5 & 1.9 & . 4 & . 30 & . 12 & . 05 & . 01 & . 21 & . 16 \\
\hline 500-699 & 191 & 149 & 90 & 34 & 24 & 168 & 182 & 6.5 & 1. 6 & . 3 & . 36 & . 12 & .03 & 02 & - 20 & . 17 \\
\hline 1,000 1,499 & 135 & 111 & 72 & 44 & 23 & 124 & 130 & 7.6 & 1. 9 & . 5 & . 46 & . 15 & . 16 & .03
.03 & .24
.22 & . 21 \\
\hline 1,5ik)-1,009 & 95 & 89 & 59 & 29 & 21 & 89 & 88 & 9.9 & 2.3
1.6
2.3 & \(\begin{array}{r}.5 \\ .5 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & .51
.53 & .18
.12 & .016
.06
.06 & (0) \(^{03}\) & .22
.26 & .21 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 41 & 38 & 18 & 12 & 1 & 36 & 39 & 10.1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1.6 \\
2.3 \\
\hline 2.1
\end{tabular} & .5
.6 & . 53 & .12
.19 & . 06 & \({ }^{(6)} 02\) & .26
.22 & +
+14 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,699\)
5,000 or aver & 13
4 & 11
4 & 9
2 & 4
4
4 & \({ }_{1}^{2}\) & 12 & 12
4 & 14.1
5.5 & 2.3
2.1 & . 6 & .65
.41 & . 19 & . .04 & .02
.02 & . 22 & .14
.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 52-mrdit, nUts, and miscellaneous foods consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming fruit, nuts, and miscellaneous foods, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in \(\mathscr{O} O\) States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1996-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 2]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline plains, mo Allypes \(\qquad\) & 1, 087 & & & & 227 & 958 & & 11.0 & 2.1 & & 51 & & & & 271 & . 20 \\
\hline Net losses & 36 & 88 & 18 & 11 & \({ }^{6}\) & 321 & \(3{ }^{34}{ }^{4} 1\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
98 \\
318
\end{tabular} & 2.7 & \begin{tabular}{l|}
\hline 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
.45 \\
.51 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .23
.17 & . 05 & . 05 & . 25 & . 26 \\
\hline Nelimeomes & 971 & 854 & 483 & 217 & 221 & 926 & 915 & & & . 4 & . 51 & & . 04 & & & \\
\hline (1-493 & 170 & 1:38 & 79 & 42 & 22 & 160 & 159 & 8.9 & 2.2 & 4 & 49 & 19 & \({ }^{05}\) & \(.031^{1}\) & \({ }_{24}^{24}\) & . 17 \\
\hline 500499 & 272 & 231 & 128 & 64 & 52 & 258 & 257 & 10.1 & 1.7 & . 5 & . 47 & . 15 & . 05 & & & . 17 \\
\hline 1,04n-1,493 & 222 & 212 & 114 & 50 & 58 & 214 & 2017 & 11.1 & 2.1 & 4 & . 50 & . 17 & . 04 & . 05 & . 28 & . 23 \\
\hline 1,50kt-1,1999 & 154 & \begin{tabular}{l}
136 \\
105 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & (80 & 35
19 & 41
32 & 148
107 & 1.50
103 & 31.7 & 2.3 & .2 & . 68 & . 19 & . 03 & . 08 & . 27 & . 22 \\
\hline 2, 3 , (00) \(0-2,4,999\) & \({ }_{35} 1\) & \({ }_{3} 10\) & 19 & 5 & 12 & 331 & 33 & 11.8 & 2.3 & . 4 & . 53 & . 20 & . 04 & . 10 & . 31 & . 29 \\
\hline 5,060 or ove & 6 & 6 & 5 & 2 & 4 & 6 & \({ }_{6}\) & 12.7 & 4.0 & . 3 & . 67 & 25 & . 04 & . 13 & . 42 & . 47 \\
\hline Type 1, & 282 & 242 & 128 & 49 & 39 & 271 & 2641 & 10.1 & 1.5 & . 3 & . 47 & 13 & . 04 & . 02 & . 27 & 17 \\
\hline Net losses. & 15 & 12 & 6 & 6 & 2 & 13 & 14 & 6.2 & 2.0 & 6 & . 43 & . 19 & .071 & . 02 & . 28. & . 25 \\
\hline Net incomes. & 267 & 230 & 122 & 43 & 37 & 258 & 246 & 10.3 & 1.4 & . 3 & . 47 & .12 & . 03 & . 02 & . 25 & . 17 \\
\hline 0.499. & 60 & 46 & 25 & 11 & 3 & 58 & 65 & 12.0 & 1.5 & 3 & . 47 & . 14 & . 64 & \({ }^{01} 9\) & .\(_{26}^{25}\) & . 15 \\
\hline 5143.939 & 91 & 80 & 4. & 16 & 11 & 88 & 84 & 7.9 & 1.3 & 4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.41 \\
.48 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 12 & & & . 26 & . 16 \\
\hline 1,f(k) \(-1,499\) & 48 & 42 & 23 & 7
3 & 8 & 4.5 & \begin{tabular}{l}
42 \\
33 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 10.5 & 1.7 & . 1 & . 48 & .11 & .03 & . 02 & 27 & . 18 \\
\hline 1,500 1,949 & 34 & 30 & 18
10 & 3
5 & \(\stackrel{6}{7}\) & 34
25
20 & 33
24 & 9.9
16.0 & 1.5 & .1 & . 59 & . 11 & . 03 & . 06 & . 28 & . 23 \\
\hline 3,010-4,999 & & 7 & 5 & 1 & 2 & 7 & 7 & \(\begin{array}{r}8.6 \\ \hline 8.8\end{array}\) & \(\stackrel{2.9}{1.0}\) & \(\mathrm{t}^{-1}\) & \(7^{7} 8\) & \({ }_{7} .24\) & \(\begin{array}{r}.01 \\ \hline .00\end{array}\) & \({ }^{.06}\) & .25
7.41 & +.24 \\
\hline 5,(0) or over & & \(t\) & & 0 & 9 & t & 1 & \({ }^{1} 27.0\) & T.0 & & & & & & & , 16 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 306 & 276 & 170 & 78 & 88 & \(2(3)\) & 288 & 11.3 & 2.2 & 4 & 52 & 18 & . 04 & . 05 & . 24 & 22 \\
\hline Net losses & 10 & & & 2 & 2 & 10 & 10 & 6.1 & 4.1 & . 3 & . 431 & . 32 & . 025 & . 065 & . 22 & . 23 \\
\hline Net jucomes. & 296 & 268 & 164 & 76 & 86 & 245 & 278 & 11.5 & 2.1 & . 4 & . 52 & . 17 & & . 05 & & \\
\hline 0-493. & 55 & 48 & 30 & 15 & 13 & 52 & 52 & 8.1 & 2.5 & . 5 & . 42 & . 20 & . 05 & . 04 & . 21 & 19 \\
\hline \(500 \cdot 998\) & 86 & 75 & 41 & \({ }^{2}\) & 25 & 81 & 82 & 12.4 & 1.7 & 4 & . 48 & . 17 & . 05 & . 04 & . 22 & \\
\hline 1,000) -1,493 & 72 & 65 & 4.5 & 20 & 23 & 69 & 68 & 11.3 & 2.1 & - 4 & - 49 & -17 & . 05 & . 68 & . 25 & . 21 \\
\hline 1,5'0-1,999 & 49 & 47 & 25 & 14
3
4 & 17 & \({ }_{28}^{48}\) & 48 & 11.7 & 2.3
2.7 & . 6 & . 89 & . 19 & . 02 & . 68 & . 23 & . 18 \\
\hline 2, \(3,6 \times 100-4,999\) & 23
10 & 22 & 17
5 & 3
2 & \(\begin{array}{r}6 \\ 3 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \({ }_{2}^{23}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}21 \\ 8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 16.6
12.4 & 2.7
1.9 & . 8 & . 61 & . 14 & . 10 & .32 & . 21 & . 29 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,000-4,89 \\
& 5,000 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & , & 716.0 & \({ }_{7}^{19} 9\) & 79 & \({ }^{1}: 1.03\) & . 18 & 1.00 & \({ }^{7} 10\) & \({ }^{7} .48\) & ?. 86 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 419 & 354 & 209 & 101 & 100 & 397 & 401 & 11.3 & 2.5 & 5 & . 53 & 21 & . 05 & . 06 & . 30 & . 21 \\
\hline & & & & & 2 & 9 & 10 & 17.9 & 2.5 & & . 50 & 22 & . 04 & . 07 & . 24 & . 29 \\
\hline Net incomes & 408 & 356 & 293 & 98 & 98 & 388 & 391 & 11.1 & 2.5 & .3 & . 53 & 21 & 05 & . 0.5 & . 30 & . 21 \\
\hline 0-499 & 55 & 44 & 24 & & & & & 6.5 & 2. \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & & & . 22 & .07 & . 62 & 25 & . 19 \\
\hline 5104999 & 95 & 78 & 46 & 26 & 16 & 89 & 91 & 10.3 & 2.2 & . 6 & . 51 & . 18 & . 078 & . 03 & \({ }_{39}^{25}\) & . 18 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 102 & 95 & 46 & \(\stackrel{3}{38}\) & '27 & 100 & 99 & [11.4 & 2.3
28 & \({ }^{-5}\) & . 51 & \(\begin{array}{r}18 \\ .25 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & . 04 & . 06 & 36 & . 22 \\
\hline 1,50)-1,999 & 71 & \({ }_{59} 9\) & \({ }_{31}^{43}\) & 18 & 18 & 68
59 & \({ }_{58}^{69}\) & 11.4 4 & 2.8 & .3 & . 67 & . 21 & . 03 & . 09 & 32 & . 24 \\
\hline 2,016-2,999 & \({ }^{63}\) & \({ }_{17}^{59}\) & 31
9 & \({ }_{2}^{11}\) & 7 & 18 & 18 & 12.7 & 2.6 & .3 & . 5.5 & . 23 & . 02 & .11 & . 39 & 31 \\
\hline 5,000 or me & 18 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 8.3 & 5.5 & . 5 & . 38 & . 32 & .06 & . 18 & .40 & 46 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 52.-fruit, ndts, and miscedlaneous foods consumpd at home during one week ( 7 -day estimate): Number of households consuming fruit, nuts, and miscellaneous foods, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {? }}\) ]



\section*{See footnotes at end of table.}

Table 52.-Fruit, nets, and miscellaneous foods consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households units in 20 States, 1 March-November 1996 foods, and average quantities and average values per household, by family type and income, 5 analysis

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Type 1 & 206 & 88 & 28 & 19 & 31 & 174 & 236 & 4.31 & . 3 & . 1 & . 10 & . 01 & . 01 & (0) & W & . 05 \\
\hline 0-199. & 172 & 51 & 9 & 16 & 2 & 106 & 149 & 4. 4 & . 1 & . 2 & . 09 & . 01 & . 02 & (8) & . 07 & . 04 \\
\hline 500-099 & 80 & 35 & 15 & 3 & 1 & 56 & 74 & 4.8 & . 5 & . 1 & . 13 & . 02 & . 01 & (0) & . 11 & . 07 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 11 & 2 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 9 & 10 & + 9 & 78 & \(7{ }^{10}\) & . 05 & \(\stackrel{.04}{7}\) & . 800 & +00 & 113
7
7 & +.11 \\
\hline 1,500 1,999 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2
1
0 & 7.0
7.0 & 7.0
7.0 & 7.0
7.0 & ? 000 & 7.00
7.00 & 7.00
7.00 & 7.00
7.00 & 7.23
1.10 & 1.11
7.07 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \({ }^{\text {T }} 0\) & 7.0 & 7.0 & ?. 00 & 7.00 & \({ }^{\text {t. }} 00\) & \({ }^{7} .00\) & 1.10 & T. 07 \\
\hline \(3,000-4,999 \ldots\)
5,000 or over & 0
0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 357 & 112 & 26 & 28 & 10 & 241 & 314 & 6.8 & . 2 & . 1 & . 13 & . 01 & . 02 & (\%) & . 10 & . 07 \\
\hline 0-499. & 213 & 60 & 5 & 12 & 7 & 333 & 186 & 7.2 & (B) & . 1 & .13 & (6) & . 01 & 01 & .09 & . 05 \\
\hline \(500 \cdot 999\) & 121 & 40 & 12 & 10 & 1 & 92 & 107 & 6. 8 & . 4 & . 1 & -14 & . 02 & . 02 & (6) & . 13 & . 07 \\
\hline 1,000-1,493 & 18 & 8 & 6 & 4 & 1 & 11 & 16 & 3.7 & 1.0 & . 5 & .17 & . 06 & . 05 & (b) & . 12 & . 18 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999. & 4 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 2.0 & 1.6 & . 8 & . 15 & . 08 & .11 & . 05 & .17 & . 11 \\
\hline 2,000-2,984 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 11.5 & 7.0 & 7.0 & \({ }^{7} 15\) & \({ }^{7} .00\) & ?. 00 & 7. 00 & 7.20 & \({ }^{7} .04\) \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & -- \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 002 & 222 & 46 & 42 & 13 & 440 & 543 & 8.7 & . 2 & . 1 & .17 & . 01 & . 02 & ( \({ }^{\circ}\) & 12 & . 08 \\
\hline 0-199. & 218 & 69 & 6 & 16 & 3 & 145 & 196 & 8.3 & . 1 & - 1 & . 14 & \(\left.{ }^{6}\right)\) & . 02 & (6) & . 10 & . 05 \\
\hline 500-949 & 290 & 104 & 25 & 18 & 7 & 215 & 263 & 9.2 & . 3 & . 1 & . 18 & . 02 & . 01 & (c) 01 & . 12 & .10 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 82 & 42 & 12 & 8 & 3 & 70 & 73 & 6.4 & . 4 & . 2 & . 18 & . 03 & . 03 & (c) & . 16 & . 11 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 8 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 7 & 7 & 1.9 & . 8 & . 0 & . 15 & . 04 & . 00 & . 00 & \(\cdot 15\) & . 07 \\
\hline 2,400-2,994 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 3.8 & . 5 & . 0 & .19 & . 05 & . 00 & . 60 & . 11 & . 20 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 719.0 & 7.0 & \({ }^{7} .0\) & \({ }^{7} 1.20\) & \({ }^{7} .00\) & \({ }^{7} .00\) & ?. 00 & ケ. 00 & 7.03 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 339 & 106 & 26 & 7 & 11 & 234 & 316 & 9.1 & . 4 & ( \({ }^{8}\) ) & .17 & . 02 & (5) & . 01 & . 10 & . 08 \\
\hline (1-499 & 127 & 32 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 81 & 117 & 9.8 & . 3 & (9) & . 16 & . 02 & 01 & (5) & . 08 & . 05 \\
\hline \(50 \times 1-999\). & 166 & 60 & 15 & 1 & 5 & 117 & 153 & 9.6 & . 4 & (8) & . 17 & . 02 & (5) & . 01 & , 10 & . 10 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 38 & 13 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 30 & 38 & 5.9 & . 6 & . 0 & . 23 & . 03 & . 00 & . 02 & . 12 & . 14 \\
\hline 1,5001-1,999 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 5 & 6 & . 8 & .4 & . 3 & . 04 & . 02 & . 03 & . 00 & . 15 & .17 \\
\hline 2,000-2,449 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 7.0 & ?. 0 & 7.0 & \({ }^{\text {7. }} 00\) & ?.00 & \({ }^{7} .00\) & \(? 00\) & 7. 08 & \%. 11 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999. & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3.0 & \({ }^{7} 4.1\) & 7.0 & ?.00 & '. 20 & \%. 00 & \%. 00 & \({ }^{\text {? }} 13\) & \%. 01 \\
\hline 5,000 or over & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ------ & & & & & & & & --.-.-- & -----..- \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) See Glossary for definitions of terms such as housebold, family type, income, sinalysis unit. The consumption figures given in this table include food consumed by baid farm or household help, boarders, and guests as well gs by mernhers of the cconomic family. 1 This table includes households of farnilies in the consumption sample that furnished supplementary schedion (rooniles of or ore oretors only were studied in all rogions wopt the Southont where special studie of white sharecropper and Nerro families were made. Se Methodology bcfore using these data for regional comparisons.
\& Includes chocolate.
4 Includes leavening agents, seasonings, bottled beverages, and food mixtures not elsehere specified.
A verages are based on the number of households in each class (column 2).
avenar less
A coge based on fewer than 3 cases.
- Negro operators and sharecroppers.

Table 53.-Items of food consumed at home during one week (i-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per houschold, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 53.-items of food constmed at home deting one weex (t-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in househoids consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
[Honsebolds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{4}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis unit, family type, and income class \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Number of households} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Holuseholds consuming-} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value per housebold} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Aver-
age
value
of all
food
per
unit-
meal} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consiniming-} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average 3 quantity per household} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
A ver- & Households \\
Roge & consuming -
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quanLity per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{A rerquge value of all fond per unit-} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Homseholds consuming-} & Aver- & & A verage \({ }^{+}\) \\
\hline & & & With- & & & & & With- & & & valice
of all
food & & With-
out di- & & & & & With-
aut di- & ( \({ }^{\text {Age }}{ }^{3}\) & age
quan-
tity
per & value of all food \\
\hline & & Any & out dj-
rectex-
pendi- & & & & Any & \begin{tabular}{l}
rect ex- \\
pendi-
\end{tabular} & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Iper } \\
& \text { unit- } \\
& \text { meal }
\end{aligned}
\] & Any & rect ex pendi & & & & Any & rectex. pendi- & house- & \begin{tabular}{l}
bouse- \\
hold
\end{tabular} & per unitmeal \({ }^{5}\) \\
\hline & & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (d) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (10) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|c|}{} \\
\hline Alltypes & 3, 583 & No.
\[
100
\] & No. 96 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.010
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 0.36
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol, } \\
& 0.121
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 163 & \({ }^{\mathrm{Na}}\). & \[
\begin{gathered}
D o l \\
0.012
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{0 l} . \\
0.132
\end{gathered}
\] & No.
\[
1,5.51
\] & No. 180 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.134
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b_{+} \\
& 0.63
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
\mathbf{0 . 1 2 5}
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 559 & No. 62 & \[
\begin{gathered}
D 00 l \\
0.090
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.34
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.135
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Net losses. & b5 & 1 & 1 & . 001 & . 02 & 7. 124 & 7 & 0 & . 059 & . 51 & . 125 & 17 & 1 & . 081 & . 31 & . 126 & 8 & 0 & . 062 & . 19 & . 140 \\
\hline Net incomes & 3, 528 & 99 & 95 & . 011 & . 36 & .120 & 156 & 1 & . 011 & . 12 & . 132 & 1,534 & 179 & . 135 & . 64 & . 125 & 551 & 62 & . 090 & . 34 & . 135 \\
\hline \$0, \$49\% & 334 & 14 & 13 & . 015 & . 68 & . 104 & 27 & 0 & . 020 & . 22 & . 109 & 92 & 15 & . 071 & . 33 & . 122 & 28 & 3 & . 038 & , 14 & . 124 \\
\hline \$500-\$9\%9. & 807 & 18 & 17 & . 008 & . 29 & . 120 & 34 & 1 & . 010 & . 11 & . 111 & 337 & 47 & .104 & . 49 & . 114 & 123 & 16 & . 062 & . 25 & .121 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 979 & 28 & 28 & . 009 & . 33 & . 101 & 38 & 0 & . 011 & . 12 & . 129 & 421 & 40 & . 138 & . 67 & . 125 & 158 & 20 & . 091 & . 36 & . 184 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 647 & 22 & 21 & . 018 & . 48 & . 129 & 25 & 0 & . 008 & . 08 & . 176 & 319 & 32 & . 153 & . 74 & . 131 & 106 & 7 & . 095 & . 33 & . 140 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 13 & 12 & . 009 & . 28 & . 153 & 22 & 0 & . 010 & . 11 & .139 & 255 & 29 & . 187 & . 85 & . 132 & 92 & 12 & . 129 & . 50 & . 148 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 170 & 3 & 3 & . 003 & . 10 & . 181 & 8 & 0 & . 012 & . 13 & . 151 & 94 & 14 & - 197 & . 88 & . 128 & 37 & 4 & . 194 & . 68 & .146 \\
\hline \$5,0¢H or over & 27 & 1 & 1 & . 004 & . 07 & 7.124 & 2 & 0 & . 011 & . 10 & 7.175 & 16 & 2 & . 168 & . 64 & . 145 & 7 & 0 & . 186 & . 67 & .151 \\
\hline Type \({ }^{1}\)-.-... & 841 & 15 & 15 & . 004 & .12 & . 176 & 52 & 0 & . 013 & . 15 & . 143 & 340 & 38 & . 104 & . 50 & . 151 & 115 & 11 & . 060 & . 21 & . 158 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914
1,349 & 25 & 22 & . 008 & . 29 & - 119 & 32 & 0 & . 008 & . 08 & . 141 & 402 & 38 & . 127 & . 57 & . 127 & 173 & 13 & . 099 & . 36 & . 141 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 43 & 43 & . 015 & . 49 & . 111 & 64 & 1 & . 014 & . 14 & . 124 & 603 & 77 & . 148 & . 72 & . 119 & 206 & 33 & . 102 & . 42 & . 125 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 479 & 17 & 16 & . 014 & . 53 & . 098 & 15 & 0 & . 008 & . 08 & .110 & 206 & 27 & . 161 & . 73 & . 098 & 65 & 5 & . 088 & . 31 & . 112 \\
\hline All types & 2,350 & 198 & 194 & . 042 & . 99 & . 102 & 51 & 0 & . 006 & . 05 & . 101 & 689 & 10 & . 084 & . 36 & . 115 & 89 & 37 & . 025 & 12 & . 133 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 279 & 21 & 18 & . 044 & . 84 & & 3 & 0 & . 001 & . 01 & . 055 & 40 & 0 & . 032 & . 15 & . 096 & 2 & 1 & . 001 & . 01 & 7. 127 \\
\hline \$500-\$099. & 916 & 66 & 65 & . 038 & . 93 & . 087 & 16 & 0 & . 005 & . 04 & . 104 & 170 & 1 & , 046 & . 20 & . 103 & 24 & 13 & . 002 & . 12 & . 117 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 ......- & 523 & 42 & 42 & . 043 & . 98 & . 102 & 12 & 0 & . 0007 & . 06 & . 101 & 182 & 5 & . 100 & . 43 & . 114 & 23 & 9 & . 024 & . 11 & . 119 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,909 \(\ldots . . . .\). & 270 & 33 & 33 & . 050 & 1. 23 & .110 & 9 & 0 & . 008 & . 08 & .098 & 109 & 1 & . 126 & . 55 & . 118 & 21 & 7 & . 049 & . 23 & . 143 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 53.- items of food consumed at home during one week (7-Day matimate): Number of houscholds consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Housebolds of noncelief farm families that include a hustand and wife, both native-born ']



See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 53.-ITEMS OF FOOD CONSOMED AT HOME DURING ONE WEEK (7-DAy EGYTMATE): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 Slates, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 - Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wite, both nutive-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A nalysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Number of households} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{2}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity per household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Avprago \({ }^{4}\) value of all rood per unitmeal s} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Honseholds consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) valise jer housebold} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) quant.ity per bousnhold} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text { Aver- } & \text { Households } \\
\text { age } & \text { Consuming- }
\end{array}
\]} & Aver- & Average 3 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l|l} 
Aver- & Households \\
age & Consuming-
\end{tabular}} & Av & A vernge \({ }^{1}\) & A verave \({ }^{6}\) value \\
\hline & & Any & With-
out di-
rectex-
pendi-
fure & & & & Any & Witholat direct ex-penditure & & & value
of all
food
per
unit--
meal & Any & Without direct ex-penditure & age \({ }^{3}\)
value
per
house-
hold & \begin{tabular}{l}
quan- \\
tity \\
per \\
house- \\
hold
\end{tabular} & value
of all
food
per
unit.
meal & Any & Without di-rectex-penditure & age \({ }^{3}\)
value
per
house-
hold & \begin{tabular}{l}
quan. \\
tity per household
\end{tabular} & value of ald lood per unitmeal \({ }^{6}\) \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{CREAM} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{HUTTEER} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{LARD} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{FAT COMPOUNDS} \\
\hline FAMILIES \({ }^{8}\) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 1,564 & Na.
40 & No. 35 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.020
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ib. } \\
& 0.10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.088
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 812 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
13(760)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.285
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h . \\
& 1.12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.074
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
978
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 288 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.261
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 1.83
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol } \\
& 0.069
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 457 & No. 14 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
\text { (0.119 }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.84
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.062
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$80-\$499 & 730
657 & 7
20 & 6
17 & . 005 & . 03 & . 0076 & 358 & (13) & 217
.2136 & . 86 & .069 & 398 & 77
154 & . 196 & 1. 39 & . 061 & 252 & 8 & . 126 & 92 & . 059 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 149 & 12 & 11 & . 026 & . 31 & .078 & 383
101 & (13) & .336
.361 & 1.31
1.42 & .075
.089 & 452
108 & 154
46 & - 307 & 2. 214 & . 070 & 165
3 & 6
0
0 & . 109 & . 75 & . 060 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,949 & 20 & I & 1 & . 063 & . 32 & i. 122 & 14 & (13) & . 438 & 1.75 & . 080 & 15 & 7 & -395 & 2. 74 & . 060 & 3
4 & 0 & . 085 & . 65 & . 106 \\
\hline Type 1 & 266 & & 7 & . 0210 & . 10 & . 115 & 150 & (13) & . 222 & . 87 & . 098 & 181 & 61 & . 186 & 1.34 & . 089 & 82 & 1 & . 102 & 72 & . 082 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 357 & 9 & 8 & . 012 & . 06 & . 089 & 186 & (13) & . 241 & . 95 & . 078 & 217 & 63 & . 227 & 1. 62 & . 068 & 110 & 3 & . 119 & . 84 & . 065 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 602 & 13 & 11 & . 029 & . 14 & . 093 & 354 & (13) & . 326 & 1.27 & . 071 & 394 & 116 & . 299 & 2.08 & . 069 & 159 & 4 & . 117 & . 81 & . 658 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 339 & 10 & 0 & . 013 & . 07 & . 059 & 172 & (13) & . 307 & 1,21 & . 057 & 204 & 48 & . 287 & 1.99 & . 051 & 106 & 6 & .136 & . 92 & . 048 \\
\hline & & TAI & F FAT & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{S}, ~ o r \\
& \mathrm{O}^{\prime} \mathrm{T}^{\prime} \mathrm{E}
\end{aligned}
\] & TERT & THAN & VEO & ETAB & E SH & RTEN & IING & MAY & ONNAI & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I\&E (H } \\
& \text { ONLY }
\end{aligned}
\] & JRCR & ASED & & EEF, S & CEAK, & ROUN & \\
\hline 417 types & 3. 583 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
147
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 19 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.013
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h, \\
& 0.08
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
\mathbf{0 . 1} 106
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 206 & No. 2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& D 0 l \\
& 0.013
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L 6 . \\
& 0.08
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{0} l . \\
0.135
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 608 & No. 58 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.036
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.136
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 630 & No. 86 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.103
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.42
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.129
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Vet losses. & 55 & 1 & 1 & . 003 & . 02 & '.095 & 4 & 0 & . 012 & . 09 & [138 & 8 & 2 & . 029 & .15 & . 121 & 10 & 2 & 127 & 53 & 137 \\
\hline Net incornes. & 3, 528 & 146 & 18 & . 013 & . 08 & . 106 & 202 & 2 & . 013 & . 08 & . 135 & 680 & 56 & . 036 & . 18 & . 136 & 620 & 84 & . 102 & . 42 & . 129 \\
\hline  & 334
897 & 16 & 41 & .009
.014 & . 06 & .096
.096 & 17 & 0
1 & .008
.0009 & . 05 & .098
.135 & 31
103 & 12 & .017
.021 & .08
.10 & .124
.122 & 47
130 & 4
20 & .085
.076 & . 36 & .124
.118 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 53.-ttems of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified ilems of food, average value and average quanily per household, and average value of all food per food-axpenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 --Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis umit, family type, and income class \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Number of households \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mouseholis consuming -} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Averane \({ }^{3}\) value per hoursehold} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity per housebold} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average: value of all food per unit-} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & & Aver-
age \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
Ayet- & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Households \\
age
\end{tabular} \\
consuming
\end{tabular}} & Atrer & Aver- & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Houscholds consuming-} & & Aver. aque \({ }^{3}\) & Average 1 \\
\hline & & & With-
out di- & & & & & With-
out di- & agn
value
per & gge
quan-
tity
per & yalue
of all
food & & With-
out di- & age 3
value
per & age \({ }^{\text {aga }}\) quan- & value
of all
food & & With-
out di- & age \({ }^{\text {a }}\)
value
per & aqe
quan-
tity
per & value
of all
foud \\
\hline & & Any & out di-
rect ex-
pendi-
ture & & & & Any & out di-
rectex-
pendi-
ture & house- & per
hause.
hold & qur \({ }_{\text {unit- }}^{\text {meal }}\); & Any & out di-
rectex-
pendi- & house- & per
house-
hold & por \({ }_{\text {unit- }}\) & Any & out direct ex-pendi- & house- & \begin{tabular}{l}
per \\
household
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { pro } \\
& \text { unit. } \\
& \text { meal }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|r|}{} \\
\hline NORTH AND WEst \({ }^{6}\) & 3,583 & No.
141 & No. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.022
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.08
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.136
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No. } \\
59
\end{array}
\] & \[
\mathrm{NO}_{7}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.010
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 50 . \\
& 0.04
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.132
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{\underset{y}{N} \underset{\sim}{N O}}{ }
\] & No. 73 & \[
\begin{gathered}
D 0 l . \\
0.081
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.39
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0,131
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 170 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
26
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.035
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.17
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Dol} . \\
& 0.124
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Net losses. --
Net incomes & 3,528 & 4
137 & \(\stackrel{2}{17}\) & . 0224 & . 14 & .138
.136 & 0
59 & 0 & .000
.011 & .00
.04 & . 132 & 8
377 & 3
70 & .111
.080 & .58
.39 & .137
.130 & 3
167 & 25 & .045
.035 & .25
.17 & .102
.124 \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 334 & 4 & 1 & . 007 & . 03 & . 159 & 5 & 1 & . 011 & . 04 & . 148 & 23 & 3 & . 039 & . 19 & . 118 & 12 & 0 & . 029 & 14 & 133 \\
\hline \$500-\$099. & 897 & 19 & 2 & . 010 & . 04 & . 111 & 13 & 2 & . 0017 & . 04 & . 128 & 81 & 15 & . 065 & . 32 & . 122 & 22 & 4 & . 018 & .09 & . 118 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 979 & 42 & 6 & . 023 & . 09 & . 130 & 17 & 2 & . 013 & .06 & . 103 & 100 & 14 & . 080 & .39 & . 131 & 45 & 3 & . 029 & .15 & . 127 \\
\hline \$1,5(n) 1,999 & 647 & 30 & 2 & . 028 & . 10 & . 155 & 11 & 0 & . 609 & . 03 & . 147 & 87 & 12 & . 107 & . 50 & . 129 & 41 & 11 & . 047 & .23 & . 125 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 28 & 5 & . 032 & .12 & . 136 & 9 & 2 & . 013 & . 05 & .171 & fio & 17 & .100 & . 49 & . 145 & 33 & 5 & . 057 & . 26 & . 126 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 170 & 14 & 1 & . 087 & . 21 & . 145 & 4 & 0 & . 018 & . 06 & . 119 & 24 & 9 & .106 & . 50 & . 139 & 14 & 2 & . 071 & . 34 & . 114 \\
\hline \$5,000 or nver & 27 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 010 & . 00 & & 2 & 0 & . 069 & . 33 & 7.154 & 0 & 0 & . 090 & . 00 & \\
\hline Type 1 & 841 & 50 & 5 & . 027 & . 10 & . 158 & 14 & 1 & . 006 & . 02 & . 143 & 106 & 20 & . 084 & . 40 & . 152 & 33 & 2 & . 024 & 12 & . 154 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 32 & 5 & . 020 & . 08 & . 132 & 9 & 1 & . 0805 & . 02 & .137 & 86 & 15 & . 067 & . 32 & +132 & 41 & 6 & . 032 & \(\bigcirc 15\) & . 134 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 45 & 5 & . 020 & . 08 & . 130 & 28 & 3 & . 017 & . 07 & . 130 & 151 & 30 & . 088 & . 44 & . 123 & 68 & 11 & . 041 & . 20 & . 113 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 479 & 14 & 4 & . 022 & . 08 & . 091 & 8 & 2 & . 010 & . 04 & . 114 & 42 & 8 & . 080 & . 37 & 101 & 28 & 7 & . 044 & . 23 & . 101 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
southeast-White oferators \\
All types \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & 2, 350 & 52 & 2 & . 014 & . 05 & . 133 & 21 & 1 & . 005 & . 02 & . 118 & 93 & 12 & . 027 & . 15 & .110 & 24 & 3 & . 006 & . 03 & . 130 \\
\hline Type 1. & 382 & 13 & 0 & . 018 & . 07 & . 179 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (i1) & 7,215 & 14 & 2 & . 020 & . 11 & . 111 & 4 & 1 & . 008 & . 03 & . 186 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 11 & 0 & . 013 & . 05 & . 140 & 8 & 1 & . 006 & . 13 & . 113 & 12 & 1 & . 014 & . 07 & . 125 & 6 & 0 & . 005 & . 03 & . 129 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,018 & 19 & 1 & . 012 & . 05 & . 112 & 8 & 0 & . 005 & . 02 & . 134 & 57 & 8 & . 640 & . 23 & . 108 & 11 & 2 & . 006 & . 04 & . 107 \\
\hline Tyues 6 and 7 & 438 & 9 & 1 & . 015 & . 07 & . 104 & 4 & 0 & .005 & . 03 & . 070 & 10 & 1 & . 020 & . 12 & . 098 & 3 & 0 & . 000 & 03 & . 140 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE SHABECKOPYERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 878 & 15 & 0 & . 010 & . 04 & . 100 & 4 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & . 114 & 21 & 0 & . 014 & . 08 & . 084 & 6 & 0 & . 004 & . 02 & . 088 \\
\hline Type 1. & 140 & 5 & 0 & . 021 & . 07 & . 115 & 1 & 0 & 005 & 04 & ?.132 & 2 & 0 & . 005 & . 03 & \({ }^{7} .094\) & 2 & 0 & . 005 & . 04 & \({ }^{7} .091\) \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292 & 5 & 0 & . 009 & . 04 & . 107 & 2 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & 7.121 & 8 & 0 & . 017 & . 07 & . 089 & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & 7.074 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 276 & 4 & 0 & . 010 & . 04 & . 082 & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & i. 084 & 10 & 0 & . 024 & . 16 & . 081 & 2 & 0 & . 004 & . 03 & \({ }^{7} .098\) \\
\hline Types 6 and \(7 .\). & 170 & 1 & 0 & . 004 & 02 & 7.065 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & '. 045 & 1 & 0 & . 004 & . 02 & \({ }^{\text {7. }} 077\) \\
\hline  & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types... & 1, 564 & 11 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & . 071 & 22 & 1 & . 005 & . 05 & . 079 & 34 & 1 & . 012 & . 07 & . 077 & 15 & 0 & . 005 & . 03 & . 072 \\
\hline Type 1 & 266 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (11) & \({ }^{7}, 075\) & 5 & 0 & . 017 & . 04 & . 091 & 4 & 0 & . 110 & . 05 & . 140 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & . 01 & T. 110 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 . & 357 & 2 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & T,085 & 5 & 0 & . 003 & . 02 & . 074 & 10 & 0 & . 012 & . 07 & . 070 & 4 & 0 & . 006 & . 03 & . 069 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & \({ }_{602}\) & 7 & 0 & . 006 & . 02 & . 071 & 5 & 0 & . 004 & . 03 & . 086 & 12 & 0 & . 011 & . 06 & . 082 & 7 & 0 & . 007 & . 03 & . 072 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 339 & 1 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & ?. 040 & 7 & 1 & . 007 & .12 & . 069 & 8 & , & . 015 & . 09 & . 017 & & 0 & . 1004 & . 03 & . 052 \\
\hline & & \[
\mathrm{Br}
\] & PO & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { TROA } \\
& 80 \mathrm{UNN}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{LO}
\] & WER & & BEEP, & ROAS & , Lol & & & Beer & ROAS & , RIB & & \[
10 \mathrm{TI}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{BEE} \\
\mathrm{BT}
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\mathrm{F}, \mathrm{RO}
\]
LN LO & \begin{tabular}{l}
ST, \\
IN AN
\end{tabular} & D RID \\
\hline NORTH AND WEST \({ }^{6}\) & 3, 583 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No. } \\
32
\end{array}
\] & \[
\mathrm{No}_{3}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.008
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\stackrel{L b .}{0.03}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.135
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { NO. } \\
& 112
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} \\
27
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.022
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.1220
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} \\
101
\end{gathered}
\] & No. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.021
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.132
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
12
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\mathrm{No}_{3}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.002
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L_{0} . \\
& 0.01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Do?. } \\
& 0.143
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 8 & 1 & . 008 & . 03 & . 146 & 28 & 7 & . 015 & . 08 & . 161 & 29 & & . 023 & . 13 & . 164 & 5 & 2 & . 003 & . 02 & 158 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 . & 914 & 7 & 0 & . 006 & . 03 & . 166 & 30 & 7 & . 024 & .12 & .122 & 24 & 9 & . 017 & . 08 & .126 & 2 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & \%. 164 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,319 & 15 & 1 & . 010 & . 04 & . 120 & 44 & 12 & . 024 & . 13 & . 114 & 44 & 6 & . 025 & .12 & . 118 & 2 & 1 & .004 & . 01 & . 120 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & \({ }_{4} 49\) & 2 & 1 & . 004 & . 02 & ז. 096 & 10 & 1 & . 023 & .10 & . 088 & 8 & 3 & . 013 & . 06 & . 104 & 0 & 0 & .000 & . 00 & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SOUTHEABT-WHITE } \\
& \text { OPREATORS }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types.---------.... & 2,350 & 13 & 2 & . 004 & . 02 & . 122 & 48 & 2 & . 015 & . 08 & . 109 & 35 & 5 & . 009 & . 05 & . 117 & 6 & 1 & . 002 & . 01 & . 088 \\
\hline Type 1 ....-......--... & 382 & & & & & & & & & . 08 & . 111 & & & . 005 & . 03 & & & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3.......---- & 511 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (i1) & 7152 & 8 & 0 & . 011 & . 05 & . 108 & 6 & 1 & . 006 & . 03 & . 136 & 2 & 0 & . 002 & 01 & ? 099 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,018 & 8 & 1 & . 006 & . 03 & . 120 & 16 & 0 & . 013 & . 06 & -120 & 13 & 1 & . 009 & . 05 & . 117 & 1 & 0 & (10) & (1); & \%.068 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 439 & 1 & 10 & . 001 & . 01 & \%.060 & 15 & 1 & . 026 & . 16 & . 085 & 10 & 3 & . 015 & .11 & .093 & 2 & 1 & . 003 & . 02 & 7.074 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table
}

TABLE 53.-ITEMS OF FOOD CONSUMED AT HOME DURING ONE WEEK (7-DAY ESTIMATE): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per houschold, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, 1 March-November 1996 - Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a hasband and wife, both native-born ?]



Table 53.-items of food consumed at home during one wfek (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per houschold, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis unils in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936--Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A nalysis unit, family type, and incume class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Nimm- } \\
& \text { ber of } \\
& \text { house- } \\
& \text { holds }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consurning-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A van } \\
& \text { nalue } \\
& \text { ralue } \\
& \text { per } \\
& \text { holse- }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A ver-
ape
quan-
tity
per
homse-
hold} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Average * value ford yer unitmeal \({ }^{5}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value per honsehold} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A ver- } \\
& \text { qge } \\
& \text { quan- } \\
& \text { tity } \\
& \text { per } \\
& \text { house } \\
& \text { hold }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{|l|l}
\text { A ver- } & \text { Houscholds } \\
\text { nge. } & \text { consuming- }
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A verare value household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A ver- } \\
& \text { age } \\
& \text { quan- } \\
& \text { tity } \\
& \text { per } \\
& \text { house- } \\
& \text { hold }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A verage valu food per unit-
meal (17)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Aver- } \\
\text { aqe } \\
\text { value } \\
\text { pore } \\
\text { house- } \\
\text { hold }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A ver- } \\
& \text { age } \\
& \text { quan- } \\
& \text { tity } \\
& \text { por } \\
& \text { house-- }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Average 1 value of ald per meal'} \\
\hline & & Any & Without di rect ex-penci- & & & & Any & Without di ruct ex penditure & & & of all food per unitmeal & Any & With-
out di-
rect ex-
pendi-
ture & & & & Any & Withont di rect ex pendi ture & & & \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{NORTH AND WESt \({ }^{\text {b }}\)} & & \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{BEEF, BOILING, OTHER} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{BEEF, DRIED} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{BEEF, OTEER \({ }^{4}\)} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{PORK, FRESH, OTHER THAN PORK CHOPS, LOIN ROAST, AND SAUSAGE} \\
\hline & 3,583 & No. 57 & No. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& D \alpha . \\
& 0.007
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h . \\
& 0.04
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.106
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{\substack{\text { No. } \\ 484}}{ }
\] & No.
\[
166
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { DOL. } \\
0.049
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.123
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{9}{\mathrm{No}}
\] & \[
N o_{1}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& D o l \\
& 0.002
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b_{i} \\
& 0.01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.122
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 79 & \(N o\), 42 & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{\mathrm{nl}} . \\
0.012
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.06
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.123
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Type 1 & 841 & 17 & 3 & . 007 & . 04 & . 110 & 94 & 19 & . 025 & . 06 & . 143 & & & . 001 & (11) & 7. 194 & 19 & 9 & . 013 & 06 & . 134 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 10 & 1 & . 004 & . 03 & . 129 & 104 & \(3{ }^{3}\) & . 038 & . 10 & . 132 & 3 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & . 164 & 20 & 11 & . 009 & . 05 & . 124 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 2 ¢ & 3 & . 011 & . 06 & . 099 & 189 & 50 & . 059 & . 12 & . 120 & 4 & 0 & . 0002 & . 01 & . 087 & 34 & 17 & . 015 & . 17 & . 118 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 479 & , & , & . 005 & . 03 & . 085 & 97 & 61 & . 111 & . 26 & . 101 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & . 01 & 7.066 & \({ }^{6}\) & , & . 007 & . 04 & . 108 \\
\hline All types. & 2,350 & 53 & 4 & . 011 & . 08 & . 096 & 8 & 3 & . 002 & . 01 & . 161 & 1 & 0 & (10) & (11) & \({ }^{7} .121\) & 40 & 35 & . 016 & . 09 & . 127 \\
\hline Type 1 & 382 & 5 & 0 & . 004 & 03 & . 135 & 3 & 2 & . 006 & . 02 & . 207 & 0 & 0 & . 0 (1) & . 010 & & 8 & 7 & . 016 & 10 & 173 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 12 & 1 & . 009 & . 07 & . 097 & 1 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & & 6 & . 010 & 06 & 132 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 19 & 1 & . 008 & . 16 & . 100 & 2 & 1 & . 002 & (i1) & \({ }^{7} .199\) & 1 & 0 & (10) & (1i) & 7. 121 & 10 & 8 & . 009 & . 05 & . 120 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 439 & 17 & , & . 026 & . 20 & . 179 & 3 & 0 & . 0013 & (11) & . 091 & 0 & 0 & . \(10 \times 1\) & . 00 & & 15 & 14 & . 039 & . 23 & . 104 \\
\hline southeart--white SHARECROPPEHS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types..------------- & 878 & 36 & 0 & . 019 & . 15 & . 087 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (I) & 1. 122 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 13 & 8 & . 010 & . 06 & 098 \\
\hline Type 1. & 140 & & & & . 11 & . 135 & & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 3 & 3 & . 019 & . 11 & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 292 & 7 & 0 & . 008 & . 06 & . 188 & 1 & 0 & . 004 & . 01 & \(\cdots, 122\) & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 2 & 0 & . 004 & . 02 & : 0990 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 276 & 10 & 0 & . 016 & . 14 & . 082 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 4 & 3 & . 007 & . 04 & . 097 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 . & 170 & 14 & 0 & . 044 & . 37 & . 074 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 4 & 2 & . 018 & .12 & . 077 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
GOUTHEAST-NEQRO EAMLIES \({ }^{6}\) \\
All types.
\end{tabular} & 1,564 & 79 & 1 & . 022 & . 17 & . 060 & 2 & 1 & . 001 & (11) & 7.088 & 5 & 1 & . 001 & . 02 & . 083 & 37 & 7 & . 014 & . 09 & . 076 \\
\hline Type 1 & 266 & 7 & 0 & . 009 & . 07 & . 073 & 0 & 0 & . 0001 & . DO & & 1 & 0 & (10) & (11) & \(? .092\) & 6 & 1 & . 004 & . 05 & . 098 \\
\hline Types 2 and & 357 & 12 & 0 & . 012 & . 09 & . 079 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (i1) & 7. 090 & 1 & 0 & 001 & . 07 & 7.063 & 9 & 1 & . 009 & . 05 & . 093 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 602 & 26 & 1 & . 019 & . 15 & . 064 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 3 & 1 & . 0001 & . 01 & . 087 & 17 & 3 & . 022 & . 14 & .071 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7........... & 339 & 34 & 0 & . 049 & . 39 & . 048 & 1 & 1 & . 003 & . 01 & '. 085 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 5 & 2 & & . 06 & \\
\hline & & & POR & RK CH & OPS & & & ORK & LOIN & OAST & & & POR & S SAU & AGE & & & BAC & N, SL & ED & \\
\hline NORTH AND WESY \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 3,583 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
316
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 109 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.048
\end{gathered}
\] & L3.
0.20 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.137
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 129 & No. 85 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.027
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.132
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
412
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 238 & \[
\begin{gathered}
D_{o l} . \\
0.048
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.124
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 848 & No. 449 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.125
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.44
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0. 128
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Net losses. & 55 & 4 & 1 & . 022 & . 08 & . 136 & 1 & 1 & . 009 & . 09 & 7. 186 & 3 & 1 & . 028 & . 13 & . 147 & 17 & 8
441 & .134
.125 & .53
.44 & .136
.128 \\
\hline Net incomes. & 3, 528 & 312 & 108 & . 048 & . 21 & . 137 & 128 & 84 & . 027 & . 13 & . 131 & 409 & 237 & . 048 & . 24 & . 124 & 931 & 441 & , 125 & . 44 & \\
\hline 80-\$499 & 334 & 21 & 6 & . 033 & . 14 & . 128 & 11 & 7 & . 013 & . 06 & . 141 & 26 & 14 & . 024 & . 14 & . 119 & 72
209 & 28 & .105
.094 & .38
.34 & .118
.118 \\
\hline \$500-\$999. & 897 & 69 & 23 & . 038 & . 15 & . 134 & 21 & 13 & . 013 & . 06 & . 109 & 94 & 49 & . 043 & . 21 & . 113 & \begin{tabular}{l}
209 \\
285 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & 101
137 & . 094 & .34
.49 & . 118 \\
\hline \$1,090-\$1,499. & 979 & 92 & 41 & . 049 & . 22 & . 134 & 46 & 35 & . 039 & . 19 & . 136 & 110 & 67 & . 046 & . 23 & . 125 & 285
176 & 137
76 & . 140 & .49
.44 & . 138 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 647 & 62 & 11 & . 050 & . 20 & . 137 & 19 & 12 & . 0222 & . 11 & . 138 & 68 & 36 & . 044 & . 23 & . 128 & 176 & 76
66 & .132
.133 & . 46 & . 139 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 46 & 19 & . 064 & . 28 & . 1.43 & 21 & 12 & . 035 & . 18 & . 134 & 72 & 48 & -074 & . 36 & . 141 & 131
50 & \({ }^{66}\) & 1.187
.187 & -. 66 & . 137 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999. & 170 & 18 & 8 & . 075 & . 34 & . 152 & 9 & 5 & . 050 & . 23 & , \(\cdot 128\) & 32 & 21 & . 073 & .37
.39 & .141
.135 & 50
8 & 31
2 & .187
.137 & .66
.39 & .137
.146 \\
\hline \$5,000 or 0ver....... & 27 & 4 & 0 & , 101 & . 31 & . 165 & 1 & 0 & . 044 & . 15 & \({ }^{7} .134\) & 7 & 2 & . 090 & , 39 & . 135 & & 2 & & . 39 & . 146 \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 83 & 27 & . 047 & . 20 & . 161 & 25 & 18 & . 018 & . 09 & . 165 & 85 & 48 & . 035 & . 18 & . 149 & 232 & 89 & . 110 & . 36 & . 148 \\
\hline 'l'ypes 2 and 3 & 914 & 86 & 31 & . 048 & . 21 & .136 & 34 & 22 & . 022 & . 11 & . 134 & 106 & 53 & . 040 & . 21 & . 126 & 247 & 113 & . 120 & . 41 & . 132 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 121 & 43 & . 051 & . 22 & . 128 & 57 & 37 & . 036 & . 18 & - 121 & 161 & 97 & . 052 & . 26 & . 118 & 371 & 172 & . 116 & . 52 & . 120 \\
\hline TYpes 6 and 7. & 1,479 & 26 & 8 & . 041 & .16 & . 105 & 13 & 8 & . 024 & . 09 & . 109 & 60 & 40 & . 071 & . 35 & . 105 & 98 & 75 & . 102 & . 40 & . 103 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITK
OPERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 2,350 & 117 & 34 & . 025 & . 12 & . 118 & 19 & 10 & . 0006 & . 03 & . 104 & 377 & 126 & . 071 & .36 & . 112 & 382 & 250 & . 108 & . 48 & . 118 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 279 & 5 & 0 & . 007 & . 03 & . 074 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & \({ }^{(11)}\) & \({ }^{\text {'. }} 078\) & 20 & 4 & . 022 & . 11 & . 119 & \({ }_{107}^{28}\) & 19 & . 054 & . 28 & . 088 \\
\hline \$500-\$299 & 916 & 21 & 7 & . 010 & . 05 & . 118 & 4 & 1 & . 004 & . 02 & . 102 & 105 & 31 & . 046 & . 23 & . 106 & 107 & 76 & . 077 & . 35 & . 115 \\
\hline \$1,000- \(\$ 1,499\) & 523 & 31 & 14 & . 027 & . 13 & . 126 & 7 & 5 & . 008 & . 04 & . 100 & 110 & 42 & . 093 & . 46 & . 109 & \({ }_{52}^{88}\) & 60 & . 142 & . 85 & -115 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 270 & 20 & 4 & . 042 & . 17 & . 133 & 3 & 1 & . 010 & . 05 & . 092 & 55 & 19 & . 086 & . 42 & . 115 & 52
57 & 38 & . 142 & . 89 & +132 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,099 & 222 & 21 & 6 & . 056 & . 26 & .106 & 3 & 3 & . 008 & . 05 & \({ }_{7} .128\) & 55 & 16 & . 131 & . 66 & . 121 & 57 & 37
14 & . 198 & . 89 & - 145 \\
\hline \$3,000- 24,999 & 101 & 13 & 2 & . 090 & . 41 & .110 & 1 & 0 & . 010 & . 04 & 7.130 & 20
12 & 9
5 & .103
.219 & .52
1.06 & .117
.141 & \(\begin{array}{r}32 \\ -18 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 14
6 & . 231 & . 89 & . 145 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 39 & 3 & 1 & . 048 & . 23 & . 140 & 0 & 0 & . 060 & . 00 & & 12 & 5 & . 219 & 1.06 & . 141 & 418 & 6 & . 251 & . 86 & . 169 \\
\hline Type 1 & 382 & 21 & 7 & . 021 & . 09 & . 150 & 2 & 1 & . 003 & . 02 & 7. 144 & 59 & 21 & . 051 & . 26 & , 134 & 62 & 39 & . 081 & . 34 & . 141 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 29 & 11 & . 026 & . 12 & .127 & 2 & 2 & . 003 & . 02 & \({ }^{7} .102\) & 80 & 24 & . 058 & . 29 & . 127 & 71 & 40 & . 076 & . 31 & . 127 \\
\hline 'rypes 4 and 5 & 1,018 & 45 & 7 & . 024 & . 11 & . 106 & 9 & 3 & . 006 & . 03 & . 098 & 147 & 49 & . 067 & . 33 & . 108 & 194 & 128 & .132 & . 59 & - 113 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7....... & 439 & 22 & 9 & . 032 & . 16 & . 098 & 6 & 4 & . 010 & . 05 & . 100 & 91 & 32 & . 115 & . 58 & . 094 & 55 & 43 & . 115 & . 54 & . 096 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 53.-trems of food consumed at home during one week (7.day estimate): Number of households consuming specifed ilems of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, \& analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 9 ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{3,583} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{13ACON, STRIJ} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{SAL'T SIDE, DRY CURED} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{HAM, SLICED} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{HAM, WHOLE OR HALF} \\
\hline & & No,
440 & No. 293 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0. U122
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L 6 . \\
& 0.23
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.128
\end{gathered}
\] & \(N^{r} 0\). 145 & No. 164 & \[
\begin{gathered}
I \nLeftarrow R L \\
0 . W 25
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { It. } \\
& 0.14
\end{aligned}
\] & Doi. & No. 878 & No. 760 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.218
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h . \\
& 0.82
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dot } \\
0.123
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& N_{0} \\
& 323
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 264 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.147
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h_{1} \\
& 0.59
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0. 129
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Net losses
Net incomes & 3. \(\begin{array}{r}565 \\ \hline 58\end{array}\) & \({ }_{4}{ }_{3}^{7}\) & 2888 & .087
.062 & .35
.23 & \(=-\)
.1111
.128 & 198 & 160 & . 022 & .12
.14 & .140
.120 & \(=-7\)
11
867 & 10
780 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 128 \\
& .21 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
\therefore & = \\
& 52 \\
& .53
\end{aligned}
\] & .138
.123 & 7
316 & 6 6 & - \(-:=-\)
.307
.145 & - & \(-==\)
.114
.130 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 334 & 38 & 25 & . 053 & . 19 & . 118 & 19 & 15 & 021 & 12 & . 119 & 42 & 34 & . 087 & . 35 & . 125 & '24 & 20 & . 52 & 61 & 134 \\
\hline \$ \(5000-\$ 999\) & 897 & 1(1) & 5.1 & . 047 & . 17 & . 110 & 133 & 47 & . 0133 & . 18 & . 118 & 162 & 139 & . 127 & . 49 & . 109 & 6.3 & 48 & . 082 & 33 & .134
.126 \\
\hline \$1,0001-\$1.499 & 979 & 102 & 719 & . 0.54 & . 210 & . 124 & 51 & 48 & . 024 & . 15 & . 121 & 236 & 2313 & . 230 & -86 & . 125 & 60
40 & 78 & . 101 & 6.3 & . 127 \\
\hline \$1,500- 81.399 & 647 & 8 8.5 & (i) & . 072 & . 25 & . 134 & 30 & 22 & . 619 & . 10 & . 116 & 192 & 164 & .240 & .91 & . \(12 \%\) & 63 & 55 & . 162 & . 62 & . 138 \\
\hline \$2,010 \(-\$ 2.999\) & 474 & 78 & 52 & . 084 & . 31 & . 134 & 20 & 20 & . 016 & . 09 & . 126 & 158 & 140 & . 346 & 1.31 & . 124 & 51 & 40 & . 171 & . 72 & . 129 \\
\hline \$3,000 \$4. 999 & 170 & 26 & 21 & . 080 & . 32 & . 138 & 7 & 7 & .017 & . 04 & . 246 & 68 & 64 & . 454 & 1.72 & . 128 & 21 & 17 & - 220 & . 90 & . 121 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 27 & 6 & 4 & . 180 & . 72 & . 1313 & 1 & 1 & . 0.023 & . 44 & 7.126 & \(\stackrel{4}{4}\) & 6 6 & . 318 & 1.94 & . 157 & 4 & 17 & . 204 & . 85 & . 151 \\
\hline Type 1. & 8 & 94 & 53 & . 0.18 & . 17 & . 150 & 41 & 29 & . 014 & . 08 & , 141 & & & & . \(53{ }^{-}\) & & 63 & & 114 & & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 914 & 138 & 31 & . 070 & . 2.5 & . 128 & 56 & 50) & . 025 & . 14 & .141
.124 & 208 & 144
172 & .141
.186 & .53
.69 & 145
.130 & 63 & 49
41 & 114
.115 & . 44 & 150
.130 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1.34. & 154 & 142 & . 048 & . 25 & . 121 & 71 & 59 & . 029 & . 15 & .116 & 326 & 287 & . 231 & . 88 & . 120 & 137 & 107 & . 169 & 68 & 127 \\
\hline Typres 6 and 7 & 479 & 54 & 47 & 0.58 & . 22 & . 10.1 & 28 & 26 & . 032 & . 17 & . OHE & 169 & 157 & . 377 & 1. 45 & . 093 & . 53 & 47 & 205 & . 85 & . 109 \\
\hline sovtleast-wilate OPRRATORG & & & & & & & & & & & -- -- & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 2,350 & \(2 \times 1\) & 153 & . 016 & . 28 & . 11 n & 1. 443 & 1,016 & 300 & 2.07 & . 103 & 879 & 833 & . 283 & 1. 25 & . 111 & 225 & 210 & 130 & . 37 & . 120 \\
\hline \$0.8499. & 279
916 & 13
63 & 10
42 & .023 & - 10 & .110 & 174 & 113 & . 259 & 1. 811 & . 088 & 75 & 75 & . 169 & .74 & 096 & 8 & 8 & 016 & . 08 & . 126 \\
\hline \$1,0 \(293-\$ 1,499\) & 523 & 63
65 & 42 & . 044 & . 212 & . 103 & \$09 & 467 & - 310 & 2. 16 & . 0957 & 242 & 281 & . 217 & . \(\%\) & . 106 & 75 & 71 & . 030 & .36 & . 10, \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1.9997 & 220 & 30 & 2.4 & . \(0 \times 9\) & '418 & . 112 & 1512 & 231
114 & -317 & 2.17 & . 108 &  & 195 & 296 & 1. 33 & . 111 & 62 & 56 & 162 & . 72 & . 116 \\
\hline \$2.0060 \$2,959 & 222 & 16 & 14 & . 062 & . 27 & . 122 & 109
116 & 114 & . 317 & 2. 24 & - 112 & 123
117 & 117 & . 374 & 1. 66 & . 114 & 351 & 33 & . 220 & 1. 09 & . 133 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4, 4399 & 101 & 11 & 9 & -132 & . 37 & . 1118 & 116 & 45 & .2665
.342 & 2. 8.3 & . 114 & 117
49 & 109 & . 4417 & 1.97 & .114
.135 & 21 & 19 & 192 & . 81 & . 135 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 34 & 3 & 3 & . 051 & . 23 & . 175 & 24 & 17 & . 272 & 1. 76 & . 145 & 19 & 13 & 344 & 1. 401 & . 143 & 7 & 5 & . 355 & 1. 28 & . 175 \\
\hline Type 1. & \(3 \times 2\) & 37 & 35 & . 047 & . 21 & - \(142=\) & - 202 & 161 & . 195 & 1.37 & \(=:=\) & 160 & 156 & . \(239{ }^{-}\) & & -- 130 & & & . 069 & & 140 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 43 & 29 & . 06.4 & . 24 & .121 & \({ }^{212} 1\) & 221 & . 279 & 1.91 & . 112 & 198 & 156 & . 239 & 1. 120 & 130
.114 & 32
34 & 28 & . 0699 & 30
85 & 149
.139 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 90 & 65 & . 068 & . 31 & . 14.5 & 629 & 454 & . 315 & 2.17 & . 098 & 382 & 362 & - 297 & 1. 32 & . 107 & 117 & 112 & . 1.66 & . 65 & 1139
.114 \\
\hline \({ }^{\text {'Types } 6 \text { and }} 7\). & 465 & 31 & 23 & O \(\mathrm{CiS}^{3}\) & . 28 & . 089 & 2*) & 178 & . 379 & 2. 61 & . 687 & 149 & 133 & . 297 & I. 33 & . 093 & 42 & 37 & . 181 & . 79 & . 1108 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 53.-IThms of Food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specifed items of
 specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm fantilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



Table 53.-Items of food consumed at home during one wefk (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis unils in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband ant wile, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHEAST-NEGRO FAMILIES \({ }^{\text {: }}\) \\
All types
\end{tabular} & 1,564 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 1 & 0 & (10) & (11) & \({ }^{7} .188\) & 42 & 0 & . 010 & . 08 & . 075 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & --- \\
\hline T Type 1-.........------- & 266 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 9 & 0 & . 010 & . 07 & . 114 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline T ypes 2 ard 3 & 357 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 1 & 0 & (10) & (i1) & \({ }^{7} .188\) & 7 & 0 & . 005 & . 04 & . 071 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & -... \\
\hline -1 T ypes 4 and 5. & 602 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 19 & 0 & . 014 & . 11 & . 070 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & - \\
\hline \({ }^{\circ}\) Types 6 and 7. & 339 & 0 & 0 & .000 & 00 & & 0 & 0 & .000 & . 00 & ------ & 7 & 0 & . 009 & . 01 & . 045 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline \[
1
\] & & LAM & B AND & D MU' & TON, & LEG & & AMB & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AND } \\
& \text { BREA }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathrm{UTT}_{\mathrm{T}}
\] & & & \[
\underset{\mathrm{MCK}}{\mathrm{MB}}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ND } \mathrm{M} \\
& \mathrm{OR}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { UTTO } \\
& \text { ULD }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & MB & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { IND } \\
& \text { OTHE }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\text { UTT }_{17}
\] & \\
\hline All types. & 3,583 & No. 13 & No. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.004
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.02
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.116
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No. } \\
8
\end{array}
\] & No. 1 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.001
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.123
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 6 & No. 0 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.001
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\underset{\left({ }^{(11)}\right.}{L b}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
D \circ l . \\
0.166
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 7 & No. 3 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.001
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.145
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 3 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & 135 & 2 & 0 & (10) & (11) & \({ }^{7} .130\) & , & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & 214 & 3 & 2 & . 002 & 01 & 140 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 2 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & '. 120 & 1 & 1 & . 001 & . 01 & 7. 144 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (11) & 7.067 & 2 & 1 & . 001 & . 01 & 7. 092 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 7 & 2 & . 007 & . 02 & . 116 & 1 & 0 & (10) & (11) & 7.082 & 2 & 0 & . 001 & (11) & 7.143 & 2 & 0 & . 001 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .207\) \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 479 & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & \({ }^{\top} .061\) & 4 & 0 & . 004 & . 03 & . 125 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE OpERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 2,350 & 4 & 2 & . 002 & . 01 & . 167 & 1 & 0 & (10) & (11) & \({ }^{7} .146\) & 2 & 1 & . 001 & (1) & \({ }^{7} .115\) & 2 & 2 & . 003 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .116\) \\
\hline Type 1 & 382 & 1 & 1 & . 002 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} 128\) & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} 146\) & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & 00 & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & (i) 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 3 & 1 & . 004 & . 02 & . 181 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 1 & 1 & . 0001 & (11) & 7.140
+091 & 2
0 & 2
0 & .006
.000 & . 03 & \({ }^{7} .116\) \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 439 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (11) & \({ }^{7} .091\) & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE SHARECROPPERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 878 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & 00 & ------ \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-NEGRO families \({ }^{8}\) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 1,564 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Thble 53.- items of food consumed at home during one whek (7-day mistimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Housetolds of nonrelicf farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ']

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOLTHEAST-WHITE OPERATORS \\
All types. \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & 2,350 & 9 & 3 & . 002 & . 01 & . 122 & 16 & 7 & . 008 & . 04 & . 136 & 74 & 5 & . 015 & . 09 & . 122 & 322 & 115 & . 062 & . 33 & . 116 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 279 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & (11) & \({ }^{7} .077\) & 1 & 0 & .001 & (1) & 7.077 & 6 & 1 & . 009 & . 06 & . 136 & 21 & 10 & . 029 & . 16 & . 102 \\
\hline \$500-\$909 & 916 & 1 & 0 & (10) & (i) & 9.075 & 3 & 1 & . 007 & . 04 & . 152 & 20 & 2 & . 012 & . 08 & . 102 & 120 & 53 & . 052 & . 29 & . 114 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 523 & 2 & 1 & . 003 & . 01 & ? 147 & 2 & 1 & . 003 & . 01 & 7.147 & 12 & 1 & . 008 & . 05 & . 114 & 73 & 22 & . 064 & . 33 & . 110 \\
\hline \$1,500- \$1,999. & 270 & 1 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .076\) & 2 & 0 & . 005 & . 02 & '.083 & 18 & 1 & . 034 & . 20 & . 115 & 51 & 14 & . 098 & . 57 & . 117 \\
\hline \$2, (0)0-\$2, 499 & 222 & 3 & 1 & . 008 & . 03 & . 162 & 3 & 2 & . 015 & . 07 & . 162 & 9 & 0 & . 016 & . 12 & . 159 & 30 & 9 & . 074 & . 40 & . 137 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 101 & 0 & 0 & . 010 & .00 & & 2 & 1 & . 019 & . 09 & '. 138 & 6 & 0 & . 032 & . 11 & . 1160 & 18 & 7 & . 094 & . 44 & . 120 \\
\hline \$5,010 or over. & 39 & 1 & 1 & . 017 & . 10 & \({ }^{7} .087\) & 3 & 2 & . 074 & . 38 & . 142 & 3 & 0 & . 070 & . 23 & . 110 & 6 & 0 & . 069 & . 27 & . 167 \\
\hline Type 1-... & 382 & 2 & 1 & . 004 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .147\) & 4 & 2 & . 011 & . 03 & . 164 & 16 & 2 & . 016 & . 09 & . 149 & 58 & 28 & . 0103 & . 31 & . 139 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & . 14 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & . 164 & 10 & 0 & . 020 & . 07 & . 126 & 80 & 19 & . 052 & . 30 & . 118 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 6 & 2 & . 003 & . 01 & -121 & 10 & 5 & . 014 & . 07 & 136 & 36 & 2 & . 019 & .10 & . 118 & 131 & 56 & . 067 & . 36 & . 112 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 439 & 1 & 0 & . 0002 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .076\) & 2 & 0 & . 0003 & . 01 & 7.083 & 12 & 1 & . 014 & .10 & . 082 & 53 & 12 & . 059 & . 32 & . 098 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE sHaRECROPPERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 878 & 5 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & . 0077 & 5 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & . 097 & 20 & 0 & . 010 & . 06 & . 094 & 125 & 20 & . 049 & . 26 & . 092 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 236 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 0008 & . 00 & & 4 & 0 & . 005 & . 03 & . 100 & 25 & 5 & . 025 & . 15 & . 073 \\
\hline \$560-\$899... & 462 & 3 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & . 090 & 3 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & . 090 & 7 & 0 & . 0009 & . 05 & . 081 & 68 & 11 & . 051 & . 28 & . 095 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499.. & 134 & 2 & 0 & . 000 & . 02 & \({ }^{7} .107\) & 2 & 0 & . 006 & . 02 & 7. 107 & 6 & 0 & . 016 & . 10 & .106 & 26 & 3 & . 081 & . 42 & . 100 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999.. & 46 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 3 & 0 & . 041 & .22 & . 089 & 6 & 1 & . 066 & . 27 & .108 \\
\hline T'ype 1. \(\quad\). & 140 & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & \(\stackrel{7}{7} 106\) & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & 7. 106 & 3 & 0 & . 008 & . 05 & . 128 & 21 & 3 & . 039 & . 22 & . 111 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292
276 & 2 & 0 & . 0104 & . 01 & +104 & 2 & 0 & . 004 & . 01 & \({ }_{7}^{7.094}\) & 4 & 0 & . 004 & . 02 & . 104 & 46 & 9 & . 048 & . 22 & . 097 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 276 & 2 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & 7. 085 & 2 & 0 & . 003 & . 01 & \({ }^{\circ} .085\) & 9 & 0 & . 018 & . 09 & . 096 & 38 & 6 & . 058 & . 33 & . 088 \\
\hline Tyues 6 and 7 & 170 & \((1\) & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & -- & 0 & 0 & . CNO & . 00 & & 4 & 0 & . 016 & . 10 & . 072 & 20 & 2 & . 051 & . 22 & . 079 \\
\hline All types \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & t, 564 & 1 & 0 & (19) & (11) & '. 082 & 1 & 0 & ( \({ }^{19}\) ) & (1) & \({ }^{7} .082\) & 47 & 0 & . 011 & . 08 & . 077 & 241 & 17 & . 049 & . 28 & . 074 \\
\hline \[
\$ 0-\$ 499
\] & 730
657 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 010 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & & 0 & & . 06 & & 92 & 9 & . 038 & . 22 & . 067 \\
\hline \$8500-\$999 & 657
149 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & . 01 & 7.082 & 1 & 0 & , 001 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .082\) & 22 & 0 & . 014 & . 10 & . 086 & 114 & 6 & . 055 & . 32 & . 074 \\
\hline \$1,000- \(\$ 1,500-499\). & 149
20 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 5 & 0 & . 019 & . 13 & . 063 & 28 & 2 & . 070 & . 39 & . 093 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999.. & 20 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 6 & 0 & . 164 & . 90 & . 081 \\
\hline Type 1-.... & 206 & 0 & 0 & .000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 10 & 0 & . 009 & . 08 & . 110 & 38 & 2 & . 035 & . 19 & . 101 \\
\hline Types 2 aud 3. & 357 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 010 & & 10 & 0 & . 008 & . 06 & . 085 & 67 & 5 & . 064 & . 41 & . 080 \\
\hline 'I yous 4 and 5 - & 602 & 1 & 0 & (10) & . 01 & 7.082 & 1 & 0 & . 010 & . 01 & \({ }^{7} .082\) & 20 & 0 & . 015 & . 11 & . 069 & 99 & 5 & . 0.54 & . 30 & . 068 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 339 & 0 & 0 & . 040 & . 00 & & 0 1 & 0 & . 000 & .00 & & 7 & 0 & . 009 & . 06 & . 045 & 37 & 5 & . 037 & . 21 & . 0.52 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See tootnotes at and of table.
'Table 53.-Items of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantily per household, and average value of all food per food-expendilure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936- Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both uative-bora ?]
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Table 53.- items of food consumed at home during one wefk (7-d^y festimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per houschold, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1930-Continucd
[Households of noarellef farm families that include a husbaud and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Aualysis unit, family type, and iacome class \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{4}{*}{Number of households} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mousetholds consuming -} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Aver-
age
quan-
lity
per
house-
hold} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Averare \({ }^{1}\) value of thll food per пиез]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households constrwing-} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Avernge \({ }^{3}\) value per banse hold} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Aver- } \\
\text { ages } \\
\text { quinn- } \\
\text { tity } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { hollse- } \\
\text { hold }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text { Aver- } & \text { llouseholds } \\
\text { uge } 4 & \text { consuming }-
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { A yer- } \\
\text { 日ge }{ }^{3} \\
\text { quan- } \\
\text { tity } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { house- } \\
\text { hold }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text { Aver- } & \text { Households } \\
\text { age } 4 & \text { consuming- }
\end{array}
\]} & Average \({ }^{3}\) & A verare \({ }^{3}\) quan- & Average value \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Any} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
With- & valno \\
out di- & per \\
recl. ex- \\
pendi- & hold
\end{tabular}} & & & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Any} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Without di-rectex-pendi-} & & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{of all food per dnitmeal \({ }^{5}\)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Any} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{|c|c|} 
With- & valuc \\
out di- & per \\
rectex- & house- \\
pendi- & hold
\end{tabular}} & & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{value of ull food per unitmeals} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Any} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Without di-rectex-} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Falue per housebold} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(\underset{\text { tity }}{\text { quan- }}\) \\
per \\
house- \\
hold
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{of all poor unit. meal :} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{2,350} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{FLOUR, WHITF.} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{CORN MEAL} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{HOMINY GRITS} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{RICE,} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{All types......-.-....} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Na} . \\
& 2,308
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{No. 653} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.
0.628} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\frac{L b .}{14.11}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.104
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} . \\
2,163
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 1,610
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.243
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\frac{L b,}{11.32}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.105
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
604
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{No .} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& L .6 \\
& 1.51
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0. 107
\end{tabular}} & No. & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol } \\
0.073
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(L h\). \\
1. 23
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0.111
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & N,004 & \[
{ }_{12}
\] & & & \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 279 & 272 & 93 & . 533 & 11.97 & . 089 & 255 & 196 & . 233 & 11.11 & . 090 & 62 & 33 & . 043 & 1.38 & . 084 & -76 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.045
.056} & . 78 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.092
.098} \\
\hline \$500-\$48Y & 916 & 902 & 294 & . 634 & 14.23 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.087
.109} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 630 \\
& 375
\end{aligned}
\]} & . 257 & 12. 114 & . 098 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 172 \\
& 151
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
92
\]} & . 036 & 1.16 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
.095
\]} & 312 & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}.98 \\ 1.44 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 523 & 511 & 135 & . 660 & & & & & . 252 & 11.85 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.110
.115} & & & . 053 & 1.55 & & 257 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3 \\
& 5
\end{aligned}
\] & -084 & & .098
.114 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 270 & 268 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{68
45} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.642
.658} & 14.88
14.68 & . 115 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 479 \\
& 251 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & 195 & . 242 & 11. 28 & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
151 \\
89
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 75 \\
& 47
\end{aligned}
\] & . 067 & 2. 14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .111 \\
& .115
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{143
124} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \\
& 2
\end{aligned}
\] & . 096 & 1.63 & .116 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 222 & 218 & & & 14.76 & . 114 & 205 & 146 & . 196 & 8.87 & .115 & 84 & 45 & . 073 & 2. 29 & . 117 & & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|l}
2 & .096 & 1.63 & .116 \\
1 & .102 & 1.68 & .120
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \$3,000- \(\$ 4,999\). & 101 & 98 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{162} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{- 583} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 12.87 \\
& 11.50
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .126 \\
& .150
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 91 \\
& 34
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{53
15} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
.205 \\
.231 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{9.18
8.76} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.128 \\
.154
\end{array}
\]} & 30 & 11 & . 053 & 1. 68 & . 132 & (i1 & 0 & . 102 & 1. 40 & . 135 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 39 & 39 & & & & & & & & & & 16 & 3 & . 065 & 1. 20 & . 152 & 31 & 0 & . 138 & 2.01 & . 149 \\
\hline Type 1............... & 382 & 373 & 109 & . 418 & 9.15 & . 126 & 347 & 247 & . 179 & 8. 16 & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .128 \\
& .113 \\
& .101 \\
& .088
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
75 \\
124 \\
245 \\
160
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
35 \\
62 \\
117 \\
92
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .025 \\
& .028 \\
& .047 \\
& .086
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.74 \\
1.15 \\
1.46 \\
\text { 2. } 74
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .128 \\
& .117 \\
& .106 \\
& .092
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 137 \\
& 219 \\
& 435 \\
& 213
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{1
1
6
4} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{.045
.064
.075
.105} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .71 \\
& 1.06 \\
& 1.23 \\
& 1.87
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{.134
.119
.109
.092} \\
\hline T'ypes 2 and 3.......... & 511 & 503 & 123 & . 531 & 11. 73 & .113 & 461 & 323 & . 202 & 9.13 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline rypes 4 and 5 & 1,018 & 998 & 278 & . 650 & 14. 53 & . 100 & 948 & 642 & . 266 & 12.50 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline rypes 6 an & 439 & 434 & 143 & . 873 & 20. 20 & . 087 & 407 & 348 & . 291 & 13.88 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|l|}{SOUTHEAST--WHITE SHARECHOPHERS} \\
\hline 111 type & 878 & 870 & 142 & . 636 & 14.50 & . 087 & 801 & 495 & . 228 & 10.39 & . 088 & 170 & 67 & . 035 & 1.09 & . 086 & 309 & 3 & . 053 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{.92 . 088} \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 236 & 235 & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
61 \\
77 \\
8 \\
6
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
. 556 \\
.656 \\
.664 \\
.752
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
12.69
14.99 \\
15. 13 \\
16.94
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .080 \\
& .088 \\
& .095 \\
& .098
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{217
418
121
45} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
122 \\
264 \\
80 \\
29
\end{array}
\]} & . 232 & 10.42 & . 080 & 43 & 18 & . 033 & 1.01 & . 078 & 88 & 1 & . 053 & . 98 & . 083 \\
\hline \$500-\$999. & 462 & 457 & & & & & & & . 238 & 10.92 & . 089 & 89 & 36 & . 033 & 1.03 & . 084 & 150 & 1 & . 048 & .83 & . 087 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 134 & 132 & & & & & & & . 197 & 8. 83 & . 094 & 32 & 11 & . 050 & 1. 60 & . 103 & 56 & 1 & . 067 & 1. 19 & . 097 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,959 & 46 & 46 & & & & & & & . 199 & 9.41 & . 098 & 6 & 2 & . 023 & . 71 & . 093 & 15 & 0 & . 038 & . 64 & . 097 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 53.-ITEMS Of FOOD CONSUMED AT home during one whek (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and atterage value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-. Continued
[Households of nonrelicf farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



Table b3." tems of food constmed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 -Continued
[Households of nonrelier farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{CORN ANI) OTRER SIKUPS} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{FELLIES ANI JAMS} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{FRESERVES} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{CANDY} \\
\hline All types.---------- & 3,583 & No.
368 & No.
0. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Dol} . \\
0 .(120)
\end{gathered}
\] & Ib
0.22 & DoL.
0.128 & - No & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 1,630
\end{aligned}
\] & Dot. & Lb.
1.07 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.124
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{c}
No \\
\hline 343 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & No.
307 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.045
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b_{.} \\
& 0.26
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { DoL } \\
0.132
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 945 & No. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { nol. } \\
0.052
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Y_{h} . \\
& 0.26
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.124
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Net losses. & 55 & 7 & 0 & . 017 & . 22 & . 126 & 24 & 16 & . 131 & 85 & . 136 & 5 & 3 & . 024 & . 14 & . 128 & 17 & 0 & . 037 & . 20 & .125
.124 \\
\hline Net incomes. & 3,523 & 363 & 69 & . 020 & . 22 & . 128 & 1,781 & 1,614 & . 196 & 1.08 & . 123 & 338 & 304 & . 046 & . 26 & . 132 & 928 & 21 & . 052 & . 26 & \\
\hline \$0. \(\$ 490\) & 334 & 41 & 3 & 016 & . 19 & . 112 & 138 & 115 & . 130 & . 71 & . 121 & 25 & 21 & . 033 & . 18 & . 126 & 5 & 8 & . 028 & 14
.18 & . 118 \\
\hline \$500-\$099 & 897 & 78 & 12 & .015 & . 18 & . 119 & 308 & 361 & . 158 & . 88 & . 115 & 56 & 51 & . 023 & . 14 & . 124 & 180 & 8 & . 035 & . 18 & .115
.128 \\
\hline \$1,0019-\$1,499 & 979 & 93 & 22 & . 018 & .18 & . 127 & 489 & 437 & . 202 & 1. 10 & - 123 & 95 & 82 & . 041 & . 24 & . 134 & 267
204 & 3
3 & . 051 & .26
.31 & .128
-124 \\
\hline \$1,500 \$1,949. & 647 & 64 & 16 & . 023 & . 26 & . 133 & 344 & 318 & . 214 & 1.16 & . 128 & 75 & 69 & . 068 & . 36 & . 143 & 204
136 & 3
5 & . 064 & . 31 & . 124 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 60 & 12 & . 030 & .31 & . 132 & 289 & 269 & . 205 & 1. 46 & . 129 & 59 & 55 & . 061 & . 38 & . 130 & 136 & 5
0 & .064
.108
.08 & \(\begin{array}{r}.34 \\ .50 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & . 129 \\
\hline \$,3,000-\$1,999 & 170 & 17 & 3 & . 016 & . 16 & - 171 & 108 & 99
15 & . 250 & 1.35 & . 123 & 26 & 24 & .086
.052 & .48
.26 & .128
7.102 & 65
11 & 0 & .108
.127 & .50
.06 & . 131 \\
\hline \$5,00) or over & 27 & 8 & 1 & . 063 & . 49 & . 157 & \%6 & 15 & . 2226 & 1. 24 & . 144 & 2 & 2 & . 052 & . 26 & 7. 102 & 11 & 0 & . 127 & .26 & . 142 \\
\hline Jype 1 & 841 & 76 & 18 & . 016 & . 16 & . 148 & 358 & 323 & . 138 & . 75 & . 147 & 79 & 66 & . 035 & . 20 & . 158 & 149 & 5 & . 030 & .15 & 150
.132 \\
\hline \(T\) ypes 2 and 3 & 914 & 98 & 16 & . 019 & .19 & . 134 & 472 & 428 & . 190 & 1.61 & - 129 & 70 & 63 & . 032 & . 18 & . 133 & 311 & 2 & . 060 & \(\begin{array}{r}.31 \\ .25 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & . 132 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 151 & 30 & . 023 & . 26 & . 119 & 6.85 & 608 & . 207 & 1.12 & . 119 & 129 & 316 & . 048 & . 27 & . 129 & 311
174 & 11 & .052
.073 & . 25 & .117
.103 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 479 & 43 & 5 & . 020 & . 24 & .107 & 290 & 271 & . 273 & 1.54 & . 097 & 65 & 62 & . 079 & . 50 & . 106 & 174 & 3 & . 073 & . 40 & \\
\hline southeast -wiite OPERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 2,350 & 436 & 270 & . 036 & . 63 & . 102 & 710 & 657 & . 118 & . 64 & . 120 & 408 & 386 & . 083 & . 43 & . 113 & 282 & 2 & . 017 & .11 & . 110 \\
\hline \$0-\$199 & 279 & 44 & 28 & . 022 & . 39 & . 095 & 62 & 56 & -079 & . 44 & . 114 & 30 & 29 & . 049 & . 25 & . 108 & 29 & 0 & . 009 & . 09 & . 089 \\
\hline \$500-\$889 & 916 & 180 & 122 & . 038 & . 72 & . 091 & 267 & 245 & - 112 & . 65 & . 111 & 138 & 130 & . 071 & . 36 & . 102 & 90 & 0 & . 013 & . 08 & . 108 \\
\hline \$1,000- \(\$ 1,489\) & 523 & 109 & 64 & . 046 & . 79 & , 105 & 168 & 156 & . 140 & . 74 & - 123 & 104 & 97 & . 099 & . 51 & . 111 & 68 & 0 & . 018 & . 12 & . 108 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,099 & 270 & 43 & 25 & . 032 & . 57 & . 115 & (19) & 86 & . 120 & . 62 & . 129 & 56 & 52 & . 093 & . 49 & . 128 & 46 & 0 & . 024 & . 16 & . 113 \\
\hline \$2,010-\$2,999 & 222 & 39 & 20 & . 029 & . 44 & . 124 & R 3 & 59 & . 104 & . 52 & . 122 & 43 & 42 & . 1015 & . 53 & . 117 & 34 & 1 & . 027 & . 15 & . 133 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 101 & 17 & 10 & . 032 & . 51 & . 121 & 38 & 35 & . 148 & . 74 & . 139 & 25 & 24 & . 110 & . 56 & . 133 & 14 & 1 & . 024 & . 14 & . 114 \\
\hline \$5,000 or aver. & 39 & 4 & 1 & . 011 & .17 & . 145 & 22 & 20 & . 222 & 1.15 & . 143 & 12 & 12 & . 162 & . 81 & . 145 & 1 & 0 & . 006 & . 03 & \({ }^{7} .140\) \\
\hline Type 1. & 382 & 48 & 27 & . 016 & . 25 & . 130 & 116 & 102 & . 089 & . 50 & . 143 & 59 & 53 & . 059 & . 30 & . 142 & 21 & 0 & . 008 & . 04 & . 130 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 94 & 27 & . 027 & .44 & .110 & 158 & 146 & .112 & . 56 & . 125 & 90 & 87 & . 071 & . 36 & .119 & 93 & 0 & . 023 & . 16 & . 119 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,018 & 192 & 116 & . 036 & . 61 & . 0998 & 314 & 259 & . 124 & . 64 & . 114 & 188 & 176 & . 095 & . 49 & . 110 & 95 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & . 013 & . 09 & - 100 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7........... & 439 & 102 & 74 & . 063 & 1.25 & . 088 & 122 & 120 & .136 & . 85 & . 103 & 71 & 70 & . 093 & . 41 & . 090 & 73 & 0 & . 023 & .15 & . 096 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 53.--items of food consumed at home during one wefk (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specifed items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States,' March-November 1936-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-bora 9]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Analysis unit, family type, and income class \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Number ol households \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A verage quanLity per household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A verage 4 vatue of all food per unitmeal \({ }^{5}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A verage value per household} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity per housebold} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
Aver- & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Households \\
age
\end{tabular} \\
consuming-
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) yalue per hausebold} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity per household} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l|l} 
A ver- & Households \\
Hge & consuming-
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Aver- } \\
\text { age } \\
\text { quan- } \\
\text { tity } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { house- } \\
\text { bold }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A ver. value of all food per mait-} \\
\hline & & Any & With-
out di-
rect ex-
pendi-
turo & & & & Any & Without di-rectex-penditure & & & of all food per unitmeal \({ }^{3}\) & Any & Without di-rectex-penditure & & & value
of all
food
per
unit-
meal & Any & With. out direct ex penditure & & & \\
\hline & & (3) & (4) & (5) & (B) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|c|}{CORN AND OTHER SIRUPS \(\quad\) JELLIESAND JAMS PRESERVES \(\quad\) PAND} \\
\hline All types-..-...------ & 878 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
148
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 83 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Dol} . \\
0.031
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.52
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.090
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 152 & No. 143 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pol. } \\
0.073
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.38
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.101
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 110 & No. 100 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { not }_{0} \\
0.064
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lb. } \\
& 0.33
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.097
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 118 & No. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.015
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b_{.} \\
& 0.10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.088
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 236 & 35 & 23 & . 022 & . 36 & . 080 & 42 & 39 & . 069 & . 36 & . 097 & 21 & 20 & . 045 & . 23 & . 094 & 32 & 0 & . 010 & . 07 & . 079 \\
\hline \$560-8\$89. & 462 & 90 & 52 & . 037 & . 62 & . 089 & 89 & 87 & . 084 & .44 & - 100 & 61 & 55 & . 0170 & .36 & . 0099 & 63 & 1 & . 016 & . 10 & . 090 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 134 & 18 & 7 & . 031 & . 54 & . 104 & 14 & 10 & . 036 & . 19 & . 116 & 21 & 19 & . 074 & . 39 & . 099 & 15 & 0 & . 021 & . 12 & . 091 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,989 & 40 & 5 & 1 & . 026 & . 31 & . 115 & 7 & 7 & . 085 & . 42 & .108 & 7 & 6 & . 065 & .36 & . 090 & 8 & 0 & . 018 & . 12 & . 093 \\
\hline Type 1.... & 140 & I6 & 5 & . 015 & . 22 & . 110 & 27 & 26 & . 062 & . 33 & . 118 & 19 & 18 & -051 & . 2 i & . 114 & 13 & 0 & . 011 & . 06 & , 103 \\
\hline Types 2 and & 292 & 53 & 30 & . 023 & . 44 & . 095 & 52 & 48 & . 069 & .35 & . 105 & 31 & 27 & - 0.50 & . 24 & . 113 & 53 & 0 & . 017 & .11 & . 091 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 276 & 42 & 22 & . 030 & . 45 & . 086 & 19 & 47 & . 083 & . 43 & . 098 & 31 & 27 & - 016 & . 33 & . 090 & 24 & 0 & . 011 & . 07 & . 091 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 170 & 37 & 26 & . 057 & 1.04 & . 076 & 24 & 22 & . 073 & . 40 & . 081 & 29 & 28 & . 101 & . 50 & . 078 & 28 & , & . 023 & . 14 & .072 \\
\hline All types \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & I, 564 & 194 & 127 & . 024 & . 43 & . 070 & 82 & 69 & . 018 & . 09 & . 091 & 86 & 77 & . 028 & . 16 & . 084 & 123 & 2 & . 008 & . 05 & . 088 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 730 & 81 & 50 & . 021 & . 39 & . 068 & 29 & 22 & . 010 & . 06 & . 081 & 17 & 14 & . 011 & & & & & & 03 & \\
\hline \$500-\$999. & \({ }_{6557}\) & 93 & 64 & . 1228 & . 49 & . 067 & 33 & 30 & . 018 & . 09 & . 095 & 49 & 45 & . 040 & .23 & . 080 & 47 & 1 & . 008 & .\(_{05}\) & . 068 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499. & 149 & 15 & 8 & . 024 & . 39 & . 083 & \(1{ }^{18}\) & 14 & . 043 & . 22 & . 088 & 18 & 16 & . 054 & . 26 & . 0.94 & 21 & 0 & . 021 & . 12 & . 084 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,499 & 20 & 4 & 4 & . 052 & . 78 & . 100 & 3 & 3 & . 075 & . 38 & . 130 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & & 4 & (J) & . 020 & . 12 & . 080 \\
\hline Type 1 & 286 & 30 & 16 & . 015 & . 30 & . 084 & 16 & 14 & . 017 & . OH & . 124 & 9 & 8 & . 009 & . 05 & . 132 & 15 & 0 & & & . 089 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 357 & 45 & 30 & . 021 & .37 & . 076 & 20 & 15 & . 017 & . 08 & . 091 & 18 & 16 & . 023 & . 12 & . 088 & 34 & 1 & . 011 & . 03 & . 072 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 602 & 66 & 44 & . 022 & . 37 & . 070 & 26 & 22 & . 014 & .08 & . 080 & 35 & 31 & . 026 & .17 & . 084 & 34 & 1 & . 006 & . 04 & . 073 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 . & 389 & 53 & 37 & . 040 & . 731 & . 056 & 20 & 18. & . 025 & . 13 & . 06.5 & 24 & 22 & . 050 & . 26 & . 068 & 35 & 0 & . 011 & . 07 & . 052 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{POTATOES, WHITE} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{SWEETYOTATOES AND YAMS} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{ONIONS} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{CABBACE} \\
\hline NORTII \(\triangle\) ND WEst \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 3,583 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} \\
3,442
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
2,622
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.285
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
10.29
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.119
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 354 & No. 219 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Dol} . \\
0.018
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.66
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.122
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No.} \\
1,348
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 1,034
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& \text { D. } 028
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 0.63
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.124
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No.} \\
1,182
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 763 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.038
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b . \\
& 1.52
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Dol. \\
0. 122
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Net losses. & 55 & 03 & 22 & . 230 & 16.45 & . 124 & 1 & 2 & . 021 & .47 & . 138 & 1, 19 & 1, 11 & . 023 & . 52 & .140
.124 & 17
1,175 & 7
756 & .032
.038 & 1.05
1.53 & .123
.122 \\
\hline Net incomes. & 3,528 & 3, 389 & 2,600 & . 285 & 19.34 & . 119 & 348 & 217 & . 018 & . 66 & . 122 & 1,329 & 1,023 & . 028 & . 63 & . 124 & 1,175 & 756 & . 038 & 1. 53 & . 122 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 334 & 311 & 192 & . 250 & 14. 66 & - 113 & 29 & 17 & . 016 & . 50 & . 111 & 110 & 81 & . 024 & . 57 & . 117 & 103 & 56
154 & .033
.129 & 1.15
1.09 & .122
.111 \\
\hline \$5500-\$999 & 897 & 860 & 645 & . 248 & 15. 45 & .110 & 64 & 41 & . 012 & . 43 & . 1109 & 339 & 262 & . 0277 & . 57 & . 1122 & 246 & 154 & . 129 & 1. 09 & . 111 \\
\hline \$1,001-\$1,499 & 979 & 943 & 743 & . 292 & 20.24 & . 119 & 91 & 55 & . 017 & . 58 & . 116 & 384 & 303
175 & . 029 & .67
.60 & .122
.132 & 318
242 & 201
161 & .038
.042 & 1.51 & .120
.128 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,949 & 647 & 625 & 605 & . 289 & 19.95 & -125 & 60 & 38 & . 017 & . 59 & . 138 & 238 & 175 & . 026 & . 60 & . 132 & 242
385 & 161
131 & .042
.052 & 1.71 & . 128 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,989 & 474 & 456 & 369 & . 326 & 23.28 & . 328 & 68 & 43 & . 028 & . 96 & . 128 & 184 & 150 & . 031 & . 71 & . 136 & 18.5 &  & . 051 & 2. 213 & . 128 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999. & 170 & 167 & 129 & . 375 & 27.35 & - 129 & 30 & 21 & . 041 & 1.56 & . 130 & 64 & 46 & . 033 & .70
.46 & .138
.146 & 73
8 & 49
4 & .051
.031 & 2.13
1.22 & .128
.134 \\
\hline \$5,006 or over & 27 & 27 & 17 & . 324 & 22.41 & . 136 & 6 & 2 & . 038 & 4.4 & . 124 & 10 & 6 & . 025 & . 46 & . 146 & 8 & 4 & . 031 & 1.22 & . 134 \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 793 & 573 & . 198 & 12.04 & . 141 & 59 & 29 & . 010 & . 33 & . 153 & 298 & 222 & . 022 & . 50 & . 150 & 238 & 138 & . 026 & 1.01 & .145 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 883 & 645 & . 269 & 17.30 & . 123 & 96 & 51 & . 019 & . 65 & . 127 & 336 & 248 & . 0227 & . 60 & . 128 & 329 & 22.5 & . 0413 & 1.67 & . 126 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 1,292 & 983 & . 309 & 21.06 & . 113 & 122 & 74 & . 019 & . 66 & . 117 & 524 & 389 & . 031 & . 70 & . 116 & 452
173 & 263
137 & .040
.048 & 1.55 & .115
.100 \\
\hline Types \(B\) and 7. & 479 & 474 & 421 & . 401 & 30.83 & . 095 & 77 & 65 & . 031 & 1. 26 & . 101 & 190 & 175 & . 029 & . 69 & . 099 & 173 & 137 & . 048 & 2. 06 & . 100 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE
OPERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 2,350 & 1,539 & 1,313 & . 142 & 5. 71 & . 110 & 612 & 578 & . 091 & 3.07 & . 110 & 921 & 829 & . 930 & . 73 & . 111 & 1,031 & 823 & . 054 & 2.26 & . 107 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 279 & 140 & 124 & . 078 & 3.42 & . 095 & 29 & 28 & . 030 & 1. 00 & . 107 & 85 & 79 & . 021 & . 52 & . 096 & \(\begin{array}{r}97 \\ \hline 361\end{array}\) & 81 & . 038 & 1.58 & \\
\hline \$500-\$999 & 916 & 537 & 470 & . 122 & 5.04 & . 102 & 205 & 195 & . 066 & 2. 22 & . 1088 & 359 & 328 & . 030 & . 76 & . 101 & \[
361
\] & 309 & . 044 & 1.96 & . 099 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 523 & 375 & 327 & . 172 & 6.86 & . 112 & 157 & 153 & . 122 & 4.16 & - 109 & 204 & 187 & . 033 & . 78 & . 117 & 262 & 201 & . 064 & 2.62 & . 111 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999. & 270 & 190 & 155 & . 172 & 6. 67 & . 116 & 95 & 87 & . 130 & 4. 62 & . 113 & 106 & 96 & . 034 & . 77 & . 118 & 128 & 98 & . 065 & 2.60 & . 115 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 222 & 177 & 143 & .170 & 6. 65 & . 119 & 64 & 59 & . 102 & 3.39 & .117 & 100 & 84 & . 0331 & . 71 & . 121 & 118 & 88 & . 072 & 3.04 & . 116 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999. & 101 & 88 & 72 & . 195 & 7.54 & . 129 & 33 & 31 & . 126 & 4.17 & . 131 & 42 & 37 & . 028 & . 69 & . 135 & 51 & 39 & . 065 & 2. 83 & 1126
.147 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 39 & 32 & 22 & . 176 & 5. 69 & . 153 & 29 & 25 & . 235 & 7. 17 & . 144 & 25 & 18 & . 045 & 1.06 & . 153 & 11 & 7 & . 041 & 1. 10 & . 147 \\
\hline Type 1. & 382 & 250 & 212 & -096 & 3.74 & . 132 & 67 & 64 & . 032 & 1. 10 & . 138 & 128 & 112 & . 023 & -58 & . 132 & 147 & 116 & . 012 & 1.60 & . 136 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 341 & 283 & . 130 & 5.31 & . 117 & 117 & 107 & . 059 & 1. 95 & . 124 & 211 & 193 & . 0228 & . 75 & . 118 & 224 & 180 & . 0474 & 1.98 & . 114 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1, 018 & 688 & 503 & . 153 & 6. 21 & . 105 & 244 & 930 & - 071 & 2.39 & . 108 & 423 & 380 & . 033 & . 78 & . 107 & 456 & 363
164 & . 059 & 2.53
2.53 & .102
093 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 439 & 260 & 225 & . 172 & 6. 71 & . 015 & 184 & 177 & . 224 & 7.64 & . 092 & 159 & 144 & . 031 & . 73 & . 098 & 204 & 164 & 059 & 2.53 & . 093 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See rootnotes at end of table.

Table 63.-items of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specifed items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, 1 March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nontelief farm families that moclude a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{LETTUCN} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{SNAP BEANS, FRESH} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{JEAS, JRESG} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{BEETSAND TURNIPS, FRESTI} \\
\hline NORth and west \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 3,583 & No. & No.
752 & Dol. &  & Dol.
0.126 & No. 529 & No. 454 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.023
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lb. } \\
& 0.54
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.127
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 485 & No. 445 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.021
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L b_{.} \\
& 0.62
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.121
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 549 & No. 485 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dol. } \\
0.014
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& L h . \\
& 0.44
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dol. } \\
& 0.128
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Net losses.
Net income & 55
\(3+528\) & 17
1,277 & 3
749 & . 034 & .38
.77 & . 126 & 520 & 6
448 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.030 \\
.023 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .60
.57 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.142 \\
.127 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & - \({ }^{0}\) & 445 & .090
.032 & .00
.63 & . 121 & 7
542 & 6
479 & . 011 & .33
.45 & .134
.128 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 334 & 85 & 41 & . 029 & . 38 & . 120 & 30 & 24 & . 016 & . 30 & . 117 & 33 & 29 & . 015 & . 28 & .117 & 30 & 24 & . 007 & . 22 & . 113 \\
\hline \$500-\$990 & 897 & 300 & 186 & . 051 & . 68 & . 117 & 114 & 102 & . 017 & . 42 & .116 & 122 & 114 & . 0226 & . 55 & . 116 & 122 & 104 & . 015 & . 43 & .124 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 979 & 364 & 220 & . 067 & . 84 & . 126 & 140 & 125 & . 020 & . 51 & . 125 & 137 & 125 & . 032 & . 60 & . 118 & 143 & 128 & . 012 & 37 & 129 \\
\hline \$1,500- \(\$ 1,999\) & 647 & 265 & 150 & . 066 & . 84 & . 132 & 108 & 89 & . 025 & . 62 & . 132 & 100 & 93 & . 042 & . 75 & . 122 & 110 & 104 & 4 & . 47 & 25 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 181 & 108 & . 670 & . 90 & . 131 & 90 & 78 & . 038 & 1.07 & . 138 & 70 & 63 & . 0.35 & . 75 & . 132 & 99 & 85 & . 122 & . 68 & 34 \\
\hline \$3,000 & 170 & 72 & 40 & . 088 & 1. 07 & . 137 & 35 & 28 & . 030 & . 69 & . 131 & 20 & 19 & . 043 & 1.08 & . 138 & 33 & 30 & . 023 & . 65 & 134 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 27 & 10 & 4 & . 085 & . 89 & . 153 & 3 & 2 & . 018 & . 22 & . 138 & 3 & 2 & . 026 & . 50 & . 126 & 5 & 4 & . 021 & . 74 & 132 \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 302 & 159 & . 044 i & 59 & . 150 & 120 & 95 & . 018 & . 43 & . 154 & 105 & 93 & . 025 & . 52 & . 143 & 122 & 104 & . 010 & . 30 & 15] \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 311 & 171 & . 050 & . 69 & . 130 & 122 & 107 & . 021 & . 49 & . 135 & 96 & 88 & . 020 & . 46 & . 128 & 146 & 126 & . 015 & . 47 & 136 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,348 & 523 & 299 & . 067 & . 86 & . 118 & 198 & 164 & . 024 & . 60 & . 119 & 202 & 184 & . 0.34 & . 68 & . 115 & 195
86 & 173
82 & . 015 & . 46 & .118
.102 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 - & 479 & 158 & 123 & . 073 & . 92 & . 103 & 89 & 84 & . 030 & . 90 & . 097 & 82 & 80 & . 044 & . 91 & . 098 & 86 & 82 & . 020 & . 59 & . 102 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE GIERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All typ & 2,350 & 220 & 117 & . 015 & . 19 & . 132 & 950 & 852 & . 162 & 2.43 & , 108 & 809 & 775 & . 095 & 1.75 & . 108 & 304 & 272 & . 019 & 43 & . 113 \\
\hline \$81-8.199 & 279 & 12 & 12 & . 008 & . 11 & . 126 & 107 & 100 & . 132 & 1. 96 & . 088 & 101 & \(9 \times\) & . 102 & 1. 93 & . 089 & 17 & 16 & . 0077 & . 19 & . 096 \\
\hline \$500-\$999 & 916 & 57 & 41 & . 0018 & .10 & . 116 & 391 & 361 & . 176 & 2. 6.5 & . 103 & 292 & 282 & . 084 & 1. 51 & . 102 & 80 & 75 & . 013 & . 30 & . 104 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 523 & 43 & 32 & . 013 & . 26 & . 134 & 197 & 172 & . 147 & 2. 21 & . 109 & 173 & 163 & . 097 & 1. 89 & .107 & 79 & 70 & . 021 & . 48 & -114 \\
\hline \$1,500- \$1,999 & 270 & 27 & J2 & . 017 & . 19 & . 130 & 104 & 95 & . 193 & 2. 89 & . 117 & 103 & 101 & . 104 & 1.88 & . 118 & 46 & 38 & . 027 & . 57 & . 113 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 222 & 38 & 11 & . 026 & . 26 & . 139 & 83 & 72 & . 134 & 2.04 & . 121 & 91 & 85 & . 136 & 2. 34 & . 119 & 40 & 37 & . 028 & . 65 & . 119 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 101 & 22 & (i) & . 034 & . 38 & . 143 & 48 & 42 & . 203 & 3.04 & . 129 & 34 & 33 & . 068 & 1.31
1.22 & . 134 & 14 & 26 & .039
.050 & . 90 & .131
.140 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over- & 30 & 21 & 3 & . 103 & 1. 10 & . 155 & 15 & 10 & . 099 & 1. 43 & . 144 & 15 & 13 & . 073 & 1. 22 & . 169 & 14 & 10 & . 050 & . 95 & . 140 \\
\hline Type 1 & 388 & 46 & 19 & . 016 & . 18 & 160 & 162 & 141 & 106 & 1. 62 & . 130 & 129 & 120 & 084 & 1. 16 & . 129 & 45 & 38 & . 014 & . 31 & . 129 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 511 & 45 & 24 & . 013 & . 25 & . 130 & 140 & 175 & . 145 & 2.17 & . 115 & 186 & 179 & . 087 & 1.70 & . 114 & 60 & 55 & . 017 & . 38 & . 125 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 114 & 68 & . 019 & . 21 & . 124 & 447 & 394 & . 181 & 2.68 & . 102 & 353 & 337 & . 097 & 1. 77 & . 104 & 129 & 113 & . 017 & . 39 & . 110 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7........ & 439 & 15 & 6 & . 006 & . 07 & . 116 & 151 & 142 & . 188 & 2.88 & . 030 & 141 & 139 & . 126 & 2. 27 & . 1093 & 70 & 66 & . 029 & 69 & . 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of tuble.

Table 53.-Itemb of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and avernge quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born r]



Table 53.--ITEMS of Food CONSUMED at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 -Continued
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {2 }}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Analysis unit, [amily type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Number of households} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Houscholds consuming-} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Avergige \({ }^{3}\) quantity per bousehold} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text { Aver- } & \text { Households } \\
\text { eoge }{ }^{\text {Honsuming- }}
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Aver-日ge \({ }^{3}\) quantity рег household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average of all food per unit-} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Avergge \({ }^{3}\) value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quan. tity per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{A verage value of all rood per unit-} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bouseholds consuming-} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Averages value per household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Average : quantity рег household} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{A verage: value of all food per unit-} \\
\hline & & & With- & & & value
of all
lood & & With- & & & & & With- & & & & & With- & & & \\
\hline & & Any & cut di- & & & per & Any & out di- & & & & Any & out di- & & & & Any & ont di- & & & \\
\hline & (2) & & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (8) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (10) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{NORTR AND WEST \({ }^{\text {All }}\)} & & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{FRESH VEGETABTES, NOT ELSEWHERE SPECIFIED} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{TOMATOES, FLESH} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{TOMATOES, CANNED} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{TOMATO JUICE, CANNED} \\
\hline & & No. & No. & Dol. & \(\underline{L b}\). & Dol. & No. & No. & Dol. & \(L b\). & Dol. & No. & No. & Dol. & Lb. & nol. & No. & \(N 0\). & Dol. & Lb. & Dol. \\
\hline & 3,583 & 374 & 319 & 0.039 & 1. 02 & 0.123 & 1, 140 & 740 & 0.068 & 1.77 & 0.125 & 1,072 & 767 & 0,056 & 0.95 & 0.123 & 150 & 73 & 0.008 & 0.10 & 0.138 \\
\hline Net losses & 55 & 3 & 2 & . 014 & . 53 & . 155 & 21 & 5 & . 140 & 2.75 & . 138 & 20 & 9 & . 064 & . 97 & . 129 & 1 & 0 & . 002 & . 02 & 7.114 \\
\hline Net incomes & 3, 528 & 371 & 317 & . 040 & 1.03 & . 122 & 1,119 & 735 & . 067 & 1.75 & . 125 & 1, 0512 & 758 & . 056 & . 95 & . 123 & 149 & 73 & . 008 & . 10 & . 138 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 234 & 31 & 27 & . 028 & . 90 & . 111 & 112 & 57 & . 066 & 1.48 & .121 & 96 & 54 & . 051 & . 78 & . 115 & 11 & 4 & . 006 & . 07 & . 128 \\
\hline \$500-\$0090 & 897 & 87 & 70 & . 031 & . 72 & . 108 & 268 & 174 & . 056 & 1.41 & . 114 & 275 & 177 & . 054 & . 97 & . 115 & 20 & 9 & . 004 & . 05 & . 124 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,498....... & 979 & 96 & 84 & . 034 & . 84 & . 119 & 300 & 198 & . 068 & 1.76 & , 124 & 293 & 231 & . 055 & . 85 & . 123 & 36 & 18 & . 008 & . 10 & . 13.5 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 647 & 59 & 50 & . 034 & . 92 & . 131 & 201 & 1.31 & . 063 & 1.60 & . 133 & 180 & 134 & . 056 & . 91 & . 130 & 46 & 21 & . 015 & .17 & . 139 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & 474 & 70 & 61 & . 065 & 1. 76 & . 13.5 & 169 & 123 & . 084 & 2.35 & . 131 & 148 & 116 & . 064 & 1.10 & .127 & 26 & 18 & . 010 & . 12 & . 150 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,949. & 170 & 20 & 19 & . 085 & 2.39 & . 138 & 61 & 43 & . 088 & 2.87 & . 130 & 49 & 39 & . 053 & . 88 & . 134 & 7 & 2 & . 010 & . 09 & . 143 \\
\hline \$5,000 or fiver & 27 & 8 & 6 & . 060 & 1.53 & . 137 & 10 & 4 & . 098 & 2.47 & .130 & 10 & 7 & . 065 & 1.05 & . 133 & 3 & 1 & . 041 & . 48 & . 181 \\
\hline Type 1. & 841 & 89 & 71 & . 023 & . 48 & . 146 & 268 & 154 & . 060 & 1.39 & . 148 & 226 & 164 & . 044 & . 73 & . 143 & 27 & 12 & . 005 & . 06 & . 156 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 914 & 95 & 82 & . 033 & . 84 & . 121 & 312 & 200 & . 066 & 1. 66 & . 127 & 277 & 191 & . 053 & . 90 & . 127 & 58 & 26 & . 012 & . 14 & . 145 \\
\hline Types 4 and \(b\) & 1,349 & 130 & 108 & . 046 & 1.25 & . 119 & 431 & 265 & . 080 & 2.04 & .117 & 419 & 282 & . 061 & . 97 & .117 & 54 & 25 & . 009 & .11 & . 128 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 479 & 00 & 48 & . 060 & 1. 69 & . 098 & 129 & 121 & . 054 & 1. 88 & .004 & 150 & 130 & . 068 & 1.36 & .100 & 11 & 10 & . 005 & . 07 & . 105 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SOUTHEAST . whime OJERATOIEA \\
All types. \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & 2,350 & 700 & 677 & , 105 & 2.99 & . 107 & 1,016 & 897 & - 114 & 2.65 & . 112 & 447 & 330 & . 047 & . 66 & . 112 & 53 & 26 & . 005 & . 05 & . 139 \\
\hline \$0-\$199 & 279 & 90 & 89 & . 106 & 2. 73 & . 093 & 101 & 93 & . 083 & 1.98 & . 094 & 29 & 23 & . 023 & . 31 & . 092 & 2 & 1 & . 001 & . 01 & 7.112 \\
\hline \$500-\$998 & 916 & 251 & 241 & . 102 & 2.92 & . 102 & 375 & 351 & .104 & 2.54 & .104 & 154 & 110 & .040 & . 54 & .101 & 8 & 4 & .001 & . 01 & . 658 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 523 & 148 & 144 & . 093 & 2. 66 & .106 & 224 & 191 & .123 & 2.80 & . 112 & 109 & 88 & . 052 & . 73 & . 121 & 13 & 8 & . 004 & . 04 & . 142 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 274 & 89 & 88 & . 124 & 2. 50 & .117 & 120 & 104 & . 126 & 2.91 & .120 & 69 & 52 & . 066 & . 94 & . 122 & 4 & 1 & . 002 & . 02 & . 134 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,994 ....... & 222 & 76 & 74 & . 125 & 3.77 & . 1116 & 121 & 97 & . 141 & 3. 19 & . 125 & 46 & 31 & . 0.50 & . 81 & . 1108 & 13 & 9 & . 018 & . 20 & . 147 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 . ... & 101 & 41 & 36 & . 124 & 3. 76 & . 128 & 62 & 44 & . 127 & 2.82 & . 135 & 28 & 20 & . 077 & 1.08 & . 134 & 5 & 1 & . 008 & . 08 & . 135 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over......- & 39 & 5 & 5 & . 012 & . 60 & . 114 & 23 & 17 & . 150 & 2.87 & . 167 & 12 & ti & . 047 & . 96 & . 133 & 8 & 2 & . 052 & . 63 & . 181 \\
\hline Type 1 & 3 KL & 92 & 90 & . 062 & 1.87 & . 132 & 151 & 129 & . 071 & 1, B0 & . 135 & 60 & 46 & . 030 & . 40 & . 134 & 12 & 6 & . 1006 & . 07 & .162 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 163 & 159 & . 108 & 2.85 & . 112 & 242 & 314 & . 105 & 2.47 & .117 & 78 & 54 & . 1335 & . 50 & . 122 & 9 & 4 & . 004 & . 05 & . 136 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 1,018 & 304 & 290 & . 110 & 3. 10 & . 1104 & 447 & 393 & . 1116 & 2. 68 & . 108 & 225 & 170 & . 058 & . 79 & . 110 & 25 & 12 & . 005 & . 05 & . 139 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 439 & 141 & 138 & . 128 & 3.78 & . \(04 \times\) & 176 & 161 & .157 & 3.72 & . 096 & -84 & 60 & . 053 & . 76 & . 092 & 7 & 4 & . 003 & . 03 & . 102 \\
\hline All types. & 878 & 271 & 26.5 & . 095 & 2.88 & . 089 & 320 & 300 & . 084 & 2.05 & . 096 & 123 & 80 & 1.031 & . 45 & . 092 & 2 & 1 & . 001 & . 01 & 7. 152 \\
\hline \$0- \$490 & 236 & 59 & 57 & . 084 & 2.25 & . 080 & 94 & 90 & . 086 & 2.15 & . 1184 & 25 & 15 & . 020 & . 25 & . 085 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & 00 & \\
\hline \$5000-\$099. & 452 & 139 & 136 & . 094 & 2. x 3 & , (190) & 157 & 142 & . 086 & 2.06 & . 049 & 65 & 40 & . 033 & . 51 & . 093 & 2 & 1 & . 002 & . 01 & 7.152 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499. & 134 & 54 & 53 & . 101 & 3.52 & . 081 & 48 & 48 & . 078 & 1. 95 & . 105 & 26 & 18 & . 039 & . 55 & . 099 & 0 & 0 & . 600 & . 60 & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,993 & 46 & 19 & 19 & .134 & 4. 78 & . 102 & 21. & 20 & . 066 & 1. 63 & . 109 & 7 & 7
7 & . 046 & . 6.67 & . 089 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & .00 & \\
\hline Type 1 & 140 & 33 & 32 & . 068 & 2.04 & . 114 & 54 & 46 & . 072 & 1.64 & . 117 & 19 & 13 & . 027 & . 35 & , 114 & 1 & 0 & . 001 & 01 & ก. 167 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292 & 83 & 82 & . 075 & 2.21 & . 097 & 123 & 116 & . 0003 & 2. 28 & . 103 & 43 & 26 & . 030 & . 43 & . 097 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 276 & 86 & 85 & . 117 & 3.31 & . 0184 & 102 & 98 & . 091 & 2.24 & . 088 & 33 & 19 & . 026 & . 35 & . 085 & 1 & 1 & . 002 & . 18 & 7.136 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 170 & 69 & 66 & . 119 & 4.01 & .072 & 41 & 40 & . 066 & 1. 6.3 & . 066 & 28 & 22 & . 043 & . 74 & . 080 & 0 & 0. & . 0000 & . DO & . 130 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-NEGRO FAMLIES \({ }^{\text {B }}\) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types \({ }^{\text {s }}\) & 1, 564 & 410 & 307 & . 074 & 2.53 & . 070 & 292 & 282 & . 039 & . 94 & . 076 & 119 & 47 & . 014 & . 19 & . 075 & 9 & 2 & . 001 & . 01 & . 092 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 . \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999
\end{aligned}
\] & 730
657 & 169
167 & 164
161 & . 088 & 2.05
2.5 & . 062 & 128 & 124 & . 083 & \(\begin{array}{r}.76 \\ \hline 106\end{array}\) & . 0167 & 51 & 13 & . 011 & . 14 & . 062 & 3 & 0 & & & . 079 \\
\hline \$51,000-\$1,499 & 657
149 & 167 & 161
60 & .080
.116 & 2.75
3.66 & .071
.086 & \(\begin{array}{r}124 \\ 35 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{r}118 \\ 35 \\ \hline 5\end{array}\) & . 0103 & 1.06
1.25
1.10 & . 080 & 53
12 & 25 & . 017 & . 23 & .079
.103 & 3
3
3 & 2 & . 001 & . 01 & . 104 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 20 & 9 & 8 & . 086 & 2.99 & . 071 & 4 & - 4 & . 044 & 1.10 & . 055 & +3 & 3 & . 033 & . 48 & . 110 & 0 & 0 & . 000 & . 00 & . 092 \\
\hline Type 1-..-- & 266 & 56 & 55 & . 049 & 1.64 & . 094 & 45 & 43 & .02y & . 63 & . 1180 & 16 & 7 & . 010 & . 14 & . 104 & 1 & 0 & (ii) & (11) & 1. 152 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3.........-- & 357 & 83 & 81 & . 06.3 & 1.98 & . 070 & 65 & 61 & . 035 & . 84 & . 078 & 30 & 10 & . 014 & . 18 & . 067 & 2 & 1 & . 0001 & . 01 & 7.086 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 602 & 150 & 141 & . 071 & 2.39 & . 074 & 121 & J18 & . 048 & 1. 16 & . 075 & 49 & 17 & . 016 & . 21 & . 078 & 4 & 0 & . 001 & .01 & . 094 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7....-...e-- & 339 & 121 & 120 & . 110 & 4.06 & . 052 & 61 & 60 & .037 & . 89 & . 058 & 24 & 13 & . 014 & .19 & . 060 & 2 & & . 001 & . 02 & 7.062 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 53.-Items of food consumed at home during one week (7-day matimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-borna!



See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 53.-ITEMB OF FOOD CONSEMED AT HOME DURING ONE WENK (7-DAY ESTMMATE): Number of houscholds consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantily per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born²]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline &  & &  &  & & ｜\％ & & 898큐․ & \％\({ }_{\text {¢ }}\) &  \\
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{} & \％ & & \％r．ng & F58\％ & a & T¢ ¢ ¢ & \(\because\) & \％9\％ & ？ &  \\
\hline &  &  &  &  & \(\stackrel{\text { \％}}{6}\) &  & \(\frac{\square}{\square}\) &  & 8 &  \\
\hline & 8 & & & ＋0．00 & ＊ & 0000 & － & 0005 & & \\
\hline &  & 㗔 &  &  & \(\overline{\text { g }}\) &  & 8 & ＝\％\({ }^{\circ}\) & 5 & ござ \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{} &  &  &  &  & 9 &  & \(\stackrel{5}{\square}\) & Che & \％ & 器 \\
\hline &  & ｜c｜c． & 89¢9\％ํat： & \％\％ax & 7 & \％ & ！ & 8．8．8．0 & \(\varepsilon\) & 5．8．8 \\
\hline & 20． & 咢号 &  & 59．age & 5 & \％ & § & \％ & 5 & ® \({ }^{\text {greme }}\) \\
\hline & \(\square_{4}^{\circ}\) & ｜00｜ & ｜on－0m00｜｜ & loswo & & \(100-0\) & － & 1000 & － & 0000 \\
\hline & 交兂 & \(\left.\right|^{\text {Nag }}\) & － &  & \％ & da & － & & ＊ & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{} &  & ！ &  &  & 9 & 是示哥 & \(\stackrel{1}{\square}\) &  & \(\stackrel{\text { a }}{ }\) & \％ \\
\hline & 430 & \％\％ & ｜\％888．acd & 9\％89 & ＋ & ［89\％8 \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 8 & \％abe & \(\square\) & 88.88 \\
\hline & 䛠管 & ｜\％ & ［ &  & 8 &  & 8 & \％\({ }^{3} 8.78\) & \(\stackrel{3}{8}\) &  \\
\hline & \({ }^{\text {8 }}\) & ｜0\％ & － & －รสสํ & \(=\) & －s＋ & \(\cdots\) & & \(\cdots\) & － \\
\hline & \({ }^{\text {sixu}}\) & \(\bigcirc\) &  & －¢ & & \({ }^{100}=\) & & －＊ & ＊ & － \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{} &  & \(\square\) &  &  & &  & \％ &  & 8. &  \\
\hline & ） & ｜ढ़！ &  & －5 & & 8จ\％ & & \％\％ & 9 & बสํux \\
\hline & \％\({ }_{\text {¢ }}^{6}\) & 码 &  & ｜ & & \％ & 안․ & ｜ & \(\stackrel{\square}{\square}\) &  \\
\hline & \(\stackrel{3}{4}^{\text {cm }}\) & \(10 \cdot 0\) & & & g &  & ： & ＂min & \(\geq\) & あデ9 \\
\hline & \(4^{83}\) & ｜－\％ & & ＋1000 & & － 9 \％\％ & \({ }^{2}\) &  & I & \％\％ณ5 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} & &  & & 『exte & \(\stackrel{5}{3}\) & 桇产 \\
\hline &  &  &  &  &  &  & &  & &  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE 53.-items or food consumed at home duming one whek (7-day hstimate): Number of households consuming specified items of
 specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1496 —Continued
[louscholds of nonrulief farm families that include a lusband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {? }}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
SGUTHEASTM-WHTE GHERATORS \\
A.ll types.
\end{tabular} & 2,350 & 320 & 2 & .036 & . 54 & . 126 & 650 & 358 & . 074 & 2. 65 & . 115 & 469 & 4 & . 044 & . 75 & . 119 & 277 & 253 & . 090 & 6.34 & . 119 \\
\hline \% 0 \$0-\$499 & 279 & 14 & 0 & . 009 & . 13 & . 127 & 48 & 40 & . 028 & 1. 21 & . 033 & 22 & J & . 014 & . 28 & . 110 & 35 & 33 & . 091 & 6.48 & - 101 \\
\hline \% \(\$ 500-\$ 999\) & 916 & 63 & 0 & . 016 & .24 & . 114 & 223 & 151 & . 083 & 2. 50 & -108 & 131 & 1 & . 024 & . 42 & .112 & 110 & 104 & . 093 & 5. 75 & .210 \\
\hline \(\cdots\) - \(\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499\) & 523 & 79 & 1 & . 037 & . 54 & .125 & 166 & 84 & . 092 & 3, 44 & . 120 & 129 & 2 & . 051 & . 89 & . 118 & 51 & 47 & . 076 & 6. 26 & . 117 \\
\hline - \(\$ 1,500-\$ 1,949\) & 270 & 44 & 1 & . 042 & . 67 & . 117 & 42 & 46 & . 098 & 3. 47 & .113 & 69 & 0 & . 058 & . 99 & . 116 & 36 & 30 & . 089 & 5.15 & . 129 \\
\hline - \(\$ 2,000-\$ 2,099\) & 222 & 53 & 0 & . 069 & 1.07 & . 124 & 71 & 29 & . 076 & 2.38 & . 128 & 76 & 0 & .083 & 1.28 & . 120 & 24 & 23 & . 180 & 6.10 & . 143 \\
\hline \$3,000-\$4,999 & 101 & 36 & 0 & . 120 & 1. 68 & . 143 & 34 & 7 & . 100 & 2.35 & . 129 & 41 & 0 & . 115 & 1.97 & . 137 & 17 & 13 & . 171 & 16. 67 & . 153 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over. & 39 & 31 & 0 & . 249 & 3. 47 & . 147 & 16 & 1 & . 150 & 2. 87 & . 152 & 21 & 0 & - 126 & 2. 10 & . 143 & 4 & 3 & . 019 & 2.79 & .205 \\
\hline 4 Type 1. & \(3 \$ 2\) & 55 & 0 & . 033 & . 47 & . 148 & 85 & 47 & . 041 & 1. 29 & . 137 & 59 & 0 & . 023 & . 47 & . 148 & 39 & 36 & . 055 & 4.80 & .143 \\
\hline -o Types 2 and 3 & 511 & 60 & 0 & . 032 & . 47 & . 128 & 162 & 87 & . 079 & 2.58 & . 123 & 114 & 1 & . 046 & . 77 & . 128 & 63 & 56 & . 086 & 5. 36 & . 126 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,013 & 145 & 2 & . 042 & . 61 & . 125 & 262 & 135 & . 060 & 1.49 & . 110 & 210 & 2 & . 047 & . 79 & . 114 & 120 & 108 & . O56 & 6.22 & . 115 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 1,439 & 51 & 0 & . 032 & .51 & .100 & 141 & 89 & . 130 & 5. 47 & . 101 & 86 & 1 & . 050 & . 88 & .100 & 55 & 53 & . 134 & 9.07 & . 104 \\
\hline All lypies & 878 & 79 & 0 & . 020 & . 33 & . 093 & 149 & 67 & . 032 & 1. 01 & . 098 & 113 & 1 & . 025 & . 42 & . 100 & 101 & 90 & . 078 & 4. 64 & . 103 \\
\hline \$0. \$409 & 236 & 11 & 0 & . 009 & . 15 & . 080 & 24 & 15 & . 015 & . 56 & . 100 & 13 & 0 & . 010 & . 16 & . 100 & 37 & 33 & . 103 & 5. 84 & . 102 \\
\hline \$300-\$999 & 462 & 38 & 0 & . 018 & . 30 & . 099 & 95 & 45 & . 640 & 1.28 & . 098 & 55 & 1 & . 020 & . 34 & . 099 & 46 & 42 & . 168 & 4. 11 & . 102 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 134 & 23 & 0 & . 040 & . 66 & . 091 & 25 & 6 & . 036 & 1.02 & . 101 & 32 & 0 & . 053 & . 97 & . 093 & 13 & 11 & . \(0 \times 6\) & 5. 30 & . 000 d \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 46 & 7 & 0 & . 043 & . 70 & . 092 & 5 & 1 & . 020 & . 58 & . 090 & 13 & 0 & . 060 & 1.04 & . 118 & 5 & 4 & . 040 & 1.89 & .111 \\
\hline Type 1 & 140 & 13 & 0 & . 018 & . 29 & . 104 & 25 & 11 & . 028 & . 86 & . 116 & 18 & 1 & . 022 & . 35 & . 127 & 15 & 10 & . 058 & 1.80 & .131 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292 & 24 & 0 & . 017 & . 28 & . 107 & 55 & 27 & . 031 & . 92 & . 107 & 41 & 0 & . 1222 & . 38 & . 106 & 35 & 32 & . 063 & 4.18 & - 110 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 276 & 25 & 0 & . 024 & . 39 & . 0189 & 38 & 16 & . 030 & . 96 & . 087 & 28 & 0 & . 024 & . 43 & . 099 & 37 & 35 & . 097 & 6.84 & . 092 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 170 & 17 & 0 & . 022 & . 35 & . 073 & 31 & 13 & . 040 & 1.35 & . 082 & 26 & 0 & . 031 & . 55 & . 073 & 14 & 13 & . 088 & 4. 20 & . 082 \\
\hline  & 1,564 & 59 & 0 & . 008 & . 12 & . 091 & 156 & 55 & . 020 & . 55 & . 086 & 58 & 0 & . 007 & . 12 & . 072 & 176 & 159 & . 075 & 5. 55 & . 079 \\
\hline \(\$ 0-\$ 490\) & 730 & 35 & 0 & . 004 & . 06 & . 088 & 45 & 18 & . 013 & . 33 & . 077 & 15 & 0 & . 004 & . 06 & . 067 & 96 & 84 & . 079 & 6. 00 & .076
.080 \\
\hline \$500-\$909. & 657 & 26 & 0 & . 008 & . 33 & . 086 & 74 & 26 & . 023 & . 65 & . 076 & 29 & 0 & . 000 & . 14 & . 068 & 66 & 63 & . 077 & 5. 99 & . 080 \\
\hline \$1,000- \$1,499 \(\ldots\)......- & 149
20 & 10
2 & 0
0 & .021
.034 & \(\begin{array}{r}.36 \\ .52 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & .097
7.123 & 31
3 & 9 & .043
.026 & 1. 15 & . 111 & 12 & 0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
.015 \\
.028 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & .24
.45 & , .083 & 12 & 11 & .054
.010 & 2.42
.10 & .087
7.0154 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 ........- & 20 & 2 & 0 & . 034 & . 52 & \({ }^{7} .123\) & 3 & 0 & . 026 & . 28 & . 071 & 2 & 0 & . 028 & . 45 & 7.092 & 1 & 0 & . 010 & . 10 & -084 \\
\hline Type 1. & 286 & 10 & 0 & . 007 & . 11 & . 118 & 23 & 8 & . 016 & . 47 & . 114 & 3 & 0 & . 002 & . 04 & . 107 & 25 & 22 & . 041 & 2.85 & . 098 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 357 & 9 & 0 & . 0006 & . 08 & . 090 & 31 & 8 & . 018 & . 47 & . 088 & 19 & 0 & . 011 & . 13 & . 084 & 37 & 33 & . 068 & 5. 12 & . 098 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 602 & 29 & 0 & . 010 & . 15 & . 092 & 69 & 27 & . 023 & . 57 & . 090 & 22 & 0 & . L07 & . 11 & . 066 & 83 & 75 & . 088 & 6. 42 & . 076 \\
\hline Typer 6 and 7..-.....-- & 339 & 11 & 0 & . 007 & . 13 & . 0 c3 & 33 & 12 & . 021 & . 67 & . 0.54 & 14 & 0 & . 008 & . 14 & . 058 & 31 & 29 & . 087 & 6. 80 & . 063 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE 53.-ITEMS OF FOOD CONSUMED AT HOME DURING ONE wELE ( \(\mathbf{T}\)-DAY ESTIMATE): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, \& analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1986 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm lamilies that inctude a husband and wife, both native-born?]



\footnotetext{
see footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 53.-ITems of food consumed at home dihing one wher (7-Day mstimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, \& analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November \(19 \$ 6\)-Continued
[Households of nourclief farm farnilics that include a hasband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



Table 53.-Items of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-cxpenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Housebolds of nourellef farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
 \\
Alltypes \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & & & & & +1 & . 041 \} & & & . 14.3 & & . 104 & & & (103) & & & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}
\] & & & . 111 \\
\hline Type 1 & 1961 & 3 & 1 & -012 & . 02 i & . 1210 & 3 & & . \(\mathrm{CLH}_{2} 3^{3}\) & , 12 & . 304 & 2 & 1 & . 005 & . 02 & 7.311 & 3 & 3 & \({ }^{1} 1177\) & & : 104 \\
\hline Typeseand 3 & 2981 & 13 & 4 & 1103 & 06 & - lik & , & 1 & . 603 & \(0^{3}\) & . 116 & 6 & 0 & - 1416 & 0 & 7113 & 2 & & -002 & & \\
\hline T'ynis 4 abd 5 & 276 & \(\stackrel{8}{8}\) & \({ }_{3}^{2}\) & . 1078 & . 05 &  & 3 & 0 & - \({ }_{(0121}\) & . 01 & \(\xrightarrow{-1032}\) & 1 & 1 & . 0005 & . 01 & 7. 113
\(i .0 t 1\) & 0 & \({ }_{1}{ }^{1}\) & . 002 & & \(\because 9\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Typestand \\
SODTHEAST- NEGRO FAMALIES
\end{tabular} & \(\stackrel{\text { - }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}\) & : & & - 103 & . 6 & - & & & & & . 10\()\) & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All type & 1, 5634 & 43 & 8 & . 005 & . 04 & . 075 & 5 & 6 & 006 & . 05 & 174 & 5 & 5 & ( \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 01 & . 087 & 14 & 11 & (102 & . 02 & Ots \\
\hline Type 1. & 2 tin & 13 & , & . KWO & . 18 & . 010 & \({ }^{13}\) & 0 & . 002 & . 02 & . 074 & 1 & 1 & . (k)2 & 01 & \({ }^{1} \mathrm{I} 115\) & , & d & (000 & & \()^{0} 0\) \\
\hline Types 2and &  & 10 & 1 & - 0415 & - 04 & . 0 (10) & 17 & 2 & . 011 & . 04 & - 0 & & 1 & & \({ }^{\text {(1i) }}\) & \(\bigcirc\) & \(\stackrel{2}{6}\) & 2 & (1) 02 & . 02 & . \(0 \times 3\) \\
\hline Typut 4 ant \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & (603 & 13 & 4
0 & \({ }_{\text {c }}^{.0017}\) & . 01 ! & i.0ts & \(\stackrel{22}{22}\) & 2 & . .002 & . 04 & . 059 & \({ }^{3}\) & \({ }_{0}\) & . 000 & & . 081 & \({ }_{6}\) & 4 & . 605 & . 0.5 & . \(0: 00\) \\
\hline & & & PEAN & U'1 \({ }^{\text {b }}\) & TER & & & & COF & F. & & & & TEA & & & & & coco & & \\
\hline NOETA AND Whist \({ }^{\text {all }}\) & 3, 583 &  & \[
{ }_{11}
\] & Sol. & \[
\begin{aligned}
1,21
\end{aligned}
\] & mot. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 3,1046
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathrm{No}_{3}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pol. } \\
0.204
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& X b, \\
& 0.80
\end{aligned}
\] & Dol. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
\hline 142
\end{gathered}
\] & No. &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { lob. } \\
& 0.06
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\underset{\substack{\text { Dot. } \\ 0.125}}{ }
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{C}}
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathrm{No}_{3}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dod. } \\
& 0.012)
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9 b \\
& 0.11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { fol } \\
& 0.120
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Net losses & -5s & 8 & 1 & . 029 & 118 & .123 & (19 & 0 & -204 & . 73 & . 120 & 715 & & . 017 & . 07 & \({ }^{183}\) & 9
78 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 3
\end{aligned}
\] & . 012 & . 07 & .124
.120 \\
\hline Net incum & 3. 528 & T35 & 11 & . 034 & . 21 & . 126 & 3, 117 & 3 & . 2634 & . 80 & . 120 & 727 & 9 & . 030 , & . 01 & 125 & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-8499 & 334 & 16 & 0 & . 019 & . 12 & . 123 & 295 & & . 194 & . 76 & . 113 & 67 & 1 & . 025 & . 05 & . 121 & 56 & , & . 011 & . 06 & 116 \\
\hline \$500 3999 & 89 & 144 & 4 & . 025 & .15 & - 1217 & 795 & 1 & . 1266 & . 74 & . 111 & 183 & 2 & . 024 & . 06 & . 116 & 14. & 2 & . 012 & & . 116 \\
\hline \$1,004) \$1,469 & 969 & 213 & 3 & -035 & . 22 & . \(12{ }^{2+3}\) & 8:ili & 1 & . 203 & . 81 & . 120 & 201 & 1 & . 0229 & . 06 & . 128 & 223 & 0 & . 030 & . 12 & 116 \\
\hline \$1,5900-81,999 & 647 & 162 & 0 & . 142 & -25 & . 132 & 577 & 0 & . 21214 & - 81 & - 127 & 14.4 & 1 & . 033 & . 078 & \(\xrightarrow{132}\) & 1163 & 0 & . 032 & -14 & . 122 \\
\hline \(\$ 2,0000\)
\(\$ 3,009)\)
\(\$ 4,999\) & 174 & 106
51 & 0 & . 104 & . 28 & . 129 & 162 & 0 & .233 & . 89 & -130 & 4 & 0 & . 038 & . 07 & . 131 & 43 & 0 & . 126 & 13 & . 134 \\
\hline \$5,000 or over & 27 & 11 & 1 & - ous & 413 & 152 & 24 & 0 & . 250 & 97 & . 135 & , & 1 & . CH & . 10 & . 151 & 7 & 0 & . 018 & . 08 & . 157 \\
\hline Type 1 & 8.13 & 96 & & . 016 & . 10 & . 152 & 7-14 & 2 & . 188 & . 73 & . 141 & 200 & 1 & . 032 & . 175 & . 147 & 94 & 0 & 009 & . 15 & 146 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 014 & 231 & 1 & . 033 k & 24 & . 1326 & 412 & 0 & . 188 & . 72 & . 124 & 14.3 & 2 & . 621 & . 04 & . 126 & 211 & 1 & . 018 & . 1 & . 126 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 1,349 & 281 & 6 & . 035 & 22 & . 120 & 1,222 & , & . 227 & . 89 & . 113 & 428 & 4 & . 039 & . 08 & . 118 & 241 & 2 & . 019 & . 10 & . 122 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 479 & 135 & 3 & 12,5 & 32 & . 102 & 402 & 0 & . 195 & . 82 & . 095 & 71 & 2 & . 021 & . 14 & . 049 & 15s & & . 041 & . 25 & . 100 \\
\hline BOUTEEAST-WUITF OPERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 2,350 & 226 & 3 & . 017 & . 09 & . 121 & 2,092 & 4 & . 160 & . 76 & . 106 & 741 & 0 & . 043 & . 00 & . 116 & 271 & 1 & . 011 & . 05 & . 110 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 279 & & & . 1055 & . 03 & . 113 & 251 & 0 & . 136 & . 72 & . 089 & 52 & 0 & . 023 & . 03 & .094 & 18 & 0 & . 004 & . 02 & . 078 \\
\hline \$500 \$999. & 916 & 50 & 0 & . 1009 & . 03 & . 107 & 829 & 2 & .147 & . 76 & . 098 & 241 & 0 & . 032 & . 07 & . 109 & 81 & , & . 009 & . 04 & . 103 \\
\hline \$1,000 \$1,499 & 523 & 56 & 1 & . 018 & . 10 & .118 & 458 & 1 & .158 & . 75 & . 110 & 168 & & . 046 & . 11 & . 114 & 71 & & & & . 110 \\
\hline \$1,500 \$1,999. & 270 & 15 & 1 & . 028 & . 16 & - 122 & \({ }^{242}\) & 0 & . 1786 & . 80 & . 116 & 108
106 & 0 & . 054 & . 12 & 119
.123 & 40 & 0 & . 013 & . 07 & . 118 \\
\hline \$2,000 \(\$ 3,000-81,999\) & 222
101 & 37
15 & 0 & .030
.027 & . 16 & .129
.130 & 189
87 & 0 & .180
.212 & .75
.86 & .117
.128 & 109
48 & 0
0 & .069
.074 & . 16 & 123
130 & 34
23 & 0 & . 023 & 12 & . 128 \\
\hline \$ \(\$ .000\) or over & 38 & 14 & 0 & . 078 & 3i & .154 & 36 & 0 & . 299 & 1.01 & . 149 & 24 & 0 & . 094 & .16 & . 159 & , & 0 & . 008 & . 03 & . 156 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See foonnotes at end of table.

Table 53.-Items of food consomed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specifed items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified ilem, by family type and income, 4 analysis unils in 20 Slates, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Num-
ber of households} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Housebolds consuming-} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Aver- } \\
& \text { age } \\
& \text { value } \\
& \text { por } \\
& \text { house- } \\
& \text { hold }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Aver- } \\
\text { ages } \\
\text { quan- } \\
\text { tity } \\
\text { per } \\
\text { house- } \\
\text { bold }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Average oralue food per meal \({ }^{5}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming -} & & A verage & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households consuming-} & Average \({ }^{3}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Aver- } \\
& \text { age : }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Households ronsuming-} & Average \({ }^{3}\) & Aver- & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{|l} 
Aver- \\
age \\
value \\
of all \\
food \\
per \\
parit- \\
meals
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & With- & & & & & With- & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { age }{ }^{2} \\
& \text { vallue }
\end{aligned}
\]
per & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { tuan } \\
& \text { tity }
\end{aligned}
\] & of all & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { age }{ }^{3} \\
& \text { value } \\
& \text { per }
\end{aligned}
\] & quan- & cor of & & &  & quan- & \\
\hline & & & out direct ex & & & & & out directex & per & per house- & per & & out direct ex- & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { per } \\
& \text { house- }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & per
unit- & & out di- & per pouse & per & \\
\hline & & Any & rectex-peadi- & & & & Any & rectex pendi & hold & household & \begin{tabular}{l}
unit- \\
meal \({ }^{5}\)
\end{tabular} & Any & rect ex- & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { house- } \\
& \text { bold }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { holise- } \\
& \text { hold }
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{\text {unit- }}^{\text {uneal }}\) & Any & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { rectex- } \\
\text { pendj- }
\end{gathered}
\] & house- & household & \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{PEANUT BUTTER} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{COFFEE} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{TEA} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{cocoa} \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|l|}{southeast-white operators-con.} \\
\hline & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
382 \\
511 \\
1,018 \\
439
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }^{16}\)} & No. & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.
0.007} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{0}^{L b .}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{34}{ }_{3}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{No.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{0} 0.68\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }^{\mathrm{NO}} \mathrm{N}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }^{\mathrm{No}}{ }_{0}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Lb
0.09} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\stackrel{N}{\mathrm{NO}} \mathrm{2}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{No.} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Dol.
0.005} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{6}^{2 b .} 03\)} & DoI. \\
\hline Type 1. & & & 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{0.149
.129} \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & & \({ }_{6}^{61}\) & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{0} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{. 01016} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{. 08} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\({ }_{-118}\)} & 435 & 1 & . 132 & . 62 & . 112 & 170 & , & . 045 & . 10 & . 122 & 60 & 0 & . 011 & . 05 & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
95 \\
54 \\
\hline 5
\end{tabular}} & & & & & 925 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\frac{1}{2}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .178 \\
& .164
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .85 \\
& .81
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .102 \\
& .088
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{349
97} & 0 & . 048 & .11 & . 108 & 118 & 0 & . 012 & . 05 & . 105 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & & & 3 & . 024 & . 14 & . 106 & 925
391 & & & & & & 0 & . 030 & . 07 & . 097 & 72 & 1 & . 015 & . 08 & . 090 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 087} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{221} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 033} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 07} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 102} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{91} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{0} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 009} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 05} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 098} \\
\hline All types. & 878 & 61 & 0 & . 013 & . 07 & . 080 & 735 & 0 & . 136 & . 65 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-\$449- & 236 & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{10
31
12
8} & \multirow{4}{*}{0} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .007 \\
& .012 \\
& .019 \\
& .029
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .04 \\
& .07 \\
& .10 \\
& .20
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .095 \\
& .085 \\
& .095 \\
& .092
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
203 \\
387 \\
109 \\
36
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .126 \\
& .137 \\
& .140 \\
& .158
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
.66 \\
.66 \\
.59 \\
.67
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.080 \\
.087 \\
.093 \\
.097
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
53 \\
104 \\
45 \\
19
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .026 \\
& .028 \\
& .053 \\
& .056
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .06 \\
& .06 \\
& .12 \\
& .12
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .095 \\
& .100 \\
& .113 \\
& .105
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{20
42
41
8} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .007 \\
& .007 \\
& .014 \\
& .019
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .03 \\
& .04 \\
& .08 \\
& .12
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{.062
.105
.102
.096} \\
\hline \$500-8999 & 462 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 134 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 46 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Type 1. & 140 & & \multirow{4}{*}{0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.004 \\
.009 \\
.022 \\
.028
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .02 \\
& .05 \\
& .07 \\
& .16
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .138 \\
& .103 \\
& .089 \\
& .073
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 108 \\
& 228 \\
& 246 \\
& 153
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .106 \\
& .114 \\
& .168
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
.50 \\
.52 \\
.82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .105 \\
& .044 \\
& .083 \\
& .069
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{45
83
63
30} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.040 \\
.0037 \\
.030 \\
.022
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .08 \\
& .08 \\
& .07 \\
& .05
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .122 \\
& .107 \\
& .096
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{34
34
30
21} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{0
0
0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .002 \\
& .009 \\
& .010 \\
& .012
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .02 \\
& .05 \\
& .05 \\
& .06
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{( \(\begin{aligned} & .108 \\ & .094 \\ & .088 \\ & .088\end{aligned}\)} \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 292 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 16 \\
& 18 \\
& 18 \\
& 23
\end{aligned}
\]} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 aud 5. & 276 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 170 & & & & & & & & & . 71 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|l|}{SOUTHEAST-NEGBO
FAMILIES
8} \\
\hline All types \({ }^{\text {a }}\). & 1,564 & 18 & 0 & . 002 & . 01 & . 074 & 981 & 2 & . 090 & .45 & . 068 & 130 & 1 & . 009 & . 02 & . 080 & 50 & 0 & . 003 & . 02 & . 075 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 899 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 730 \\
& 657
\end{aligned}
\] & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{6} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .002 \\
& .002
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
.01
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .064 \\
& .072
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
422 \\
422
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .078 \\
& .095
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
.39 \\
-47
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .062 \\
& .069
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 47 \\
& 67
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .007 \\
& .012
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
.01
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.069 \\
.074
\end{array}
\] & 19
27 & 0 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.002 \\
.004
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.01 \\
.02
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .074 \\
& .075
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 53.--Items of food consumed at home during one week (7-day estimate): Number of households consuming specified items of food, average value and average quantity per household, and average value of all food per food-expenditure unit-meal in households consuming specified item, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936 -Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born']


1 See Glossary for definitions of terms such as houschold, income, analysis anit. The consumptinn figures given in this table include food consumed by paid farm or household help, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the economic family.
This table inchades households of ramilies in the consumption sample that furnished studied in eaction schedules (food check lists). See Methodology for the States and eomaties the Southeast where special sludies of white sharperoppers and Negro families were made See Methodology before using these data for regionat cornparicons
s Averazes are based on the number of houscholds in each class (column 2).
4 A verages are brused on the number of houscholds consuming the speeified item with
or without direct expenditure (colamps \(3,8,13\), or 18 ).
B Gep Glossary, Food expenditure Unit
\({ }^{6}\) New Eogland, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacifie regions.

A verage based on tewer than 3 cases.
\({ }^{8}\) Negro operators and sharecroppers.
in Ineludes 8 households with income \(\$ 2,000\) or over.
is \(\$ 0.00050\) or less.
\(4 \$ 0.0050\) or less.
\({ }^{13}\) Includes sweetened condensed milk, dry whole milk, and flavored milks
\({ }^{13}\) Information by income and family type is not available. The figures given for the "All types" lines for each region are estimates based on hand tabulation of the food cheek ists.
\({ }^{14}\) Includes boef heart, beef tongue, tripe.
is Includes all smoked or cured pork not consldered ham, such as Canadian bacon, pickicd plg's feet
ickicd pig's feet.
1s Inciudes sweet oreads, calves' brains, hear
is Sum of all items referring to lamb and mutton.
19 Sum of all items referring to lamb
\({ }^{20}\) Sum of 4 succeeding items-bologns and other munch meats, fresh or smoked, canned meats, cooked meats, and other meats not elsewhere spucified.
\({ }^{2 i}\) Includes any meat purchased cooked, whole or sliced, except those entered under bologna and other lunch meats.
\({ }^{22}\) Includes game as partridge, pheasant, rabbit, squirrel, venison; special meat products as tripe, tongue, kidney, and other organs where it was not known whether they were
eef, veal, lamb, or porz.
\({ }^{3}\) Information not available.

Table 54.-specifird items of foon constmed at home in a wefk (7-day estimate): Average quantity of 18 specificd itcms of food consumed at home per household in a week, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, March-November 1986
[Housebolds of nonrelief farm famibies that include a hushand and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 54--specified items of food consumfin at home in a week (7-day motimate): Average quantity of is specified items of food consumed at home per household in a week, by family type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-- Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Housebolds} & \multicolumn{13}{|c|}{A verame \({ }^{3}\) quantity consumed per household in a week} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Milk, fluid \\
whole \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\(\left\{\begin{array}{c}\text { Butter } \\ \text { (4) }\end{array}\right.\)} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Lard, lard compound, vegetable shorterings \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Bacon, } \\
\text { salt } \\
\text { side } \\
\\
(6)
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Bread. white. whole wheat, rye} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Flour, white. graham,
rye} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Corn meal, hominy grils} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Rice \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Breakfast cereals} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Potatoes, white} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Leafy, grecn, yellow vegetables 1 \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Tomatoes, citrus fruit \({ }^{5}\)} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & Uncooked & Readyto eat & & & \\
\hline & (2) & & & & & & & & & (11) & (12) & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 4 and 5} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Number } \\
1,349
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Qunts \\
16.95 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pounds } \\
2.18
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Ponuds
\[
1.80
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\left|\begin{array}{c}
\text { Poumds } \\
0.97
\end{array}\right|
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
5.80} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
8.18} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
0.21} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
P 0 u \pi d s \\
0.31
\end{gathered}\right.
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pounds} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Pounds } \\
0.79
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\({ }_{\text {Pounds }}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pounds. 6.08} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
5.92} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Net losses
Net incom & \[
\begin{array}{r}
18 \\
1,331
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16.61 \\
& 16.96
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2.47 \\
& 2.18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.78 \\
& 1.80
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1.19 \\
.97
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.13 \\
& 5.79
\end{aligned}
\] & 7.33
8.19 & . 44 & \[
. \frac{17}{31}
\] & . 70 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.710 \\
& 78
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 20.08 \\
& 21.08
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2.87 \\
& 6.12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 8. } 4 \mathrm{i} \\
& 5.88
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{104
288
3866
254
2222
84
13} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 15.35 \\
& 14.13 \\
& 16.93 \\
& 18.22 \\
& 19.21 \\
& 18.27 \\
& 21.08
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.85 \\
& 1.89 \\
& 2.16 \\
& 2.33 \\
& 2.49 \\
& 2.41 \\
& 1.73
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{1.56
1.81
1.80
1.78
2.00
2.22
2.15} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.68 \\
.89 \\
1.94 \\
1.08 \\
1.00 \\
1.10 \\
2.27
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 4.68 \\
& 4.40 \\
& 5.46 \\
& 6.32 \\
& 6.63 \\
& 9.38 \\
& 6.48
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 7.94 \\
& 8.31 \\
& 8.54 \\
& 8.04 \\
& 8.42 \\
& 6.66 \\
& 6.86
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .16 \\
& .20 \\
& .21 \\
& .16 \\
& .24 \\
& .30 \\
& .15
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .20 \\
& .27 \\
& .28 \\
& .44 \\
& .31 \\
& .37 \\
& .04
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.91 \\
.98 \\
\text { 1.08 } \\
1.19 \\
1.11 \\
1.28 \\
1.80
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.64 \\
.68 \\
.76 \\
.90 \\
.86 \\
1.02
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 18.81 \\
& 17.56 \\
& 21.89 \\
& 20.25 \\
& 23.25 \\
& 28.82 \\
& 23.12
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{3. 99
4.90
5. 80
6.61
7.83
8.63
4.66} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 4.38 \\
& 4.75 \\
& 5.70 \\
& 5.9 .5 \\
& 7.34 \\
& 7.83 \\
& 9.75
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 479 & 22, 60 & 2.12 & 2.09 & . 82 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
=-73 \\
=-0.73 \\
=0
\end{array}
\]} & 10.77 &  & . 43 & 1.35 & - 8 & 30.83 & 7.74 & 5.77 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{478} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{78.00
22.63} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{74.00
2.12} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}13.00 \\ 2.09 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
7.00 \\
.82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
24.50 \\
10.74
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{7.00
.34} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}7.54 \\ .43 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}1.35 \\ \\ \\ 1.10 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{71.20
.89} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\left[\begin{array}{r}
60.00 \\
30.77
\end{array}\right.
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1.00 \\
7.76
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{74.10
6.77} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 0-499 & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{12
90
140
111
91
29
5} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{29.00
17.37
20.25
23.07
28.16
31.66
22.60} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.65 \\
& 1.78 \\
& 2.11 \\
& 1.97 \\
& 2.39 \\
& 3.03 \\
& 2.40
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
1.62 \\
1.86 \\
1.98 \\
2.17 \\
2.40 \\
2.33 \\
1.70 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1.50 \\
.73 \\
.92 \\
.66 \\
.79 \\
1.02 \\
.80 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
4.38 \\
6.03 \\
5.74 \\
6.85 \\
8.42 \\
11.28 \\
12.06 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
10.96 \\
9.78 \\
11.58 \\
12.73 \\
8.03 \\
11.78 \\
3.40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
.62 \\
.42 \\
.30 \\
.37 \\
.33 \\
.21 \\
. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.54 \\
.27 \\
.36 \\
.60 \\
.71 \\
.40 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
1.97 \\
1.39 \\
1.36 \\
1.09 \\
1.41 \\
1.79 \\
\(-\quad .72\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
.60 \\
.67 \\
.86 \\
1.02 \\
1.07 \\
.76 \\
.88 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
22.25 \\
26.19 \\
29.90 \\
31.09 \\
33.74 \\
41.59 \\
34.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\begin{tabular}{r}
6.26 \\
6.04 \\
6.43 \\
8.72 \\
9.58 \\
11.17 \\
5.16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{3.42
5.62
4. 83
5.06
8.26
6.54
6.38} \\
\hline 500-999. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \(3,000-4,999\)
5.000 or over & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\footnotetext{
Sce footnotes at end of table.
}

Table 54.-specified ttems of food consumed at home in a week (7-day estimate): Average quantity of 13 specified items of food consumed at home per household in a week, by fanily type and income, 4 analysis units in 20 Siates, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1936-Continued
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]



 family type and income, 5 analysis umits in \(\% 0\) States, \({ }^{1}\) March-Novemiser \(1936^{\circ}\)
[Mouseholds of nonrelief farm fanilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {] }}\) ]



\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}

 family type and income, 5 analysis unils in 80 States, \({ }^{1}\) March-November 1930 -Continued
[Fouseholds of nonrelief farm fanilies that include a hasband and wife, both uative-born 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Analysis unit, farnily type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) quantity received without direct expenditure per household in a Freek} & \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Percentage \({ }^{7}\) of quantity consumed that was received without direct expenditure} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Eggs} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fluirl milk} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Chense} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Total
fluid
mill
eqniv.
alent} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
ponl- \\
try \\
fisb:
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Beef} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Pork} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Poultry} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Fish, blher se: food} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Eggs} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fluid milk} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Cheese} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Total Aluid milis equiva!ent 4} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{All meats. poultry, fishs} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Beef} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Pork} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Poultry} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Fi:h, nther sea foud} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & Fresh & Cured \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & & & & & & & & & Fresh & Cured \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & & \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (1) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (212) \\
\hline \multicolumn{22}{|l|}{SOUTHEASTWHITE OPERATORS} \\
\hline All types. & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
2,350
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Doz } \\
1.7
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 23.3
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Is. \\
(8)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \text { H. } \\
& +23.6
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
L b . \\
7.8
\end{gathered}
\] & \(\underset{\text { r.h. }}{0.2}\) & Th.
0.3 & \(\stackrel{L b .}{\text { L. }}\) & L6.
3.1 & Lb.
0.2 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pct } \\
101
\end{gathered}
\] & Pct. & Pct.
(\%) & Pct. \({ }_{93}\) & Pct.
66 & \(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{3} \mathrm{ct}\). & \(\gamma^{2}(4\).
50 & Pct.
79 & \(\mathrm{Pd}_{97}\) & \(\mathrm{Pcf.}_{14}\) \\
\hline 0-499 & 279 & . 9 & 18.7 & 0.0 & 18.9 & 4. 8 & . 1 & . 1 & 2.2 & 1.9 & . 3 & 90 & 98 & 0 & 90 & 70 & 20 & 50 & 71 & 95 & 33 \\
\hline 500-899. & 916 & 1.4 & 23.6 & (9) & 23.8 & 6.5 & . 1 & . 2 & 3.2 & 2. 5 & . 3 & 100 & 98 & (9) & 96 & 69 & 12 & 50 & 80 & 96 & 25 \\
\hline 1,000-1.499 & 523 & 1.8 & 23.4 & (b) & 23.8 & 8.6 & . 2 & . 4 & 4.3 & 3.3 & . 2 & 100 & 98 & (9) & 93 & 68 & 14 & 57 & 83 & 97 & 12 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 230 & 2.1 & 25.5 & (5) & 25.8 & 10.0 & . 1 & . 3 & 5.1 & 3.9 & . 3 & 95 & 98 & \({ }^{(2)}\) & 92 & 66 & 6 & 43 & 84 & 98 & 17 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 & 222 & 2.4 & 24.7 & (8) & 25. 1 & 10.2 & . 1 & . 7 & 5.0 & 4.0 & .1 & 100 & 98 & (i) & 91 & 63 & 5 & 58 & 83 & 95 & 5 \\
\hline 3,040-4,999 & 101 & 2.4 & 22.5 & (0) & 22.9 & 12.2 & . 2 & . 6 & 6.2 & 4.8 & . 1 & 100 & 08 & (9) & 89 & 66 & 7 & \(5{ }^{5}\) & 86 & 96 & 6 \\
\hline 5,000 or oyer & 39 & 2.9 & 25.6 & (3) & 26.0 & 10.5 & . 9 & . 8 & 3.9 & 4.7 & .1 & 94 & 130 & (9) & 87 & 55 & 17 & 57 & 70 & 96 & 9 \\
\hline Type 1 & 352 & 1.3 & 15.0 & (f) & 15.2 & 6.6 & . 2 & . 2 & 3.0 & 2.7 & . 3 & 93 & 96 & (9) & 90 & 73 & 18 & 40 & 88 & 96 & 33 \\
\hline 0-499 & 93
155 & 1.9 & 15.1 & .0 & 15.2 & 4. 6 & . 1 & .1 & 2. 2 & 1.8 & . 3 & 100 & 97 & 0
0 & 94 & 74 & 25
14 & 50
50 & 85 & 90 & 43 \\
\hline 500.999....-... & 15.5 & 1. 3 & 15.2 & (8) & 15.4 & 6.7 & . 1 & 2 & 3.2 & 9.7 & , 3 & 109 & 96
98 & (9) \({ }^{0}\) & 91 & 78 & 14 & 50 & 91
88 & 69
97 & 38
38 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 74
72
21 & 1. 6 & 14.5
15.1 & \begin{tabular}{c}
8 \\
\hline 8 \\
\hline 8
\end{tabular} & 14.8
15.2 & 6. 3 & . 3 & 2 & 2.8
4.2 & 2.88 & . 5 & 94
9.3 & 98
87 & (9) 0 & 92
88
810 & 67
77 & 19 & 40
25 & 88
91 & 97
109 & 33
25 \\
\hline 2,000-2,909 & 13 & 2.1 & 14. 3 & . 0 & 14.5 & 11.0 & . 0 & 1. 6 & 4.3 & 4.8 & .0 & 100 & 97 & 0 & 79 & 70 & 0 & 89 & 9 & 1010 & 1 \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 & 13 & 1.8 & 10.2 & .0 & 10.5 & 8.1 & . 4 & . 1 & 2.8 & 4.8 & . 0 & 100 & 100 & 0 & 88 & 76 & 29 & 50 & 74 & 100 & 0 \\
\hline 5.000 or over & 7 & 2.2 & 2.6 & . 0 & 23.0 & 8.5 & . 9 & .6 & 2.4 & 3.9 & . 0 & 100 & 100 & 0 & 91 & 50 & 18 & 47 & 55 & 87 & 0 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 511 & 1.5 & 21.2 & (9) & 21.4 & 0. 7 & 1 & 2 & 3.3 & 2.9 & 2 & 100 & 08 & (9) & 93 & 66 & 10 & 4) & 80 & 100 & 15 \\
\hline 0-499 & 79 & . 9 & 19.2 & . 0 & 19.3 & 5. 1 & (*) & . 0 & 2.8 & 2.1 & . 2 & 100 & 99 & 0 & 97 & 73 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 0 & 78 & 100 & 25 \\
\hline 5003-999 & 241 & 1.4 & 22.2 & . 0 & 22.4 & (3. 3 & ( \({ }^{\text {P }}\) & . 2 & 3.3 & 2.5 & . 2 & 100 & 98 & 0 & 96 & 67 & (1) & 67 & 79 & 96 & 17 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499. & 82 & 1.6 & 20.1 & . 0 & 20.4 & 7.6 & . 3 & . 4 & 3.3 & 3.3 & . 1 & 91 & 98 & 0 & 92 & 79 & 23 & 52 & 85 & 97 & 8 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999. & 44 & 1.9 & 20.8 & 0 & 21.0 & 8.3 & . 0 & , 1 & 4.3 & 3. 6 & . 2 & 100 & 95 & 0 & 86 & 59 & 0 & 17 & 81 & 97 & 11 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 ....- & 33 & 2.4 & 23.0 & (5) & 22.3 & 9.0 & .1 & . 6 & 3.5 & 4. 5 & . 2 & 96 & 99 & (9) & 88 & 65 & 6 & 55 & 85 & 96 & 11 \\
\hline 3,000-4,984 . ... & 16 & 1.5 & 17.1 & . 1 & 17.4 & 7.4 & . 2 & . 2 & 2.8 & 4.3 & . 0 & 100 & 100 & 11 & 84 & 50 & 7 & 29 & 58 & 93 & 0 \\
\hline 5,000 or over ...-- & [ & 2.2 & 33.7 & . 0 & 33.9 & 3.9 & . 0 & 2. 2 & . 0 & 1.7 & . 0 & 81 & 100 & 0 & 90 & 34 & 0 & 79 & 0 & 100 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Tyires 1 and 5.a---- & 1.018 & 1.91 & 24.7 & ( \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & 2.5.0 & 43 & . 21 & . 2 & 4.31 & 3.21 & . 21 & 65 & 981 & (\%) & 93 & 66 & 14 & 40 & 83 & U7 & 12 \\
\hline 0-499. & 71 & 1.1 & 20.5 & . 0 & 20.6 & 3.9 & . 0 & . 0 & 1.4 & 2.0 & . 4 & 109 & 98 & 0 & 93 & 57 & 0 & 0 & 50 & 100 & 33 \\
\hline 500-499 & 359 & 1.5 & 25.7 & (8) & 25.9 & 6. 5 & . 2 & .1 & 3.2 & 2.5 & . 2 & 94 & 98 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 96 & 71 & 25 & 50 & 817 & 186 & 7 \\
\hline 1,000-1,499 & 242 & 1.0 & 24.2 & ( \({ }^{\text {F }}\) ) & 21.5 & 8.9 & . 1 & . 3 & 5.0 & 3.3 & . 2 & 95 & 98 & (0) & 91 & 68 & 9
5 & 50
43 & 86
83
88 & 100 & 17 \\
\hline 1,500-1,909 & 115 & 2.1 & 25.1 & ( \(\varepsilon)\) & 25.5 & 9.8 & . 1 & . 3 & 5.01 & 3.9 & . 3 & 100
100 & 99
100 & \({ }^{(2)} 0\) & 92
42
42 & 68
64 & 6
8
8 & 43 & 8 & 100 & 17 \\
\hline 2,000-2,949 & 191 & 2.6 & 23.7 & . 0 & 24.1 & 10.0 & . 2 & .4 & 5.2 & 3.8 & \(\stackrel{1}{2}\) & 100
96 & 100
100 & 0
0 & 92 & 64
67 & 4 & 50 & 88 & 94 & 9 \\
\hline 3,001-1,999.....- & 65 & 2.7 & 26.7 & (5) \({ }^{0}\) & \({ }_{27}^{27.2}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
13.7 \\
12.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 1.12 & .5
.6 & 7.
5.0
5.0 & 4. 5.6 & \(\cdot 1\) & 9 & 100 & (9) & 87 & 59 & 21 & 67 & 77 & 98 & 8 \\
\hline 5,000 or over... & 24 & 3.4 & 20.0 & (5) & 26.1 & 12.6 & 1.2 & . 6 & 5.0 & \(\cdots\) & . & \(\stackrel{3}{ }\) & 10 & \(\cdots\) & & & & & & & :---: 21 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 133 & 1.6 & 29.4 & . 0 & 29.8 & 9.0 & . 2 & . 7 & 4. 3 & 3.3 & . 4 & 100 & 48 & 0 & 94 & 64 & 12 & 30 & 75 & 97 & 21 \\
\hline 0-4092 & 36 & . 9 & 23.5 & . 0 & 23.5 & 6. 3 & . 5 & . 6 & 2. 6 & 2. 0 & . 3 & 100
190 & 97
100 & 0
0 & 95
98 & 71
60 & 45
9 & 86
67 & 74
64 & 100
100 & 27
28 \\
\hline 5000-099.-. & 161 & 1.4 & 2\%.7 & . 10 & 29.0 & (.) 4 & . 1 & .4 & 2.8 & 2.5 & . 5 & 191) & 100
90 & 0
0 & 98 & 60
65 & 29 & 67
84 & 64
75 & 109
97 & 12 \\
\hline 1,000-1,494..... & 115 & 1.6 & 99.9 & . 0 & 30.4 & 9.7 & . 4 & . 7 & 4. 5 & 3.7
4.6 & .2 & 91
100 & 96
99
99 & 0
0 & 92
44
4 & 65 & 14 & 56
56 & 83 & 48 & 18 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 58 & 2. 0 & 34. 2 & . 0 & 34.5 & 12.2 & . 3 & 1.5 & 6.4
5.8 & 4.6
4.0 & . 1 & 100
95 & 99 & 0 & 94
91 & 66
60 & 14 & 50 & 77 & 95 & 8 \\
\hline 2,000-2,999....-- & 50 & 2.1 & 32.7 & . 0 & 33.1 & 11.4 & . 1 & 1.0 & 5. 8 & 4.0
5.0 & \({ }_{.}^{2}\) & 95
100 & 97
92 & 0 & 91 & 60
60
60 & 12 & 65 & 77
93 & 100 & 8 \\
\hline 3.000 - \(4.9493 . . .-\) & 17 & 102.5 & 23.4 & -0

10 & 23.8
108 & 10 \(\begin{array}{r}15.1 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 10.0 &  & 137.8 & \(\begin{array}{r}5.0 \\ 10.8 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 10.0 & 10100 & 92
109
109 & \({ }_{10}^{10} 0\) & \({ }_{10} 88\) & 1060 & 104 & -20 & 10100 & 1077 & 100 \\
\hline 6,000 or over & 10.2 & 101.6 & 108.0 & 10.0 & 108.3 & 1512. 6 & \({ }^{10} .0\) & 10.0 & 137.8 & 104.8 & 10.0 & , 100 & 15100 & 10 & 148 & 10 & 1 & -0 & & & , \\
\hline sodtreastWMTE SIIARECROPPERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 :
\[
500-499 \text {. }
\] & 150 & 1.3 & 23.1 & (5) & 23. 2 & 5. 5 & (3) & . 2 & 2.4 & 2.5 & . 3 & 100 & 99 & ( \({ }^{\text {) }}\) & 97 & 53 & (9) & 50 & 55 & 96 & 19 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5:
\[
500-099
\] & 230 & 1.0 & 13.0 & .0 & 13.1 & 3.8 & (3) & (6) & 1.7 & 1.9 & . 2 & 100 & 97 & 0 & 91 & 36 & ( \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & (9) & 40 & 90 & \(\theta\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1 Sce Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, family type, income, analysis utit. The consumption figures given in this tahie include ford consumed by paid farm or housebold help, boarders, unit guests as well as by members of the economic family. \({ }_{2}\) This table includes householls of famitios io the consumption sample that furnished sumplemantary schedtales (foad check list.s). See Metholology for the states and eonties
studied in each rugion. Fandies of white farm oforators only were studied in all reyious exeept the Southeasi where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negrof fumilies were mado.

A verages are based on the number of houscholds in each class (column 2),

A Approximately the quantity of fluid milk to which the varjous dary products except. butter art equivalent io protems and minerals.

Incluties canned, cooked, nonsperified meats as well as Jamb, mutton, and vent.
Jnelules bamo and salt side.
7 Percentrues are based on the tot quantily consumed (purchased and received wilh out direct expenditure) of the correspondiug food, tables 48-52.
0.050 ir less.
0.50 percent or less.

10 A verage based on fewer than 3 cases.
is Negro operators and sharecreppers.

 direct expenditure, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 20 States, 1 March-November \(19 S G\)
[Households of nonvelief farm families that izclude a husband and wife, both native born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Analysis unit, famliy type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Housebolds} & \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Average \({ }^{3}\) quantity received without direct expenditure per bousehold in a week} & \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Percentage \({ }^{5}\) of quantity consumed that was received without direct expenditure} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fats 4 \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar, sirups, preserves \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equivglent 5 \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, swoetpota. toes \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruits} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sugar, sirtips, preServes \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Flour equiv. alents \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes, sweetpota. toes \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Other vegetables} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruits} \\
\hline & & & & & & Fresh & \begin{tabular}{l}
Can. \\
ned
\end{tabular} & Dried & Fresh & Can. ned & Driod & & & & Fresh & Can- & Dried & Fresh & Can- & Dried \\
\hline (1) & (2) & & & & & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & & & & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline \multicolumn{21}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 0-499. & 164 & 19 & 1.0 & . 9 & 16.2 & 6.7 & 1. 6 & .2 & 3.9 & 1.6 & (7) & 14 & 7 & 85 & 88 & 73 & 33 & 44 & 30 & (3) \\
\hline 500-909 & 625 & 1.0 & 1.1 & 1. 5 & 10.1 & 6.0 & 2.2 & .1 & 2.6 & 1.5 & (7) & 15 & 12 & 87 & 86 & 73 & 17 & 34 & 79 & \({ }^{8}\) ( \()\) \\
\hline 1,000-1,489 & 757 & 1.2 & 1.4 & 2.2 & 20.2 & 6.9 & 2.3 & .2 & 3.1 & 1.7 & (7) & 16 & 15 & 87 & 84 & 68 & 25 & 32 & 81 & (5) \\
\hline 1,5000-1,999 & 493 & 1.3 & 1.6 & 2.5 & 20.7 & 7.5 & 2.5 & .2 & 3.7 & 2.2 & (\%) & 17 & 16 & 90 & 83 & 69 & 29 & 32 & 85 & (s) \\
\hline 2,000-2,993 & 362 & 1.8 & 2.0 & 2.9 & 24.2 & 10.9 & 2.8 & .2 & 5. 2 & 2.3 & (7) & 19 & 18 & 87 & 87 & 72 & 25 & 36 & 85 & (8) \\
\hline 3,003-4,999. & 135 & 1.8 & 1.9 & 2.5 & 27.3 & 12.8 & 2.8 & . 3 & 4.7 & 2.5 & . 0 & 18 & 14 & 84 & 86 & 64 & 33 & 28 & 83 & 0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
5,000 or over \\
Type 1
\end{tabular}} & 21 & 1.3 & 1.6 & 1.1 & 23.0 & 5.3 & 2.8 & . 1 & 3.3 & 2.3 & .0 & 18 & 8 & 73 & 69 & 62 & 12 & 26 & 70 & 0 \\
\hline & 553 & . 9 & 1.1 & 1.0 & 11.9 & 4.8 & 1.9 & 1 & 2.2 & 1. 1 & ( \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 17 & 10 & 85 & 81 & 70 & 20 & 28 & 58 & (9) \\
\hline 0-499 & 74 & . 7 & . 8 & . 1 & 11.4 & 4.1 & 1.9 & . 2 & 3.1 & 1.3 & . 0 & 15 & 4 & 85 & 85 & 73 & 50 & 48 & 68 & 0 \\
\hline 500-999 & 191 & . 8 & 1.0 & . 3 & 13.5 & 4.1 & 1.6 & . 1 & 1.6 & 1.2 & . 0 & 17 & 10 & 86 & 82 & 67 & 25 & 2.5 & 75 & 0 \\
\hline : ,0001-1,190.....-- & 135 & . 9 & . 9 & 1.4 & 12.0 & 4.8 & 2.8 & .1 & 2.0 & 1.4 & () & 14 & 14 & 83 & 77 & 69 & 17 & 26 & 74 & (5) \\
\hline 1,500-1,909 ...... & 95 & 1.0 & 1.4 & 1.2 & 12.6 & 5.0 & 2.0 & .3 & 2.5 & 2.0 & (?) & 21 & 12 & 89 & 78 & 69 & 75 & 25 & 87 & (5) \\
\hline 2,000-2,999 \(\ldots\) & 41 & 1.2 & 1.2 & 1.5 & 12.6 & 8.3 & 1.7 & .2 & 3.2 & 1.3 & (7) & 17 & 12 & 77 & 88 & 65 & 33 & 32 & 81 & (4) \\
\hline 3,000-4,999 .-...- & 13 & 1.3 & 1.4 & . 8 & 11.4 & 6.7 & 2.9 & . 1 & 5.0 & 1.8 & . 0 & 19 & 7 & 80 & 87 & 83 & 17 & 35 & 78 & 0 \\
\hline 5,000 or over. .-. & 4 & 1.2 & . 6 & . 5 & 7.6 & . 8 & 1.6 & . 2 & . 8 & . 5 & .0 & 10 & 7 & 84 & 24 & 73 & 100 & 15 & 24 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


See footnotes at end of table.

 direct expenditure, by family type and income, 5 analysis units in 90 States, 1 March \(\rightarrow\) November \(1986-C o n d i n u e d\)
[Houscholds of nonrelicf farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Types 6 and 7...-..... & 439 & 2.1 & 3.0 & \(21.1{ }^{1}\) & 1.3.41 & 16.0 & 1.0 & .31 & 15. 7 & . 71 & . 1 & 32 & 631 & 93 & 051 & 77 & 501 & 81 & 88 & 33 \\
\hline 0-499 & 36 & 1.4 & 1. \({ }^{\text {i }}\) & 20.2 & 5.0 & 15.3 & . 2 & . 2 & 28.3 & . 4 & . 0 & 25 & 56 & 1013 & 97 & 67 & 67 & 99 & 100 & 0 \\
\hline 500998 & 16 I & 1.8 & 3.1 & 20.9 & 10.0 & 15.0 & . 6 & . 3 & 16.5 & . 5 & . 1 & 3.5 & 54 & 93 & 96 & 67 & 43 & (1) & 100 & 100 \\
\hline 1,000-1,199 ...... & 115 & 1.6 & 3.7 & 23.0 & 16.4 & 17.7 & 1.2 & . 4 & 17.9 & . 8 & . 1 & 35 & 55 & 94 & 96 & 86 & 67 & 80 & 80 & 33 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 ....... & 58 & 2.7 & 2.4 & 23.0 & 38.5 & 17.8 & 1, 1 & . 4 & 16.3 & . 9 & . 3 & 24 & 54 & 91 & 93 & 73 & 100 & 82 & 90 & 60 \\
\hline 2.600-2,999 & 50 & 3.2 & 2.6 & 18.1 & 14.6 & 13.2 & 2.1 & . 2 & 7.3 & 1.0 & . 2 & 27 & 44 & 92 & 86 & 75 & 40 & 54 & 67 & 40 \\
\hline 3,000-4,998 & 17 & 3. \({ }^{3}\) & 2.9 & 15.7 & 22.4 & 18.0 & 1. 6 & . 7 & -2.1 & 1.6 & \(\square 1\) & - 27 & 42 & \(\begin{array}{r}96 \\ 0 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 96
8100 & 80 & \(\begin{array}{r}78 \\ 80 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 19
-63 & 100
90 & \(\bigcirc\) \\
\hline 5,000 or aver & 2 & -3.5 & \({ }^{0} 1.5\) & \({ }^{8} 3.0\) & -18.5 & -8.8 & 0.0 & \(\stackrel{\square}{0}\) & \({ }^{9} 12.5\) & \(\stackrel{9}{ }\) & - 0 & \({ }^{-17}\) & 97 & -100 & \({ }^{-1} 100\) & \({ }^{2} 0\) & \(\bullet\) & \({ }^{9} 63\) & \({ }^{9} 0\) & \({ }^{\circ}\) \\
\hline plains, mountain, and pacific & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & 1, 007 & . 6 & . 9 & . 5 & 7.4 & 1.7 & 1.3 & . 1 & 2.7 & 1.3 & ( \({ }^{3}\) & 14 & 4 & 60 & 62 & 45 & 17 & 25 & 62 & ( \({ }^{\text {d }}\) \\
\hline Net losses & 36 & 1.1 & . 0 & 2.2 & 6.3 & 1.6 & 2.0 & . 1 & . 7 & 1. 3 & (1) 0 & 11 & 15 & 42 & 30 & 44 & 25 & 7 & 43 & ( 0 \\
\hline Net imeames. & 971 & 1.6 & .9 & . 4 & 7.5 & 4.8 & 1.2 & .1 & 2.7 & 1.3 & (1) & 14 & 3 & 61 & 62 & 41 & 17 & 25 & 62 & (') \\
\hline 0-499 & 170 & . 6 & . 8 & . 4 & 5. 2 & 2.5 & 1. 0 & . 1 & 2.0 & 1. 0 & \(\cdot 1\) & 12 & 4
3 & 46 & 54 & 36
45 & 14 & 22 & 45
59 & 25
20 \\
\hline 500-989... & 272 & . 6 & . 8 & . 4 & 6. 9 & 4.0 & 1.3 & .1 & 2.3 & 1. 0 & (i) \({ }^{1}\) & 13 & 3
4 & 61 & 63 & 45 & 20
17 & 23
28 & 59
67 & (8) \({ }^{20}\) \\
\hline 1,000-1,199 & 222 & . 7 & -9 & . 5 & 8.2 & 5. 5 & 1. 4 & . 1 & 3.1 & 1.4 & (7) & 13 & 4
3 & 63 & 65 & 47
42 & 17
0 & 28 & 67
58
58 & (8) \\
\hline 1,5000-1,999 & 154 & . 5 & 1. 2 & . 4 & 8.6 & 6. 17 & 1.1 & . 0 & 2.4 & 1.4 & (7) & 18 & 3
5 & 67
70 & 62 & 42
50 & 0
40 & 22
30 & 58
70 & (8) \\
\hline 2,000-2,949.. & 112 & . 6 & 1.4 & . 7 & 9.0 & 6.7 & 1.5 & . 2 & 4.7 & 1. 6 & ( \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & 18 & 5 & 70 & 64 & 50
50 & 67 & 20 & 70 & \\
\hline \(3,000-4,909\)
5,000 or over & 35
6 & . 9 & 1. 1.2 & .0
.0 & 8.7
4.5 & 6.4
4.2 & 1.6
.0 & .1
.0 & 2.4
4.0 & 3. 6
3.0 & .1
.0 & 14
15 & 0
0 & 56
43 & 6.5
68
28 & 50
0 & 67 & 20 & 70 & 25
0 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE SHARECLOHPERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\text { Types } 4 \text { and } 5:
\] & 150 & 1.2 & 1.3 & 12,8! & 7.0 & 13.1 & . 5 & , 3 & 7.1 & . 4 & (7) & 19 & 38 & 91 & 94 & 71 & 50 & 72 & 80 & \({ }^{(3)}\) \\
\hline SOUTREAST-NEGEO FAMILIES \({ }^{10}\) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. \(5(0)-099\) & 290 & . 7 & 1.1 & 9.7 & 5.1 & 10.9 & . 1 & . 3 & 6.8 & . 3 & \(\left.{ }^{( }\right)\) & 16 & 32 & 95 & 92 & 33 & 43 & 74 & 100 & \({ }^{(5)}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1 See Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, family type, income, anatysis unit. The oansumption flgures given in this table inclutie food coosamed by paid farm or basehold help, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the economic fantily. \({ }^{3}\) This table includes households of families in the cousumption sample that furvished

 regions exere mude arerage arede.
A rerages ate based on the number of househoks in each class (column 2),
Eadlues butter, bacon, and silt sjde. Corresponding percentage figures are not
presented because the total quantity consumed (purchased and received without direct expenditure) of fats as shown in table 48 includes butler.
'Two-thirds of the weight of baked goods has been added to that of the dour, meals, reals
o Perceutages are based on the total quantity consmmed (purchased and received without direct expenditure) of the corresponding food, tables 48-52.

\section*{\({ }^{7} 0.050\) or less.}
- Average batived on lewer than 3 coses.

10 Negro operators and sharccroppers.

Table 56.-home-prodoced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 89 analysis units in 20 States, 1 1935-36
[Househoids of novrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, bath nativy-bora 2]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.- home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-96-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that inciude a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56-home-prodeced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 93 analysis units in 20 States \({ }^{1}\), 1935-86-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm familias that include a busband and wife, both native-born']


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, \(\$ 3\) analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Householde of nonrelief farm families that includo a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 39 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Housebolds of nonrelief farm farmilies that inciude a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {d }}\) ]


Table 56-home-produced food: Number of hataseholds producing specifed types of food for home usc, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm [amilies that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{3}\) ]


Table 56--home-hroduced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 39 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1435-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ']


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 93 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-86-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ']


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-prodiced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 83 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-86-Continued
[Housebolds of nonrelief farm families that include s husbuad and wile, both native-born \({ }^{\text {? }}\) ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56--home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 38 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-86-Continued
[Households of nonreliet farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{4}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{Recrion, analysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow{5}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mouse } \\
& \text { holds }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Households producing for home uso \({ }^{\text {a }}\) -} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Milk \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{Creamt} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Eggs \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pous. \\
try \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pork \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{Other meat} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoes \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{Other tood from garden (10)} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other lood \({ }^{4}\) \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline (1) & (2) & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{pactric-con. Oregon-Continued} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 619} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 598} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\mathrm{No}_{\Delta 75}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No, 583} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\(N o\). 521} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 349} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\underset{274}{\stackrel{N}{2}}
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 530} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 603} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{No. 676} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
{ }^{\mathrm{No}}{ }_{35}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Not losses. & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
618
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
597
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
475
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{583} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{50} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{0
349} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{0
274} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1 29} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1
575} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{9
35} \\
\hline Net incomes & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-\$498. & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{26
278
160
110
9.4
50
5} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{29
172
155
107
91
46} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
17 \\
131 \\
124 \\
91 \\
78 \\
34
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{26
166
153
107
90
41} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{22
139
138
99
86
37} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{15
90
97
65
56
26} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{7
64
64
73
36
48
28} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}23 \\ 157 \\ 138 \\ 93 \\ 83 \\ 33 \\ \hline 3\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
25 \\
178 \\
116 \\
104 \\
93 \\
48
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{24
163
148
107
86
47} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{1
12
9
4
8
3} \\
\hline \$500-3999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$2,000- \$2,999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$3,000 or over & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types B and & 200 & 193 & 148 & 184 & 163 & 142 & 96 & 173 & 195 & 175 & 16 \\
\hline Net losses. & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
189
\end{array}
\]} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Net incomes. & & 192 & 147 & 183 & 162 & 140 & 95 & 172 & 194 & 174 & 15 \\
\hline \$0-\$990 & \multirow[b]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 47 \\
& 61 \\
& 40 \\
& 30 \\
& 16
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{3
45
60
40
28
16} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 32 \\
& 49 \\
& 31 \\
& 22 \\
& 12
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{4
40
57
38
38
29
15} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
32 \\
48 \\
36 \\
27 \\
14
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{3
31
40
30
23
13} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{1
17
25
22
18
12} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{5
41
51
37
24
14} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
5 \\
4.5 \\
59 \\
39 \\
30 \\
16
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[b]{6}{*}{40
40
53
35
27
15} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{(1) \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
2 \\
4 \\
1 \\
6 \\
0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \$500-\$999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$2,000-82,999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$3,000 or over & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 8 and & 76 & 74 & 57 & 73 & 63 & 50 & 45 & 65 & 74 & 74 & 5 \\
\hline Oregon-part-time & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline typ & 571 & 443 & 402 & \[
474
\] & 412 & 149 & 109 & 396 & 519 & 468 & 13 \\
\hline Net losscs... & 1 1 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
443
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
{ }_{402}^{0}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
473
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
41^{1}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
149
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
109
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
395
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
518
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{467}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{[ 12} \\
\hline Net incomes & 570 & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-\$498...-...---- & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
3 \\
82 \\
177 \\
159 \\
119 \\
30
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
61 \\
147 \\
119 \\
94 \\
22
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
58 \\
129 \\
109 \\
87 \\
19
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
2 \\
70 \\
138 \\
135 \\
101 \\
27
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
57 \\
123 \\
116 \\
91 \\
23
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
20 \\
50 \\
40 \\
34 \\
5
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
18 \\
18 \\
32 \\
28 \\
25 \\
5
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
57 \\
525 \\
120 \\
1142 \\
82 \\
10
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
75 \\
164 \\
143 \\
109 \\
26
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{3
60
143
134
98
29} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
2
4
3
3
3
0} \\
\hline \$500-5999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499.. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1.999. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,99\% & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$3,000 or o & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Type 1. & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
131 \\
153 \\
2059
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 73 \\
& 125 \\
& 173
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
67 \\
111 \\
159
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 122 \\
& 129 \\
& 178
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
89 \\
115 \\
150
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 26 \\
& 45 \\
& 84
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l|r|}
27 & 87 \\
24 & 105 \\
44 & 151
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 116 \\
& 139 \\
& 194
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
108 \\
121 \\
177
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{(10 \(\begin{array}{r}10 \\ 0 \\ 2\end{array}\)} \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Nat losses & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{173} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}159 \\ \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
178
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
0 \\
150
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
54
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4 4} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
151
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
194
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
177
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{- \(\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 2\end{array}\)} \\
\hline Net incomes & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-8490 & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
20 \\
59 \\
61 \\
54 \\
15
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
16
60
51
44
12} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 16 \\
& 47 \\
& 47 \\
& 39 \\
& 10
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
0 \\
18 \\
45 \\
54 \\
47 \\
14
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
14
38
46
40
12} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 4 \\ 16 \\ 18 \\ 18 \\ 13 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 4 \\ 13 \\ 16 \\ 9 \\ 2 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
11 \\
45 \\
49 \\
39 \\
7
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
18
55
57
50
14} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
15
51
52
44
15} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{0
0
0
2
0
0} \\
\hline \$500-8999 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999...--- & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$2,001-\$2,999 & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$3,000 or over. & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{68
10} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}64 \\ 8 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{58} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{56
9} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{49
9} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{23
1
1} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{13
1} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{47
6} & 62 & 52 & \\
\hline Types 8 and 9 & & & & & & & & & 8 & 10 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 39 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Mousebolds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born²]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.--home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 39 analysis units in 20 Staies, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born :]


See footnotes at end of tuble.

Table 56.-home-prodeced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 35 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-96-Continued
[Household of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, botb native-born d]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 39 analysis units in 20 States, 1935-36-Contimued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ?]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Houschoids producing for home use} \\
\hline & & Milk & Cream & Eggs & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Poul- } \\
& \text { try }
\end{aligned}
\] & Pork & Other meat & Potatoes & Other tood from gar- & Fruit & Other food \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 409 . \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \({ }_{124}^{15}\) & \({ }^{19}\) & 1
28 & 114 & 112 & 12
94 & 2
19 & 115 & 124 & \(4{ }_{4}^{4}\) & 8
74 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 102 & 52 & 51 & 100 & 99 & 83 & 15 & 90 & 102 & 50 & 71 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999. & 53 & 32 & 30 & 51 & 52 & 51 & 5 & 50 & 58. & 25. & 36 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Type 1 \\
Types 2 and 3 \\
Types 4 and 5
\end{tabular}} & 33 & 5 & 5 & 32 & 31 & 281 & 6 & 29 & 33 & 1 t & 21 \\
\hline & 74 & 22 & 21 & 70 & 66 & 64 & 12 & 70 & 74 & 34 & 50 \\
\hline & 52 & 25. & 24 & 49 & 49 & 47 & 7 & 47 & 52 & 27 & 28 \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \$500-\$999 - \(-\ldots .\). & 16 & 5 & 4 & 14 & 14 & 12 & 2 & 13 & 16 & 6 & 7 \\
\hline \$1.000-\$1.199 & 22 & 11 & 11. & 22 & 22 & 21. & 4 & 21 & 22 & 11. & 14 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & 12 & 9 & 91 & 11 & 11 & 12 & 1 & 11 & 12 & 10 & 7 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 6 and 7 Types 8 and 9 .} & 104 & 43 & 39 & 99 & 99 & 85 & 10 & 98 & 104 & 39 & 71 \\
\hline & 31 & 19 & 19 & 31 & 31 & 25 & 6. & 29 & 31 & 12 & 19 \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{South Carolina} \\
\hline All types & - 215 & 124 & 99 & 205 & 200 & 179 & 38 & 175 & 213 & 88 & 176 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & \({ }_{111}^{68}\) & 23
73 & 18
56 & 61
106 & \({ }^{58} 10\) & 47
97 & 17
19 & 49
94 & 111 & 24
44 & 54
91 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1.499....-- & 33 & 24 & 22 & 33 & 32 & 30 & 1 & 28 & 33 & 16 & 27 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\$1,500-\$1,989 \(\ldots .\).} & 4 & 3 & 5 & 5. & 5 & 1 & 4 & 5 & 4. & 4 \\
\hline Type 1. & 24 & 7 & 6 & 22 & 22 & 19 & 5 & 19 & 23 & 11. & 19 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 409 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 \\
& \$ 1,000-\$ 1,199
\end{aligned}
\]} & 11 & 1 & & 10 & 10 & & & 7 & & 4. & \\
\hline & 10 & 4 & 3. & 9 & 9. & 8 & 1 & 9 & 10 & 5. & 8 \\
\hline & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 3. & 2 & 3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{'Types 2 and 3........ 58} & 29 & 26. & 58 & 561 & 49 & 12 & 49 & 58 & 25. & 50 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\$0-849. \\
\$500-\$999 \\
\(\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499\)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{23
30
5} & 8 & 7 & 23 & 21 & 17 & 7 & 16 & 23. & \(8{ }^{\text {i }}\) & 19 \\
\hline & & 18 & 17 & 30 & 30 & 27 & 4 & 28 & 30 & 15 & 27 \\
\hline & & 3. & 2 & 5. & 5 & 5 & 1 & 5 & 5 & 2 & 4 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5........ & 40 & 23 & 18 & 35 & 35 & 33 & 6 & 31 & \(40^{\prime}\) & 24 & 33 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 0-\$ 499\) \\
5000-\$999 \\
\$1,000-\$1,499 \\
\$1,500-\$1,999
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
13 \\
18 \\
6 \\
3
\end{array}
\]} & 4 & 2. & 10 & 10 & 8 & 1 & 13 & 13 & 8 & 10 \\
\hline & & 12 & 10 & 16 & 16 & 16 & 5. & 10 & 18 & 8 & 15 \\
\hline & & 5 & 5 & 6 & \({ }^{6}\) & 6 & 0 & 5 & 6 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline & & & 1. & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 3. & 3. & 3 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7 & 68 & 46 & 34 & 66 & 64 & 59 & 14 & 55 & 67 & 24 & 55 \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 17 & 9 & 7 & 17. & 16 & 12 & 5 & 11 & 16 & 4 & 15 \\
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\$1,000-\$1,499.......} & 35. & 25 & 16 & \(33^{1}\) & 33 & 32 & 8 & 32. & 35 & 13. & 27 \\
\hline & 14 & 10. & 9 & 14 & 13 & 13. & 0 & 11 & 14 & 6 & 12 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999......-- & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Types 8 a & & 18 & 15. & 24 & 23 & 19 & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 21. & 25 & 4 & 19 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-98-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born a]


See footnotes at end ol table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producina specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, 1 1995-36-Continued
[Housebolds of nonreliff farm families that include a husband and wife, both pative-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{EOuseholds} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Households producing for home use \({ }^{-}\)-} \\
\hline & & Milk & Cream & Eggs & Poultry & Pork & Other meat & Potr. toes & Other forod from carden & Fruit & Other food 1 \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (3) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-8499.. & 179
231 & 70
177 & \(\begin{array}{r}461 \\ 142 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 162
224 & 158
226 & 138
215 & 19
28 & 111
170 & 177
230 & 60
105 & 151 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 52 & 47 & 42 & 50 & 50 & \({ }_{52}\) & 7 & 45 & 52 & 33 & \({ }_{5}^{214}\) \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 ... & 12 & 11 & 10 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 4 & 11 & 12 & 9 & 12 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,990... & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline \$3,000 or over & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 ! & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline Type 1. & 32 & 12 & 10 & 27 & 27 & 24 & 5: & 20 & 30 & 12 & 28 \\
\hline \[
\$ 0-\$ 499
\] & 22
9
1 & 5
6 & \({ }^{3}\) & 17
9
1 & 17
9 & 14
9
1 & 4 & 10
9 & \(\begin{array}{r}20 \\ 9 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 8
4 & 20
7 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 53 & 32. & 261 & 49 & 48 & 45 & 6 & 34 & 52 & 18 & 44 \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 33 & 14 & 8 & 29 & 28 & 25. & 2 & 20 & 33 & 0 & \\
\hline \$500-\$998. & 17 & 15 & 15 & 17 & 17 & 17 & 2 & 11 & 16 & 7 & 15 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499.- & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 & & 1. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 112 & 70 & 50 & 108 & 108 & 97 ! & 12 & 82 & 112 & 67 & 104 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 .
\end{aligned}
\] & 42
58 & 14
40 & 11
34
1 & 38
53
58 & \begin{tabular}{l}
39 \\
52 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 32
48
48 & \({ }_{9}^{3}\) & 27
39 & \({ }_{43}^{42}\) & 20 & 37 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 14 & 13. & 11 & 14 & 14 & 14 & 0 & 13 & 14 & 11 & 13 \\
\hline \$1,600-\$1,999 & 3 & 3 & & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 134 & 89 & \(68{ }^{\circ}\) & 127 & 126 & 116 & 17 & 97 & 134 & 52 & 116 \\
\hline \[
\$ 0-\$ 499
\]
\[
\$ 500-\$ 999
\] & 56
67 & 28
51 & 18
41 & 52
65 & 50
66 & 44
61 & 5
9 & & 56 & 15 & 44 \\
\hline \$1,000- \(\$ 1,499\) & 10 & 0 & 8. & 9 & 9 & 10 & 2 & 7 & 10 & 6 & 10 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999. & 1 & 1. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Types 8 and & 146 & 105 & 80 & 140 & 140 & 138 & 18 & 107 & 146 & 50 & 138 \\
\hline Georgia & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 222 & 195 & 198 & 214 & 203 & 211 & 36 & 157 & 222 & 139 & 204 \\
\hline \$0- 8499. & \multirow[t]{5}{*}{101
104
13
3
3
0
1
1} & 81 & 81 & 96 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{89
88} & 97 & 8 & 59 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{101} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 58 \\
& 69
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{87} \\
\hline \$500-8999 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12} & 101 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12} & & 97 & 24 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{82
12} & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999......- & & & 12 & & 12 & 13 & \({ }^{4}\) & & 13. & 69 & 11 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,999 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \(\stackrel{5}{0}\) & 0 & 3 & 3 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 3 \\
\hline \$3,000 or over-...- 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & , & 0 & 1 & , & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Type 1-..............- & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{39
32
3} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
31 \\
27 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
31 \\
28 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
38 \\
29 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{36
26} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{37
30
30} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{31} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
21 \\
23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{39
32
3} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{26
21} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{32
28} \\
\hline Types 2 and 3.......- & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 70 & 65 & 64 & 68 & 65 & 68 & 11 & 53 & 70 & 46 & 66 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{426} & 22 & 21 & 24 & 23 & 26. & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{1
9
1
0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{18
31
21
0
0
0
1} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{rer \({ }_{26}^{41} \times\)} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\left.\begin{array}{r}
15 \\
29 \\
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1 \\
1
\end{array} \right\rvert\,
\]} & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{22
41
2
0
0
1} \\
\hline \$500-\$999 .-.-....- & & 40. & 40 & 41 & 39 & 39 & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499...... & 2 & 2 & 2. & 2 & 2 & 3 & & & & & \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999 ....-- & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,099 ...... & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\
\hline \$3,000 or over-.--- & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Types 6 and 7 \\
Types 8 and 9
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
46 \\
35 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
41 \\
31 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{33}^{42}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{44
35} & 43 & 42 & 8 & 34 & 46 & 31 & 45 \\
\hline & & & & & 33 & 34. & 10 & 26 & 35 & 15 & 33 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.--home-produced food: Number of households producing specified types of food for home use, by family type and income, 33 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Houscholds} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Households producing for home use 3-} \\
\hline & & Milk & Cruam & Eggs & Foultry & Pork & Other meat & Pota. toes & \begin{tabular}{l}
Other food \\
from \\
gar- \\
den
\end{tabular} & Fruit & Other food 4 \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \$0-\$499. & 112 & 70 & 69 & 88 & 83 & 101 & 10 & 51 & 108 & 47 & 77 \\
\hline \$500-\$999. & 126 & 105 & 105 & 114 & 105 & 119 & 23 & 92 & 123 & 83 & 99 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,493 & 28 & 24 & 24 & 28 & 27 & 28 & 10 & 17 & 27 & 17 & 22 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,999.. & 8 & 8 & \(\checkmark\) & 8 & 8 & 8 & 5 & 6 & 8 & 6 & 7 \\
\hline \$2,000-\$2,099 .... & & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & & , & 1 \\
\hline Type 1-.............- & 69 & 46 & 46 & 68 & 56 & 62 & 9 & 40 & 66 & 27 & 47 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3-....... & 42 & 29 & 29 & 37
87 & 34
83 & 41
87 & \({ }^{7} 7\) & \(\stackrel{26}{57}\) & 41 & 22 & 30 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Types 4 and 5 \(\qquad\)
\[
\$ 0-\$ 499 .
\]
\[
\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499
\]} & 93 & 79 & 79 & 87 & 83 & 87 & 17 & 57 & 00 & 49 & 74 \\
\hline & 32 & 23 & 23 & 29 & 28 & 30 & & 16 & 30 & 16 & 24 \\
\hline & 47 & 42 & 42 & 44 & 41 & 43 & 7 & 33 & 46 & 26 & 37 \\
\hline & 14 & 14 & 14 & 14 & 14 & 14 & 6 & 8 & 14 & 7 & 13 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7-.-.---- & 45 & 36 & 35 & 38 & 33 & 43 & 9 & 31 & 44 & 22 & 36 \\
\hline Types 8 and 9........ & 26 & 17 & 17 & 19 & 18 & 24 & 6 & 12 & 26 & 13 & 19 \\
\hline southeast-negro SHARECROPPERS & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types-.------.--- & \({ }^{4} 393\) & 129 & 125 & 365 & 359! & 315 & 50 & 307 & 391 & 160 & 286 \\
\hline \$0-\$499 & 60. & 2 & 2 & 47 & 42 & 33 & 8 & 41 & 59 & 20 & 36 \\
\hline \$501-\$999. & 216 & 57 & 56 & 203 & 204 & 178 & 26 & 166 & 215 & 80 & 154 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 96 & 51 & 48 & 94 & 92 & 86 & 10 & 82 & 96 & 50 & 76 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,989 & 21 & 13 & 19 & 21 & 21 & 20 & 5 & 18 & 21 & 10 & 20 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Type 1. \\
Types 2 and 3 \\
Types 4 and 5.-.......
\end{tabular}} & 23 & 5 & 5 & 19 & 17 & 19 & 5 & 15 & 23 & 13 & \\
\hline & 49 & 7 & 7 & 42 & 40 & 30 & 12 & 35 & 48 & 25 & 35 \\
\hline & 93 & 29 & 28 & 86 & 88 & 79 & 6 & 72 & 9.3 & 37 & 67 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 \ldots \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 \\
& \$ 1.000-\$ 1,499 . \\
& \$ 1,5001-\$ 1,999 .
\end{aligned}
\]} & 11 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 10 & 6 & 1 & 8 & 11 & 2 & \\
\hline & 60 & 16 & 16 & 51 & 56 & 5.3 & 4 & 48 & 60 & 24 & 43 \\
\hline & 20 & 11 & 10 & 20 & 20 & 18 & 1. & 15 & 20 & 9. & 18 \\
\hline & & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & , & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 6 and 7 Types 8 and 9} & 107 & 32 & 31 & 38 & 96 & 81 & 14 & 83 & 106 & 38 & 77 \\
\hline & 121 & \(56^{\prime}\) & 54 & 120 & 118 & 105 & 13 & 102 & 121 & 46 & 91 \\
\hline South Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & -276 & 92 & 68 & 239 & 240 & 218 & 18 & 189 & 264 & 67 & 232 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ .199 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 \\
& \$ 1,000-\$ 1,499
\end{aligned}
\]} & 173 & 34 & 20 & 148 & 144 & 126 & 10 & 96 & 164 & \(4)\) & 141 \\
\hline & 94 & 50 & 38 & 83 & 88 & 84 & 6 & 68 & 92 & 22 & 83 \\
\hline & 9 & 8 & 5 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 2 & 5 & 8 & 4 & 8 \\
\hline Type 1. & 29 & 4 & 4 & 24 & 25 & 21. & 2 & 15 & 27 & 8 & 24 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\$
\]} & 2.5 & 2 & 2 & 21 & 22 & 17 & 2 & 12 & 23 & 7 & 22 \\
\hline & 4 & 2 & 2 & 3. & 3 & 4 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 61 & 10, & 7 & 53 & 52 & 47 & 4 & 39 & 57 & 18. & 48 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\$0-\$499} & 48 & 6 & 4 & 42 & 41 & 35 & 4 & 30 & 44 & 15 & 37 \\
\hline & 13 & 4 & 3 & 11 & 11 & 12 & 0 & 9 & 13 & 3. & 11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 56.-home-produced food: Number of households producing speciffed types of food for home use, by family type and income, 38 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1995-86-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm farmilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Region, analysis uait, family type, and incorne class} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { House- } \\
& \text { holds }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Households producing for home uso \({ }^{3}\) -} \\
\hline & & Milk & Cream & Eggs & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Poul- } \\
\text { try }
\end{gathered}
\] & Pork & Other meat & Potatoes & Other
food
from
gar--
den
din & Fruit & Otber food \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (i1) & (12) \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\$ 0-\$ 499 \ldots-\ldots
\] & 35
18
3 & 4
9
9 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \(\begin{array}{r}31 \\ 16 \\ \hline 16\end{array}\) & 30
17
3 & 23
17
3 & 1 & 19
12
12 & 33 & \begin{tabular}{l}
6 \\
5 \\
5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 24
14
4 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 6 and 7.........
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999
\end{aligned}
\]} & 81 & 33 & 24 & 72 & 71 & 66 & 3 & 56 & 78 & 15 & 76 \\
\hline & 46 & 121 & \(7{ }^{7}\) & \({ }_{34}^{38}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
37 \\
34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
36 \\
30 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 1 & 28 & 45
33 & 8 & 41
35 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 8 and 9 . Georgia} & 49 & 30 & 15 & 41 & 42 & 4] & 5 & 26 & 48 & 13 & 43 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types..-.......---- & 0282 & 191 & 198 & 247 & 229 & 254 & 32 & 172 & 275 & 135 & 258 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 499 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999
\end{aligned}
\] & 182 & 93
98 & 108 \({ }^{98}\) & 153
94 & 140
89 & 126
88 & 12 & 97
75 & 177 & 80
50 & 162
94 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Type 1. \\
Types 2 and 3. \\
Types 4 and 5 .
\end{tabular}} & \({ }^{37} 5\) & 21 & \({ }^{21}\) & 27 & 27 & 32 & \({ }_{4}^{4}\) & 21 & 36 & 19 & 31 \\
\hline & 70 & 60 & 68 & \({ }_{64} 6\) & \({ }_{63} 8\) & 67 & 3 & \(\stackrel{28}{44}\) & 53
68 & \begin{tabular}{|c}
22 \\
38 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 52 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0.8499 \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 39 \\
& 31
\end{aligned}
\] & 29
31 & 31
31 & 35
29 & 35
28 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 36 \\
& 31
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 3
\end{aligned}
\] & 21 & 37
31 & 16 & 35
29 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 6 and 7. Types 8 and 9 .} & 74 & 48 & 49 & 68 & 61 & 65 & 14 & 48 & 73 & 35 & 64 \\
\hline & 46 & 36 & 36 & 43 & 40 & 43 & 7 & 31 & 45 & 23 & 45 \\
\hline All types............. & -933 & 511 & 507 & 736 & 676 & 782 & 112 & 485 & 901 & 320 & 523 \\
\hline \({ }_{\$ 5000-\$ 999}\) & 630
286 & \({ }_{196}^{301}\) & 297
196 & \({ }_{240}^{480}\) & 432
228 & 505
260 & 60
48 & 290 & 603
281 & 2071 & 346 \\
\hline \$1,000-\$1,499 & 16 & 13 & 13 & 15 & 15 & 16 & 9 & 11 & 16 & 9 & 16 \\
\hline \$1,500-\$1,099. & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1. & 1 & 1 & 1. & 1 & 1 & , & 1 \\
\hline Type 1..... & 239 & 05 & 95 & 178 & 157. & 198 & 13 & 127 & 229 & 76 & 102 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 223 & 116 & 114 & 170 & 159 & 173 & 22 & 108 & 211 & 63 & 119 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 240 & 151 & 149 & 202 & 187 & 214 & 25 & 129 & 233 & 87 & 151 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 0-\$ 199-\cdots \\
& \$ 500-\$ 999 \\
& \$ 1,000-\$ 1,499
\end{aligned}
\]} & 137 & 77 & 75 & 113 & 101 & 115 & 11 & 58 & 132 & 49 & \\
\hline & 98 & 71 & 71 & 84 & 81 & 94 & 13 & 67 & 96 & 45 & 64 \\
\hline & 5 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 4 & 5. & 3 & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Types 6 and 7. Types 8 and 9} & 164 & 101 & 101 & 133 & 120 & 140 & 32 & 83 & 162 & 59 & 108 \\
\hline & 67 & 48 & 45 & 53 , & 53 & 57 & 20 & 38 & 66 & 25 & 43 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
I See Clossary for deffitions of terms such as household, family type, income, analysis unit, fond-expenditure unit.
\({ }^{2}\) This table includes housebolds of families in the income sample. See Methodology for the counties and States studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studfed in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made.
\({ }^{3}\) The number of households that produced sny food for home use is in most cases the same as the total number of households (eolumn 2). Honseholds that did not produce any food for home ase were as follows: New Jersey 3; Kansas 2; California, central 47; California, southern 47; North Carolina white operator 1; South Carolina white sharecropper, 1, Negro sharecropper, 1; Mississippi white sharecropper, 1 , Negro sharecropper, 2.
- Includes cereals, molasses, sirups.
\({ }^{5}\) Excludes 1 family that reported a net loss for the year.
\({ }^{6}\) There were no "net loss" farnilies in this analysis unit.
7 Excludes 5 families that reported a net loss for the year.
}

Table 57.-Food canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantilies of such food canucd during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruil, poullry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 90 States, 193536
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a hushand and wife, both native born "]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, aud incume class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Fouscholds eanning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{5}\) number of quarts canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Households having presstire cookers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Any } \\
& \text { food }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Vegetables} & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Jeljies, jams} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pickles, re]ishes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Youl- } \\
\text { try, } \\
\text { roeat }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Other food} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{All} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{verc. tatbles} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauer- \\
kraut
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Jellies, јытй} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pickles, relishes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Poultry, nueat} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pro-protthon produced at bome} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than hall of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & kraut & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Veqe 1.itbles \({ }^{7}\) & Fruits & Panl try. ineat \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline NEW ENGLAND & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & No. 537 & No. 513 & No. 501 & No. \({ }_{6}\) & No. 453 & No. 341 & No. 447 & No. 244 & No. 32 & Qt. & \(\mathrm{OH}_{92}\) & Qt. 1 & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Qt. \\
\hline 9
\end{tabular} & Qt. 8 & Qt. 23 & Qt. \({ }_{17}\) & No. & No.
308 & No.
481 & No.
118 & No. 220 \\
\hline 0-249. & 10 & 10 & 10 & 0 & 9 & 5 & 9 & 5 & 1 & 98 & 47 & 0 & 23 & 5 & 17 & 7 & 1 & 10 & 8
25 & 4
3 & 5
5 \\
\hline 250-499 & 28 & 26 & 24 & 0 & 21 & 16 & 21 & 7 & 3 & 102 & 43 & 0 & 27 & 5 & 17 & 8 & & 26
76 & \(\stackrel{25}{69}\) & -3 & 5
24 \\
\hline 750-994. & 111 & 76
105 & 72
104 & 2 & 65
92 & 64 & 68
88 & 13 & 1 & 123 & 66
90 & 1
2 & 32 & 9 & 18 & 15 & 7 & 103 & 99 & 25 & 35 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 94 & 90 & 89 & 0 & 81 & 68 & 81 & 50 & 8 & 190 & 87 & 0 & 47 & 8 & 26 & 20 & 0 & 90 & 84 & 27 & 18 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 74 & 71 & 69 & 0 & 62 & 47 & 62 & 36 & 4 & 205 & 106 & 0 & 44 & 11 & 24 & 20 & 3 & 71 & 68 & 15 & 36 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 49 & 47 & 45 & 1 & 14 & 37 & 43 & 24 & 3 & 214 & 308 & 1 & 49 & 9 & 28 & 18 & 4 & 47 & 44 & 11 & 21 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 44 & 44 & 44 & 0 & 38 & 20 & 37 & 30 & 2 & 245 & 141 & 0 & 38 & 9 & 30 & 25 & 6 & 43 & 43 & 7 & 26 \\
\hline 2,000-2,409 & 34 & 33 & 33 & 1 & 30 & 24 & 31 & 17 & 2 & 213 & 96 & (9) & 56 & 9 & 25 & 24 & 2 & 33 & 32 & 10 & 15 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 11 & 11 & 13 & 0 & 11 & 8 & 7 & 7 & 1 & 296 & 155 & 0 & 64 & 8 & 35 & 32 & 2 & 9 & 9 & 2 & 5 \\
\hline Type 1 - & 171 & 158 & 154 & 2 & 134 & 101 & 132 & 76 & 11 & 163 & 83 & (9) & 35 & 7 & 20 & 17 & 8 & 169 & 152 & 37 & 70 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 134 & 129 & 125 & 1 & 112 & 86 & 113 & 56 & 4 & 192 & 99 & \({ }^{2}\) & 38 & 9 & 25 & 19 & \({ }^{9}\) & 127 & 116 & 29 & 49 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 232 & 226 & 222 & 3 & 207 & 154 & 202 & 112 & 17 & 188 & 97 & (9) & 43 & 7 & 24 & 16 & 11 & 222 & 213 & 52 & 101 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sec footnotes at end of table.

Table 57.-Food canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family lype and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1935-36\)-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Monseholds \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Households canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{A rerage \({ }^{\text {a }}\) number of quarts camned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{House-
holds
hav-
ing
pres-
sure
eork-
ers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any food 3 \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Piek les, rel. ishes} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, meat \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Veretables \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Saucrkraut \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishes \\
(16)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Polultry, meat \\
(17)
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Proрот. tion produced at hotne \\
(19)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than half of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Vege-tables? & Fruit \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & Ponl try, meat \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (18) & & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline middle atlantic and NORTH CENTRAL & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline New Jersey & No. 497 & No. 474 & No. 437 & No. 39 & No. 427 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
329
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 284 & No. 118 & \(\mathrm{No}_{4}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Qt. \\
215
\end{tabular} & Qt. 86 & Qt. \({ }_{5}\) & Ql. & \(Q_{12}\) & Qt. 15 & \[
Q t_{14}
\] & No, 41 & No. 467 & No. 408 & \begin{tabular}{l}
No. \\
164
\end{tabular} & No. 111 \\
\hline 0-249 \(250-499\) & 11 & 10 & 10 & 0
3 & \({ }^{9}\) & 8 & \({ }_{2}^{6}\) & 3 & 0 & 203 & 90 & 0 & 72 & 12 & 15 & 14 & 1 & 10 & 30 & 5 & 3
3 \\
\hline 5001-749. & 41 & 38 & 32 & 4 & 34 & 29 & 25 & 11 & 0 & 199 & 63 & 2 & 98 & 13 & 15 & 10 & 1 & 37 & 26 & 10 & 9 \\
\hline 750-999.... & 49 & 48 & 44 & 9 & 44 & 34 & 32 & 14 & 1 & 202 & 82 & 11 & 71 & 14 & 16 & 8 & I & 47 & 41 & 13 & 12 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 ........... & 73 & 72 & 69 & 3 & 66 & 50 & 47 & 17 & 0 & 207 & 91 & 2 & 78 & 12 & 14 & 10 & 5 & 71 & 66 & 26 & 16 \\
\hline 1,250-1,494 ........... & 53 & 52 & 49 & 4 & 42 & 38 & 28 & 11 & 0 & 208 & 95 & 6 & 68 & 15 & 14 & 10 & 2 & 50 & 44 & 25 & 10 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749............ & 51 & 48 & 44 & 4 & 45 & 27 & 22 & 12 & 2 & 188 & 64 & 10 & 71 & 9 & 13 & 20 & 4 & 48 & 43 & 16 & 12 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999...-....--- & 50 & 47 & 43 & 3 & 44 & 32 & 31 & 13 & 0 & 261 & 110 & 2 & 99 & 14 & 18 & 18 & 4 & 47 & 44 & 12 & 13 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 62 & 59 & s3 & 3 & 51) & 41 & 28 & 14 & 0 & 203 & 77 & 5 & 78 & 10 & 12 & 21 & 5 & 58 & 48 & 19 & 13 \\
\hline 2,500-2,9999 & 33 & 31 & 30 & 5 & 30 & 24 & 23 & 9 & 1 & 277 & 109 & 7 & 112 & 15 & 18 & 16 & 5 & 30 & 28 & 13 & 9 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 38 & 35 & 31 & 1 & 31 & 24 & 21 & 11 & 0 & 245 & 97 & 1 & 101 & 12 & 14 & 20 & 9 & 35 & 29 & 12 & 11 \\
\hline Type 1-.... & 123 & 113 & 98 & \({ }^{8}\) & 101 & 78 & 61 & 22 & 1 & 155 & 55 & 2 & 06 & 10 & 9 & 13 & 9 & 112 & 89 & 35 & 21 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & J10 & 104 & 99 & 7 & 96 & 77 & 61 & 31 & 1 & 219 & 91 & 3 & 87 & 11 & 15 & 12 & 10 & 100 & 87 & 30 & 29 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 201 & 195 & 183 & 18 & 175 & 133 & 122 & 50 & 2 & 222 & 91 & 7 & 83 & 13 & 16 & 12 & 19 & 193 & 177 & 76 & 45 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7------.-.--- & 63 & 62 & 57 & 6 & 55 & 41 & 40 & 15 & 0 & 294 & 115 & 8 & 112 & 16 & 10 & 24 & 3 & 62 & 55 & 23 & 16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Pennsylvania-Ohio
All types.-.---------- & 2,254 & 2,236 & 2,196 & 1,329 & 2, 202 & 2,131 & 1,801 & 1,651 & 116 & 338 & 104 & 17 & 127 & 27 & 23 & 38 & 130 & 2, 223 & 2,143 & 1,436 & 1,599 \\
\hline 0-249 & 21 & 21 & 19 & 9 & 20 & 20 & 16 & 12 & 0 & 211 & 65 & 15 & 68 & 23 & 19 & 21 & 1 & 21 & 19 & 14 & 12 \\
\hline 250-499 & 100 & 100 & 95 & 61 & 99 & 93 & 68 & 50 & 2 & 204 & 66 & 15 & 75 & 18 & 14 & 16 & 2 & 100 & 91 & 60 & 47 \\
\hline 500-749 & 209 & 206 & 199 & 120 & 201 & 185 & 145 & 126 & 8 & 257 & 82 & 14 & 96 & 22 & 16 & 25 & 5 & 206 & 193 & 138 & 122 \\
\hline 750-999. & 304 & 302 & 294 & 175 & 299 & 282 & 236 & 198 & 23 & 290 & 87 & 15 & 115 & 22 & 19 & 30 & 19 & 298 & 285 & 191 & 199 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249. & 294 & 288 & 281 & 157 & 283 & 275 & 232 & 216 & 16 & 331 & 94 & 17 & 135 & 26 & 21 & 35 & 11 & 287 & 274 & 194 & 208 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499. & 312 & 308 & 305 & 182 & 305 & 292 & 247 & 230 & 19 & 375 & 117 & 19 & 139 & 30 & 26 & 42 & 17 & 306 & 299 & 194 & 226 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 267 & 266 & 264 & 158 & 261 & 262 & 230 & 216 & 11 & 375 & 114 & 18 & 145 & 26 & 26 & 44 & 20 & 264 & 256
191 & 165
119 & 208 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 197 & 196 & 194 & 110 & 190 & 188 & 159 & 158 & 14 & 341 & 108 & 16 & 121 & 27 & 23 & 44 & 17 & 195 & 191 & 119 & 150
192 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499. & 254 & 253 & 252 & 145 & 249 & 242 & 213 & 200 & 10 & 379
396 & 119 & 17 & 140
138 & 32
32
32 & 27
32 & 43
47 & 20 & 251
134 & 249
131 & 161
86 & 192 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999. & 135 & 135 & 133 & 98 & 134 & 132 & 120 & 110 & 9
4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
396 \\
393 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 119 & 26
20 & 138 & 32
30 & 32
25 & 49 & 12 & 116 & 114 & 84 & 91 \\
\hline \(3,000-3,999\)
\(4,000-4,999\) & 116
26 & 116
26 & 116
26 & 78
20 & 116
26 & 115
26 & 96
22 & 94
25 & 4
0 & 393
416 & \begin{tabular}{l}
127 \\
137 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 20
19 & 141
152
118 & 30 & \begin{tabular}{l}
25 \\
25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 49
48 & 2
3
1 & 116
26
19 & 114
24
17 & 17 & 23
15 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 19 & 19 & 18 & 16 & 19 & 19 & 17 & 16 & 0 & 371 & 120 & 19 & 119 & 39 & 30 & 44 & 1 & 19 & 17 & 13 & 15 \\
\hline Type1.. & 428 & 424 & 404 & 235 & 417 & 392 & 320 & 274 & 23 & 250 & 69 & 14 & 101 & 19 & 17 & 28 & 29 & 422 & 391 & 280 & 266 \\
\hline 6-249 & 13 & 13 & 11 & 5 & 12 & 12 & 10 & 6 & 0 & 139 & 29 & 18 & 52 & 17 & 11 & 12 & 0 & 13 & 11 & 8 & 7 \\
\hline 250-499 & 44 & 44 & 40 & 27 & 44 & 40 & 25 & 21 & 1 & 169 & 48 & 17 & 70 & 12 & 9 & 13 & 1 & 44 & 38 & 30 & 20 \\
\hline 500-749 & 63 & 62 & 59 & 39 & 59 & 54 & 46 & 36 & 4 & 223 & 72 & 13 & 78 & 18 & 14 & 26 & 1 & 62 & 58 & 45 & 35 \\
\hline 750-999 & 87 & 87 & 83 & 45 & 86 & 77 & 66 & 53 & 6 & 236 & 62 & 11 & 101 & 18 & 16 & 26 & 7 & 86 & 82 & 59 & 55 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 50 & 49 & 47 & 23 & 49 & 45 & 35 & 35 & 5 & 294 & 75 & 14 & 126 & 24 & 18 & 29 & 3 & 48 & 44 & 36 & 32 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 47 & 46 & 45 & 27 & 46 & 44 & 34 & 32 & 1 & 287 & 83 & 14 & 119 & 20 & 18 & 33 & 6 & 47 & 45 & 31 & 32 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 46 & 46 & 45 & 22 & 45 & 46 & 41 & 36 & 2 & 286 & 72 & 14 & 125 & 22 & 20 & 32 & 6 & 45 & 42 & 28 & 34 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 32 & 32 & 32 & 16 & 31 & 30 & 25 & 26 & 2 & 270 & 72 & 12 & 110 & 21 & 13 & 37 & 5 & 32 & 30 & 15 & 23 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 24 & 23 & 22 & 16 & 23 & 22 & 17 & 16 & 0 & 251 & 67 & 13 & 91 & 24 & 23 & 33 & 0 & 23 & 22 & 16 & 15 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 12 & 12 & 11 & 8 & 12 & 12 & 12 & 7 & 2 & 337 & 104 & 24 & 112 & 21 & 36 & 39 & 0 & 12 & 11 & 4 & 8 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 6 & 8 & 8 & 7 & 4 & 0 & 307 & 104 & 22 & 123 & 22 & 19 & 17 & 0 & 8 & 7 & 7 & 4 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 10390 & 10200 & 108 & \({ }^{10} 108\) & 104 & 1050 & 1020 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 10205 & \({ }^{10} 0\) & \({ }^{18} 0\) & \({ }^{10} 150\) & \({ }^{10} 10\) & 1015 & \({ }^{10} 30\) & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Type 2 & 261 & 258 & 254 & 156 & 252 & 244 & 208 & 188 & 9 & 306 & 101 & 15 & 107 & 22 & 20 & 38 & 20 & 258 & 249 & 169 & 184 \\
\hline 0-249 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \({ }^{10} 383\) & 10110 & 108 & 10200 & \({ }^{10} 10\) & 1025 & 1030 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 250-499. & 19 & 19 & 18 & 12 & 19 & 19 & 15 & 11 & 0 & 209 & 73 & 16 & 55 & 23 & 19 & 23 & 0 & 19 & 17 & 10 & 10 \\
\hline 500-749 & 34 & 33 & 32 & 19 & 32 & 32 & 25 & 19 & 0 & 269 & 85 & 14 & 104 & 22 & 18 & 26 & 3 & 33
32 & 31 & 22 & 17 \\
\hline 750-999. & 32 & 32 & 31 & 18 & 32 & 28 & 21 & 23 & 2 & 285 & 101 & 18 & 93 & 19 & 14 & 37
31 & \(\stackrel{2}{3}\) & 43 & 40 & 31 & 24
29 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 43 & 43 & 42 & 27 & 42 & 41 & 36 & 30 & 1 & 308 & 99
101 & 18 & 113 & 22 & 24 & 31
36 & 3
1
1 & 43
32 & 40
32 & 20 & 23 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 34 & 32 & 32 & 17 & 31 & 29 & 28 & 23 & 1 & 314 & 101 & 14 & 112 & 26 & \(\stackrel{24}{22}\) & 36
45 & 1 & 32
37 & 32 & 24 & 26 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 37 & 37 & 37 & 27 & 35 & 37 & 33 & 28 & 2 & 344 & 118 & 17 & 109 & 21 & 19 & 52
5 & \(\stackrel{4}{2}\) & 16 & 16 & 10 & 14 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 16 & 16 & 16 & 7 & 16 & 16 & 12 & 14 & 1 & 321 & 111 & 9
12 & 110 & 21 & 19 & 52
43 & 4 & 30 & 30 & 17 & 27 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 30 & 30 & 30 & 18 & 29 & 27 & 27 & 26 & 2 & 348
337 & 113
110 & 12
5 & 123 & 21 & 19 & 43
49 & 1 & 7 & 7 & 5 & 6 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 3 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 6 & 0 & 337 & 110 & 5
25 & 129 & 43 & 17 & 77 & 0 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 5 & 6 & 6 & 4 & 6 & 0 & - 357 & 104
1075 & 1025
10 & 1075 & \(\begin{array}{r}10 \\ \hline 0\end{array}\) & 1020 & 10.20 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & (10 10234 & 1075
10 & 1024
1016 & 1030 & 1015 & 1025 & 100 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{10} 146\) & 1060 & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 57.-Food canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than hnlf of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, 1935.96 . Continued
[Housebolds of nourelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-bora \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, rad income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Holaseholds \\
(2)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Housebolds canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average s number of quarts canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Households haring pressite cookers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any food \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(b)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Tellies, jams \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relisthes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pou try, meat \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food \({ }^{4}\) \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All food \({ }^{0}\) \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Yegetables \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Jellies, jams} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, re]ishes \\
(16)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, mest \\
(17)
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Pro-portion produced at borae} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Froduction of more than half of their canned \(\rightarrow\)} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Vege-tables? & Fruits & Poultry. mest \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (18) & & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
MIDDLE ATLANTIC AND \\
NORTH CENTRAL-COL. \\
Peqnsylvania-Ohio-Con. \\
Type 3
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No.
244} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
212
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 241} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 123} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(N o\). 238} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 237} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 101} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 188} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 15} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 349
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 118
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Qt. 14} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 128
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Qt.} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
Q t .
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\({ }_{39}{ }^{\text {d }}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No.
10} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 239} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 233} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 144} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{No. 184} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 0-249-499 & \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 0
4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 50¢-749 & 19 & 138888 & 13 & 4 & 8
13 & 13 & 5
10 & 10 & 0 & 280 & 103 & 12 & 129 & 22 & 13 & 11 & 0 & 8 & 8
13 & 3 & 2 \\
\hline 750-999... & 27 & 26 & 25 & 14 & 28 & 26 & 22 & 22 & 2 & 284 & 109 & 11 & 100 & 19 & 18 & 29 & 2 & 13 & 138 & 16 & \(\stackrel{9}{21}\) \\
\hline 1,000-1,249.. & 49 & 40 & 40 & 18 & 38 & 39 & 34 & 30 & 2 & 324 & 102 & 12 & 121 & 24 & 23 & 41 & 2 & 39 & 2.9 & 28 & 30 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499............ & 54 & 54 & 54 & 25 & 54 & 52 & 39 & 41 & 5 & 384 & 135 & 17 & 140 & 26 & 23 & 39 & 1 & 53 & 52 & 28 & 43 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 31 & 30 & 30 & 15 & 30 & 30 & 25 & 25 & 1 & 371 & 118 & 12 & 138 & 31 & 24 & 48 & 1 & 30 & 29 & 17 & 25 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 14 & 14 & 14 & 8 & 13 & 14 & 11 & 13 & 1 & 327 & 113 & 14 & 113 & 27 & 19 & 40 & 2 & 14 & 14 & 11 & 13 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499...------- & 25 & 25 & 25 & 17 & 24 & 24 & 19 & 19 & 1 & 380 & 111 & 20 & 127 & 26 & 27 & 48 & 1 & 25 & 25 & 18 & 18 \\
\hline 2,500-2,909....-...... & 15 & 15 & 15 & 8 & 15 & 15 & 14 & 11 & 2 & 392 & 126 & 13 & 144 & 39 & 29 & 40 & 1 & 15 & 14 & 8 & 10 \\
\hline 3,000-3,990............ & 12
5 & 12 & 12 & 5 & 12 & 12 & 7 & 9 & 0 & 386 & 141 & 6 & 138 & 37 & 19 & 45 & 0 & 12 & 12 & 5 & 8 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & & 5 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 0 & 496 & 182 & 16 & 187 & 26 & 19 & 66 & 0 & 5 & 4 & 2 & 5 \\
\hline & 475 & 473 & 465 & 283 & 468 & 450 & 377 & 335 & 20 & 322 & 91 & 16 & 130 & 26 & 22 & 35 & 30 & 471 & 456 & 304 & 332 \\
\hline (-249 & 19 & 4 & 4 & & 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 273 & 100 & 18 & 80 & 16 & 20 & 39 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 250-499 & 19 & 19 & 19 & 10 & 19 & 18 & 14 & 8 & 1 & 216 & 70 & 7 & 85 & 19 & 15 & 19 & 0 & 19 & 19 & 14 & 8 \\
\hline 500-749 & 50 & 50 & 47 & 28 & 50 & 45 & 30 & 32 & 2 & 260 & 76 & 11 & 106 & 23 & 14 & 26 & 1 & 50 & 46 & 33 & 33 \\
\hline 750-498. & 64 & 64 & 62 & 42 & 62 & 63 & 52 & 39 & 4 & 286 & 81 & 18 & 115 & 22 & 22 & 27 & 4 & 64 & 60 & 36 & 42 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 59 & 58 & 58 & 33 & 5 & 57 & 47 & 44 & 2 & 309 & 70 & 15 & 143 & 25 & 20 & 32 & 2 & 58 & 57 & 44 & 44 \\
\hline 1,250-1.499-..--------- & 76 & 75 & 74 & 41 & 74 & 69 & 80 & 53 & 8 & 347 & 93 & 16 & 144 & 27 & 23 & 42 & 5 & 74 & 71 & 41 & 52 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 44 & 44 & 44 & 25 & 44 & 42 & 35 & 33 & 4 & 371 & 105 & 16 & 160 & 24 & 26 & 37 & 2 & 43 & 41 & 30 & 32 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999........... & 42 & 42 & 41 & 26 & 41 & 41 & 35 & 31 & 1 & 357 & 111 & 18 & 131 & 30 & 28 & 38 & 2 & 42 & 42 & 28 & 30 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499.---------- & 56 & 56 & 50 & 33 & 55 & 53 & 49 & 41 & 2 & 357 & 107 & 18 & 142 & 31 & 93 & 35 & 8 & 58 & 58 & 32 & 40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline  & \begin{tabular}{l}
 888 \\
 क人 WnN： \\

\end{tabular} &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
 OHOTHIO 0 \\

\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& -1 \\
& \mathbf{H}_{8}^{1} \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
 \(888{ }^{\circ} 8\) \\
 \\

\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { H } \\
& \text { - } \\
& \text { er } \\
& \text { er }
\end{aligned}
\] &  \\
\hline  &  & &  & N00 &  & \％ &  \\
\hline \(\stackrel{\square}{2}\) &  & \({ }_{\circ}^{8}\) & Wworoide & \％ &  & 8080 & －00408 \\
\hline & ｜\(\omega\) ON & \％ &  & N &  & \％ & \(0{ }_{0} 0\) \\
\hline &  & \(\underset{\sim}{\infty}\) &  & － &  & \(\bigcirc\) & ヘぢく \\
\hline &  & 感｜ &  & N &  & － & cowtis \\
\hline &  & N &  & N &  & 年 & ，wis \\
\hline & Wervicisiognvonco & 苞 & 由ーのオ， & N &  & 发 & WNNO\％ \\
\hline &  & \(\stackrel{N}{3}\) & \(\omega \omega\) にr－ & \(\stackrel{N}{6}\) &  & N00 & －\(\omega\) \\
\hline & －00nowwowomo00 & \(\infty\) & OOHNNAONET－OO & N & OOONNNNMW以OOO & cr & ○○ート \\
\hline &  &  &  & \％ & \begin{tabular}{l}
W以 \\

\end{tabular} & \(\stackrel{\text { 河 }}{\sim}\) &  \\
\hline &  & 慈 &  & 光 &  & \(\sqrt{8}\) & 为家以 \\
\hline &  & \％ &  & N &  & N & 岡べす。 \\
\hline &  & &  & 令 &  & \({ }_{6}\) &  \\
\hline &  & \(\underset{\sim}{\sim}\) &  & \％ &  & \％ & \％ \\
\hline &  & \＄ &  & N &  & ¢ & N゙心笖 \\
\hline &  & A &  & 告 &  & \(\stackrel{\text {＊}}{ }\) & \＆心\％ \\
\hline & ｜lomoncinnermooo & 云 & OOOOMNNNOーOーO & \％ & Ormernowoon & － & ＊ \\
\hline &  & \％ &  & \％ &  & \％ & eroser \\
\hline &  & 尔 &  & ＊ &  & ¢ & ancest \\
\hline &  & － &  & &  & & NOご， \\
\hline &  & N &  & &  & \％ & －\(\omega_{0}^{\circ}\) \\
\hline & ［G SI＇JАН＇ & Vatis & HG TNV NOIJdWn & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 57.-FOod canned at homp: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \(1935-96\)-Continued.
[Housebolds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born i]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Houscholds canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{A verage \({ }^{5}\) number of dusists canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Houes having pressure conkers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Housebolds reporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any faocs 3 \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sauerkraut
(5)} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, mest \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food 4 \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Al! food \({ }^{6}\) \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jarns \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishes \\
(16)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pomil try, meat \\
(17)
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Pro-portion produced st hoine} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more that hull of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &  & Frult \({ }^{6}\) & Poultry, meat \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (18) & & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline MIUDLE ATLANTIC AND NORTH CENTRAL-COD. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& \mathbf{1}, 067
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} \\
1,052
\end{gathered}\right.
\] & No. 948 & No.
352 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
1,030
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 883 & No. 906 & No. 657 & \(N o\). 45 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 265
\end{aligned}
\] & Qt. & \(Q_{13}\) & Qt. 107 & \(Q t\). 16 & \(Q t\). 28 & Qt. 38 & No. 96 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } \\
& 1,030
\end{aligned}
\] & No. 818 & \(N o\). 501 & \(N o\). 582 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-249 \\
& 250-499
\end{aligned}
\] & 13 & 13 & 12 & 4 & 13 & 13 & 13 & 9 & 1 & 397 & 73 & 17 & 120 & 18 & 96 & 64 & 1 & 13 & 9 & 5 & 8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
250-499 \\
500-749
\end{array}
\] & 53
115 & 511 & 41 & 17 & 51
110 & 36
85 & 41 & 22 & 1 & 208 & 51 & 12 & 96 & 12 & 21 & 16 & 4 & 50 & 40 & 27 & 20 \\
\hline 750-999 & 176 & 173 & 151 & 36
56 & 110 & 85
137 & 98
143 & 64 & 4 & 218 & \({ }_{56} 5\) & 9 & 92 & 13 & 23 & 24 & 4 & 108 & 83 & 43 & 52 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 196 & 194 & 180 & 60 & 165 & 137
166 & 143 & 105 & 8 & 222 & 56 & 11 & 89 & 13 & 23 & 29 & 9 & 169 & 130 & 85 & 90 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 169 & 168 & 149 & 60 & 163 & 166
143 & 169 & 127 & 8 & 246 & 56 & 12 & 101 & 15 & 25 & 35 & 14 & 187 & 157 & 101 & 109 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 115 & 115 & 105 & 35 & 1 & 143 & 142
98 & 104 & 5
4 & \({ }_{271}^{282}\) & 65 & 12 & 117 & 18 & 29 & 40 & 16 & 168 & 142 & 73 & 94 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 80 & 80 & 74 & 31 & 115
78 & 96 & 78 & 75
53 & 4 & 271 & 57 & 13 & 112 & 14 & 27 & 46 & 12 & 110 & 96 & 56 & 67 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499.. & 95 & 93 & 88 & 37 & 92 & 81 & 78 & 53 & 3
8
8 & 325 & 74 & 14 & 135 & 19 & 35 & 47 & 9 & 79 & 64 & 40 & 50 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 25 & 25 & 24 & \({ }^{3}\) & 25 & 82 & 78 & 62
17 & 8 & 308
247 & 73 & 16 & 117 & 19 & 32 & 45 & 15 & 94 & 81 & 44 & 61 \\
\hline 3,000-3,989. & 30 & 29 & 26 & 12 & 27 & 27 & 27 & 19 & 4 & 417 & \({ }_{68} 6\) & 25 & 113
139 & 16 & 29
43 & 36
114 & 6
6 & 23
29 & 21 & 12 & 14 \\
\hline [ype 1 ........ & 219 & 214 & 187 & 69 & 209 & 172 & 179 & 125 & 12 & 214 & 51 & 0 & 90 & 13 & 22 & 27 & 18 & 208 & 169 & 101 & 109 \\
\hline [ypes 2 and 3. & 269 & 265 & 237 & 75 & 261 & 221 & 230 & 165 & 11 & 251 & 58 & 10 & 102 & 14 & 27 & 39 & 22 & 258 & 210 & 120 & 109
139 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 377 & 371 & 335 & 111 & 360 & 313 & 320 & 229 & 14 & 273 & 61 & 13 & 115 & 16 & 30 & 36 & 39 & 368 & 299 & 190 & 139 \\
\hline [3pes 6 and 7. & 202 & 202 & 189 & 97 & 200 & 177 & 177 & 138 & 8 & 320 & 76 & 20 & 118 & 20 & 32 & 53 & 17 & 196 & 170 & 90 & 210 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\footnotetext{
See footnotes at end of table.
}
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TABLE 57.-FOOD CANNED AT HOME: Number of households canning specifed kinds of food, average quantivies of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of houscholds producing more than half of their hone-canned vegetables, fiuil, poultry, and meal, by family type and income, 19 analysis umits in 20 States,' 1955 - 96 -Continued
[Houscholds of monrelief farm families that iuchde a husfond and wife, buth native-bora 2]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Reaisu, anmlysis unil, fimily type. and inconse class (doliars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
IItuse: \\
loudds
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Houschoids cauning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Arerage \({ }^{5}\) number of cuarts canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Howeholids liav. ing [ressure cookers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Ifonseholds reporting---} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Aty food \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Veretables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
sinurkirast \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c|c} 
\\
Fruit & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Jel- \\
lies, \\
jams \\
jam \\
(i) \\
(7)
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pick. les, rel. ishes \\
(ㄴ)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poaltry, meat \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food 4 \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\[
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\Delta 11 \\
\operatorname{food} \theta \\
(11)
\end{array}\right.
\]} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vege(ab) \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut. \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jell lifs, jams \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Pick. les, rel. ishes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
F'ror \\
portion juro ducerd at horlite
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Froflaction of more then half of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Yerp-fables: & Fcuit \({ }^{\text {8 }}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ponn } \\
& \text { rey, } \\
& \text { rieat }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline (1) & (2) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (17) & (18) & (13) & (21) & (21) & (29) \\
\hline PIAINS AND MOXNTAIN-Coutimed & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Nith Dikcta-Kansascoutinued & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Tyme 1 & No. 236 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N 0 . \\
218
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 177 & Nr. 58 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
103
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 156 & \[
\underset{180}{N o}
\] & Nis. 73 & No. 13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 61 \\
& 163
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\frac{4 t}{48}
\] & Qt. \({ }_{8}\) & \[
\underset{54}{\mathrm{OH}}
\] & (ti. 9 & Qt. \({ }_{26}\) & \({ }_{17}{ }^{17}\) & No.
36 & No. 217 & No.
128 & No.
\(\underline{0} 0\)
0 & Nor \\
\hline Vet losses... & 29 & 37 & 20 & 8 & 23 & 22 & 25 & 9 & 1 & \(12 \%\) & 30 & & \(4^{-12}\) & & & 12 & & & & & \\
\hline Vet inconies & 207 & 192 & 157 & 50 & 170 & 134 & 15.5 & 61 & 12 & 12 S & 50 & \({ }_{8}^{7}\) & 56 & 10
9 & 26
20 & 18 & 33 & \(\xrightarrow{261}\) & 113 & 2
18 & \({ }_{62}^{88}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0-249 \\
& 250-499
\end{aligned}
\] & 23
46
46 & 23 & 18
30 & 2
10 & 15
37 & 11 & 18
37 & 8
18 & 3 & 116
136
168 & 48
37 & 2
4 & 24
43 & 5
9 & 19
31 & 11 & 4 & 23
43
4 & 13
24 & 2 & \(\stackrel{8}{10}\) \\
\hline \[
5010749
\] & 47 & 44 & 39 & 12 & 40 & 28 & 37 & 17 & \(\stackrel{3}{2}\) & 118
177 & 67 & \({ }_{12}^{4}\) & 43
68.2 & 9
8 & \begin{tabular}{|}
31 \\
28
\end{tabular} & 11 & 6
5 & 43
44 & 24
31 & 4
2
2 & 10
17 \\
\hline \[
750-499
\] & 35 & 34 & 29 & 15 & 32 & 28 & 28 & 12 & 3 & 211 & 7 & 14 & 65 & \({ }_{10}^{8}\) & 25 & 17 & \(\stackrel{5}{6}\) & 44
34 & 31 & \(\frac{2}{5}\) & 17 \\
\hline 1,000-1,299 & 18 & 16 & 14 & +3 & 14 & 10 & 12 & 12
4 & 0 & 197 & 51 & 14 & 80 & 12 & 32 & 17 & 6
3
3 & 34
16 & 120 & \({ }_{3}^{5}\) & 14
3 \\
\hline 1,25f1-1,449 & 11 & 10 & 9 & 2 & 10 & 7 & + & 4 & 0 & 152 & 44 & 1 & 71 & 12
9 & 32
14 & 17 & 3
3
4 & 16 & 10 & 3
0 & 3 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 9 & 9 & 7 & 3 & 9 & 6 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 192 & 51 & 6 & 59 & 10 & 24 & 30 & 4 & 8 & 4 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 8 & 6 & 5 & 1 & 6 & 5 & 5 & 2 & 1 & 149 & 35 & 7 & 45 & 8 & 26 & 21 & 1 & 6 & 3 & 0 & \(\underline{9}\) \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 6 & 161 224 & 1024 & 100 & 10184 & 165 & 10 ll & 100 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 220 & 87 & 5 & 66 & 16 & 24 & 17 & 1 & \({ }_{3}\) & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999. & 4 & 2 & 2 & , & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 10250 & 1033 & \({ }^{18} 10\) & 14.50 & 1518 & 1846 & 3055 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 「ypes 2 and 3 & 371 & 358 & 282 & 00 & 326 & 269 & 314 & 185 & 23 & 192 & 52 & 7 & -62 & 11 & 36 & 28 & 49 & 357 & \(=7\) & 23 & 171 \\
\hline  & 30 & 29 & 23 & 11 & 25 & !2 & 28 & 15 & & 178 & & & 51 & 13 & 29 & & & & & & \\
\hline vet inmmos. & 341 & 329 & 259 & 79 & 301 & 247 & 2\% & 170 & 21 & 193 & 52 & 7 & 62 & 11 & 30 & 29 & 4 & 328 & 215 & 20 & 16
155 \\
\hline n-249... & 27 & 27 & 14 & 3 & 23 & 16 & 24 & 9 & 0 & 135 & 24 & 12 & 501 & 6 & 24 & 19 & 2 & 27 & 151 & 31 & 7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 590-749 & 64 & 62 & 52 & 15 & 54 & 49 & 58 & 32 & 3 & 172 & 47 & 6 & 51 & 10 & 29 & 27 & 6 & 62 & 44 | & 4 & 30 \\
\hline 750-999 & 67 & 65 & 51 & 15 & 59 & 51 & 51 & 37 & 6 & 205 & 63 & 5 & 57 & 11 & 25 & 38 & 4 & 65 & 47 & 3 & 36 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 38 & 36 & 30 & 9 & 36 & 29 & 32 & 19 & 3 & 190 & 45 & 7 & 71 & 12 & 31 & 23 & 6 & 36 & 23 & 1 & 16 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 31 & 28 & 25 & 6 & 26 & 19 & 22 & 14 & 2 & 217 & 58 & 2 & 83 & 13 & 32 & 28 & 8 & 28 & 17 & 0 & 12 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749. & 18 & 17 & 14 & 3 & 16 & 14 & 16 & 8 & 0 & 214 & 56 & 3 & 77 & 19 & 41 & 18 & 3 & 17 & 9 & 2 & 8 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 10 & 9 & 7 & 5 & 8 & 9 & 8 & 6 & 0 & 355 & 117 & 18 & 105 & 19 & 46 & 50 & 3 & 9 & 4 & 0 & 6 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 10 & 10 & 9 & 3 & 9 & 8 & 9 & 4 & 0 & 288 & 78 & 6 & 100 & 27 & 43 & 34 & 5 & 10 & 4 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 311 & 119 & 9 & 78 & 31 & 46 & 20 & 0 & 4 & 3 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 6 & 6 & 5 & 0 & 6 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 0 & 221 & 65 & 0 & 74 & 9 & 19 & 54 & 0 & 6 & 2 & 0 & 3 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 481 & 458 & 370 & 162 & 411 & 320 & 382 & 220 & 35 & 231 & 62 & 16 & 68 & 12 & 38 & 32 & 76 & 458 & 311 & 32 & 211 \\
\hline Net losses_ & 45 & 43 & 35 & 16 & 37 & 30 & 36 & 19 & 6 & 216 & 59 & 18 & 62 & 11 & 33 & 27 & 10 & 44 & 33 & 2 & 20 \\
\hline Net incomes & 436 & 415 & 335 & 146 & 374 & 290 & 346 & 201 & 29 & 232 & 62 & 16 & 68 & 12 & 39 & 32 & 66 & 414 & 278 & 30 & 191 \\
\hline 0-249 & 39 & 37 & 29 & 9 & 32 & 28 & 31 & 19 & 4 & 243 & 63 & 7 & 65 & 9 & 37 & 54 & 2 & 37 & 18 & 1 & 18 \\
\hline 250-499 & 53 & 52 & 40 & 15 & 43 & 32 & 42 & 22 & 1 & 186 & 44 & 19 & 49 & 9 & 34 & 30 & 9 & 52 & 34 & 4 & 23 \\
\hline 500-749 & 74 & 71 & 56 & 25 & 65 & 48 & 61 & 31 & 7 & 197 & 57 & 13 & 54 & 10 & 39 & 20 & 7 & 71 & 52 & 4 & 29 \\
\hline 750-999 & 75 & 75 & 65 & 29 & 70 & 51 & 62 & 34 & 5 & 216 & 60 & 13 & 76 & 9 & 35 & 21 & 12 & 75 & 51 & 4 & 33 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249. & 50 & 47 & 38 & 18 & 39 & 30 & 37 & 24 & 3 & 218 & 69 & 11 & 54 & 11 & 40 & 32 & 8 & 47 & 29 & 4 & 22 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 47 & 46 & 39 & 14 & 41 & 33 & 40 & 25 & 2 & 271 & 78 & 16 & 75 & 14 & 48 & 35 & 10 & 46 & 35 & 4 & 22 \\
\hline 1,506) 1,749 & 35 & 30 & 23 & 12 & 28 & 23 & 25 & 16 & 1 & 213 & 62 & 9 & 68 & 12 & 32 & 28 & 3 & 30 & 20 & 2 & 1.5 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 21 & 18 & 15 & 7 & 18 & 16 & 15 & 11 & 2 & 387 & 79 & 75 & 113 & 21 & 38 & 57 & 9 & 18 & 15 & 3 & 12 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 20 & 19 & 16 & 9 & 19 & 17 & 16 & 12 & 3 & 324 & 76 & 13 & 97 & 21 & 58 & 56 & 3 & 19 & 13 & 2 & 10 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 16 & 14 & 9 & 5 & 14 & 9 & 11 & 6 & 1 & 296 & 63 & 25 & 116 & 15 & 55 & 21 & 2 & 13 & 8 & 2 & 6 \\
\hline 3,000-3,999 & 6 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 0 & 200 & 59 & 6 & 74 & 13 & 41 & 7 & 1 & 6 & 3 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline South Dakota-MontanaColorado & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types.- & 447 & 397 & 334 & 118 & 340 & 314 & 310 & 191 & 29 & 265 & 69 & 12 & 113 & 21 & 24 & 23 & 111 & 398 & 279 & 91 & 186 \\
\hline 0-249 & 31 & 28 & 22 & 9 & 23 & 2) & 20 & 9 & 1 & 230 & 55 & 9 & 118 & 17 & 22 & 7 & 2 & 28 & 21 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline 250-499 & 60 & 53 & 43 & 22 & 45 & 38 & 41 & 21 & 3 & 252 & 77 & 11 & 106 & 15 & 22 & 20 & 15 & 53 & 35 & 13 & 21 \\
\hline 500-749 & 75 & 67 & 59 & 16 & 57 & 55 & 53 & 36 & 5 & 25.0 & 57 & 18 & 106 & 18 & 23 & 25 & 17 & 67 & 46 & 22 & 36 \\
\hline 750-999 & 84 & 70 & 68 & 17 & 58 & 53 & 56 & 40 & 3 & 231 & 57 & 7 & 93 & 21 & 27 & 24 & 18 & 71 & 47 & 18 & 38 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 56 & 49 & 43 & 15 & 44 & 39 & 39 & 22 & 5 & 269 & 69 & 8 & 127 & 18 & 23 & 18 & 12 & 49 & 35 & 9 & 22 \\
\hline 1,2:0-1,499 & 45 & 40 & 33 & 9 & 35 & 31 & 31 & 22 & 3 & 283 & 82 & 7 & 112 & 21 & 26 & 31 & 13 & 40 & 27 & 7 & 19 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 23 & 21 & 18 & 6 & 19 & 20 & 18 & 11 & 3 & 259 & 62 & 8 & 103 & 29 & 23 & 27 & 8 & 21 & 16 & 2 & 11 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & 25 & 24 & 20 & 9 & 19 & 18 & 18 & 10 & 3 & 318 & 99 & 14 & 113 & 35 & 24 & 25 & 6 & 24 & 19 & 7 & 10 \\
\hline 2,000-2,499 & 26 & 24 & 19 & 7 & 23 & 22 & 18 & 12 & 3 & 392 & 105 & 13 & 182 & 23 & 21 & 44 & 10 & 24 & 15 & 5 & 13 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 ..........- & 13 & 13 & 12 & 4 & 10 & 12 & 12 & 4 & 0 & 257 & 68 & 34 & 98 & 20 & 26 & 11 & 5 & 13 & 10 & 1 & 4 \\
\hline 3,000-3,909..........-- & 9 & 8 & 7 & 4 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 280 & 44 & 21 & 146 & 31 & 16 & 22 & 5 & 8 & 7 & 0 & 4 \\
\hline Type 1 & 130 & 115 & 95 & 36 & 98 & 90 & 90 & 52 & 9 & 235 & 61 & 12 & 102 & 16 & 23 & i8 & 29 & 115 & 78 & 26 & 51 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 137 & 123 & 108 & 38 & 105 & 98 & 95 & 63 & 5 & 247 & 68 & 9 & 103 & 20 & 21 & 24 & 33 & 124 & 89 & 26 & 62 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5.......... & 180 & 159 & 131 & 44 & 137 & 126 & 125 & 76 & 15 & 301 & 77 & 13 & 129 & 24 & 27 & 27 & 49 & 159 & 112 & 39 & 73 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 57.-Food canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of houscholds having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of iheir home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by fomily lype and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1935-36-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born a]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
－39 \\
T \\
NCN： \\
曷 \\
GU！
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
WNNHMNENT ర్రీ WNN I I \\

\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \geqq \\
& \text { E } \\
& \text { 荷 }
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { H } \\
& \text { 苞 } \\
& \text { N } \\
& \text { \% } \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
\] &  \\
\hline 1. &  & \(\underset{\sim}{\infty}\) & \(\bigcirc\)－N6\％ & \％ &  & 发 & 00 \\
\hline cises & FN\％ & \(\underset{\sim}{3}\) & ONN0以 & 単 & 以ちニ゙N & 遃 & 000 \\
\hline 䒺式\％ &  & 哭 &  & 罵 &  & N & \(\sim \infty\) \\
\hline ｜çorn & \(\pm\) & 8 &  & 告 &  & \％ & － \\
\hline 式甙8 &  & \(\stackrel{4}{4}\) &  & 芯 &  & 恕 & N00 \\
\hline 菏ジッ &  & 炭 &  & 気 &  & N & N00 \\
\hline N09 &  & \％ &  & 帯 &  & 管 & －00 \\
\hline EREN & OONCHOCNNOO & \(\stackrel{8}{8}\) &  & \％ &  & 式 & －sor \\
\hline 11 ¢0\％ &  & 오 &  & 9 & Own & \％ & －00 \\
\hline  &  & 8 &  & \(\stackrel{\text { है }}{ }\) &  & \(\stackrel{\otimes}{\circ}\) & \[
\] \\
\hline 8880 & 8＊ & \(\stackrel{¢}{9}\) &  & 灾 &  & \(\stackrel{\square}{2}\) &  \\
\hline 11 vono & worbosonunos & 0 &  & to & \(\omega \mathrm{\omega cosvosmow}\) & \(\infty\) & \(\bigcirc\) \\
\hline  &  & 告 &  & \％ &  & \％ &  \\
\hline ＋10\％ &  & \(\bigcirc\) &  & N & N¢N & \(\bigcirc\) &  \\
\hline 术ざ &  & － &  & N &  & 6 & 产気辰 \\
\hline Onoc &  & \(\infty\) &  & \％ &  & N &  \\
\hline \％Mcos &  & \(\varnothing\) &  & \(\infty\) &  & I & Om－ \\
\hline ｜｜ &  & \(\stackrel{\sim}{*}\) &  & \(\stackrel{\otimes}{8}\) &  & 曁 & 1000 \\
\hline \(\ddot{4} \infty\) &  & \(\stackrel{\text { U－}}{\sim}\) &  & 佥 & \(\omega\) 二co & N & NV \\
\hline \％180 &  & 等 &  & 范 &  & N &  \\
\hline －9\％\％ &  & ป & ｜｜ & \(\stackrel{\square}{6}\) &  & & － \\
\hline 618 & STAATI KUY & & GNF NOLININOSNO & & GOOX X＇IILVVA & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table．

TABLF 57.-FOOD CANNED AT HOME: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 80 States, \(1985-36\)-Continued
[Households of nonrelief carm familles that include a husbend and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Households canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{A verages number of quarts canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Honse-
holds
hry-
ing
pres-
sure
cook-
ers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reporting -} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any food \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(B)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellics, jams \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
PickJes, relishes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Poultry, meat} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food 4 \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All foods \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sruerkriat \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{2}{*}{Fruit} & \multirow{2}{*}{Jellies, jams} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pickles, relishes} & \multirow{2}{*}{Foul try, mest} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pro-portion produced at home} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than half of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Vege- } \\
& \text { ta- } \\
& \text { bles? }
\end{aligned}
\] & Fruit \({ }^{8}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ponl- } \\
& \text { try. } \\
& \text { meat }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline (1) & (2) & & & & & & & & & & & & (14) & (15) & (10) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline PACIFTC-continued & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types. & No. 888 & No.
\[
741
\] & No. 306 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { No. } \\
21
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{No} \\
712
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 562 & \[
\underset{226}{\mathrm{No}}
\] & No. 17 & No. 21 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& Q t . \\
& 136
\end{aligned}
\] & Qt. & Qt. 1 & Qt. & Qt. 14 & Qt. 6 & (\%) & No.
101 & No.
740 & No. 201 & No.
3.56 & No. 17 \\
\hline \[
0-249 . .
\] & 20 & 16 & & & & 11 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 96 & 18 & 2 & 63 & 11 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 16 & 3 & 10 & 0 \\
\hline 250-499 & 51 & 44 & 17 & 1 & 44 & 32 & 13 & 1 & \(t\) & 138 & 13 & 1 & 104 & 14 & 6 & (9) & 2 & 44 & 15 & 28 & 0 \\
\hline \(500-749\)
\(750-999\) & 74 & 65 & \({ }_{6} 9\) & 0 & 61 & 47 & 22 & 6 & 2 & 132 & 29 & 0 & 83 & 13 & 5 & 1 & 3 & 65 & 25 & 35 & 6 \\
\hline 750-999 & 87 & 75 & 26 & 6 & 75 & \(5 B\) & 21 & 2 & 2 & 133 & 16 & 2 & 95 & 13 & 6 & \({ }^{(8)}\) & 7 & 75 & 21 & 40 & 3 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 71 & 59 & 21 & 2 & 53 & 49 & 14 & 1 & 2 & 115 & 11 & 1 & 88 & 11 & 4 & (9) & 6 & 59 & 17 & 21 & 1 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 93
91 & 78 & 35 & 0 & 78 & 65 & 27 & 1 & 0 & 137 & 21 & 0 & 97 & 13 & 6 & \((\stackrel{ }{ }\) ( & 11 & 79 & 25 & 49 & 0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 91 & 75 & 29 & 1 & 70 & 57 & 24 & 0 & 4 & 136 & 18 & 1 & 92 & 13 & 10 & 0 & 13 & 75 & 18 & 38 & 0 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999 & +78 & \({ }^{66}\) & 28 & 1 & 65 & 58 & 25 & 1 & 3 & 144 & 19 & (9) & 101 & 17 & 7 & (9) & 11 & 66 & 15 & 28 & 2 \\
\hline 2,500-2,499 & 137
79 & 118 & 58 & 7 & 112 & 89 & 35 & 4 & 2 & 157 & 30 & 1 & 101 & 19 & 5 & 1 & 22 & 117 & 33 & 47 & 5 \\
\hline  & 66 & 61
55 & 24 & 1 & 56
65 & 46 & 10 & 1 & \(\frac{1}{3}\) & 121 & 18 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 85 & 14 & 3 & 1 & 12 & 61 & 9 & 21 & 0 \\
\hline 4,000-4, 09 & 24 & 19 & 3 & 1 & 19 & 16 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 122 & 4 & O & 0 & 14 & 7 & 0 & 9 & 55 & 15 & 23 & 0 \\
\hline 5,000-9,999 .........-- & 19 & 9 & 2 & 0 & 9 & 9 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 148 & 14 & 0 & 109 & 13 & 12 & 0 & 3 & 19
9 & 4
1 & 10
6 & 0
0 \\
\hline Type 1.-- & 247 & 209 & 81 & 5 & 201 & 156 & 63 & 3 & 7 & 115 & 19 & 1 & 78 & 11 & 5 & (v) & 29 & 208 & 61 & 102 & 6 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 296 & 241 & 108 & 3 & 229 & 169 & 71 & 7 & 4 & 131 & 18 & (s) & 95 & 13 & 5 & (9) & 32 & 211 & 65 & 108 & 6 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 345 & 291 & 117 & 13 & 282 & 237 & 92 & 7 & 10 & 155 & 22 & 1 & 106 & 18 & 7 & (*) & 40 & 291 & 75 & 148 & 5 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST一WHITE OJERATCRS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Noth Carolinas self-tufficing counties & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types-..-- & 607 & 603 & 592 & 498 & 595 & 549 & 557 & 359 & 58 & 290 & 91 & 29 & 115 & 16 & 24 & 12 & 17 & 581 & 570 & 361 & 367 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 57.-Food canned at home: Number of households canning specificd kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of iheir home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \(1985-36\)-Continned
[Housebolds of nonrelief farm lamilies that include a husband and wife, both aative-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Region, analysis unit, family type, aud income class (dollars) \\
(1)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow{3}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Households canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Households hav-pressure cookers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Mouseholds seporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Any} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Vegetables} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Saner- \\
kraut
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{JelJies, jams} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pickles, relishes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Poul- } \\
& \text { try, } \\
& \text { neat }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Other food} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All \\
food \({ }^{8}\)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Vagetables} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Sauerkraut} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Jcllies, jams} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Pickles, relishes} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Poill try, meat} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pro-porlion [100suced at bome.} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than half of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Vege-tahies? & Fruit \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & Pobultry, meat \\
\hline & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline SOUTREAST - WHITE OPERATORS-cOM. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolina-South Carolina-Continued & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & No. 373 & \[
\begin{gathered}
N o . \\
350
\end{gathered}
\] & No. 323 & \({ }^{\mathrm{No}} \mathrm{g}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Na} . \\
312
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { No, } \\
216
\end{array}
\] & No. 247 & \[
\mathrm{NO}_{1}
\] & No. 6 & \[
Q t
\]
\[
117
\] & Qt. & \(Q t_{2}\) & Qt \({ }_{39}\) & \({ }^{Q t}\). & Qt. 10 & Qt. \({ }_{5}\) & No.
28 & No.
346 & No.
319 & No.
188 & No. 74 \\
\hline 0-249 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1048 & 1432 & \({ }^{6} 0\) & 104 & \({ }^{\circ} 0\) & 12 & 100 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(250-499\)
\(500-749\) & 35 & 34 & 29 & 1 & 27 & 15 & 17 & \({ }^{6}\) & 0 & 64 & 28 & 5 & 23 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 3.4 & 27
57 & 18 & \({ }_{6}^{6}\) \\
\hline 500-749 & 68
70 & 64 & 66 & 4
1 & 57
57 & 36
41 & 46
47 & 11 & 0
0 & 105 & 43 & 4 & 40
34 & 5 & 9
10 & \begin{tabular}{l}
4 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 2 & 62 & 67 & 32 & 10 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 47 & 45 & 42 & 0 & 40 & \(2 \%\) & 29 & 9 & 1 & 108 & 46 & 0 & 40 & 8 & 9 & 4 & 2 & 44 & 39 & 21 & 7 \\
\hline 1,250-1,409 & 46 & 43 & 38 & 0 & 38 & 29 & 26 & 13 & 2 & 115 & 51 & 0 & 42 & 7 & 8 & 7 & 1 & 42 & 38 & 20 & 13 \\
\hline 1,500-1,749 & 29 & 29 & 28 & 1 & 28 & 19 & 23 & 6 & 2 & 144 & 68 & I & 48 & 8 & 14 & 3 & 5 & 29 & 27 & 17 & 5 \\
\hline 1,750-1,999. & 23 & 20 & 20 & 1 & 18 & 14 & 18 & 10 & 0 & 192 & 108 & (a) & 50 & 12 & 13 & 9 & 4 & 20 & 20 & 13 & 10 \\
\hline 2,(40)-2,494. & 21 & 21 & 19 & 0 & 20 & 15 & 18 & 7 & 0 & 153 & 70 & 0 & 48 & 8 & 15 & 12 & 5 & 21 & 20 & 15 & 5 \\
\hline 2,500-2,999 & 13 & 12 & 12 & 1 & 11 & 10 & 10 & 5 & 1 & 162 & 74 & 1 & 33 & 7 & 17 & 25 & 3 & 12 & 12 & 10 & 5 \\
\hline 3,000-3,899 & 10 & 9 & 9 & 0 & 8 & 5 & 7 & 2 & 0 & 115 & 52 & 0 & 39 & 5 & 14 & 5 & 4 & 9 & 9 & 6 & 2 \\
\hline 4,000-4,999 ........... & 4 & 4 & 3 & 0 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 117 & 69 & 0 & 32 & 4 & 6 & 6 & 0 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline 5,090-9,998 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 350 & 241 & 0 & 61 & 24 & 25 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5.....--...- & 732 & 680 & 614 & 21 & 607 & 411 & 456 & 143 & 19 & 126 & 55 & 1 & 48 & 7 & 10 & 4 & 67 & 676 & 618 & 446 & 130 \\
\hline O-249. & 7 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 3 & 2 & & 0 & 0 & 79 & 47 & 5 & 24 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 5 & & 0 \\
\hline 250-499 & 31 & 26 & 23 & 0 & 23 & 8 & 16 & 3 & 1 & 64 & 28 & 0 & 26 & 2 & 6 & 1 & 3 & 26 & 22 & 12 & 3 \\
\hline 500-749...........-- & 68 & 60 & 55 & 2 & 51 & 27 & 31 & 5 & 1 & 90 & 41 & 2 & 35 & 4 & 6 & 2 & 1 & 59 & 54 & 32 & 5 \\
\hline  & 911 & 8.5 & 751 & 1 & 73 & 46 & 48 & 11 & 2 & 90 & 471 & (0) 1 & 32 & 4 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 84 & 74 & 53 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline  & \(\qquad\) & 9
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 & －
苞
0
0
0
0
0
1 &  \\
\hline  &  & ｜\(\sim\) 何 & \({ }_{0}\) & 8 \\
\hline ｜寅忥忥突 &  &  & E） & －\({ }^{\text {NA }}\) \\
\hline  &  & ｜\(\sim\) ¢ & －00 & \(\infty\) ¢ \\
\hline NNSN0 &  & ｜｜OールOーWーNーーNoo & &  \\
\hline  &  &  & 80 &  \\
\hline  &  & ｜ & e20 & －¢ Nis \\
\hline  &  & \(\infty \times \infty\) & 害 &  \\
\hline ciocer &  &  & 会 &  \\
\hline  &  & ｜｜0000－00Nート000｜ & & ONN由ーローヘN \\
\hline  &  &  & &  \\
\hline ， \(\mathrm{y}_{8}^{8} \mathrm{~S}\) &  &  & 8 & crs \\
\hline 100000 &  & －ヵッフッツ \({ }^{3}\) & &  \\
\hline  &  & 9 Sc & 足 &  \\
\hline い心にち &  &  & \(\infty\) &  \\
\hline  &  &  & \(\cdots\) &  \\
\hline \＃ニこの皿 &  &  & er & wosemererera \\
\hline の会ちた & Norcosorvosvocrosno ar & 以ACNUOWOーNーOO & 㙇 & － \\
\hline  & AN： &  & 析 &  \\
\hline  &  &  & 忥 &  \\
\hline  &  &  & 参 &  \\
\hline A每乐 &  &  & &  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table．

Table 57.-hood canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantities of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meal, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States \({ }^{1} 1935-36\)-Continued
[Houstholds of nomrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Kegion, analysis unit, family type, and income class (doliars)
(1)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Honse-
holds} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Households canming at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{A verage s number of quarts camed} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Honse
holds
hav-
ing
pres-
sure
bonk-
ers} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reporting-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Vegre tables} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Stuerkrinut \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellits, jants \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishe: \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, meat \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Othar food \({ }^{4}\) \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All frods \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Veretables} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishes \\
(16)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, meat. \\
(17)
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pro-portion produced at home \\
(19)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than half of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Vege18. bles 7 & Fruit \({ }^{\text {8 }}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Poul- } \\
& \text { trF } \\
& \text { meat }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & (2) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (18) & & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WHITE SHARECKOPIERS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolma-South Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types, & Nn. 630 & \[
\stackrel{N}{N i x 7}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
N_{1} \\
511
\end{gathered}
\] & No. & No. \(4: 54\) & \[
\frac{T n}{260}
\] & N 331 & No. 44 & No. \({ }^{\text {ro }}\) & Qt: & Qt. 40 & \({ }^{Q t}{ }_{1}\) & Qt, & Qt. 4 & Qt. 8 & Qt. & No. \({ }_{19}\) & No. 558 & No. 515 & No. 224 & No. 35 \\
\hline \(0-249\) & 7 & 5 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 25 & 15 & f) & 8 & 0 & 2 & \(\bigcirc\) & 0 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 2501499. & 84 & 71 & 6.5 & 1 & 57 & 25 & 41 & is & 0 & 68 & 35 & (9) & 24 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 0 & 70 & 60 & 25 & 3 \\
\hline 500-749 & 153 & 13. & 123 & 1 & 107 & 52 & 78 & 9 & 3 & 7 & 35 & 2 & 27 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 131 & 124 & 42 & 7 \\
\hline 750-999. & 110 & 12.4 & 125 & 1 & 112 & 72 & \(8)\) & 14 & 2 & 78 & 36 & (5) & 29 & 4 & 7 & 1 & 1 & 138 & 124 & fil & 11 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 105 & 95 & 87 & 2 & 77 & 41 & 64 & 9 & 3 & 88 & 44 & (9) & 27 & 4 & 11 & 2 & 4 & 92 & 84 & 40 & \({ }^{6}\) \\
\hline 1,250-1,4999 & 69 & 63 & 52 & 0 & 53 & 32 & 49 & 3 & 0 & 94 & 47 & 0 & 32 & 4 & 10 & 1 & 6 & 63 & 57 & 24 & 2 \\
\hline 1,500-1,993. & (i3) & 59 & 55 & 3 & 48 & 43 & 44 & 4 & 1 & 107 & 47 & 2 & 33 & 8 & 15 & 1 & 7 & 59 & 57 & 31 & 3 \\
\hline Type 1. & 96 & 80 & 69 & 0 & \({ }_{6}{ }^{5}\) & 30 & 51 & 7 & 0 & 66 & 28 & 0 & 27 & 3 & 7 & 1 & 2 & 73 & 66 & 25 & 6 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3. & 192 & 183 & 171 & 2 & 152 & 83 & 119 & 16 & 5 & 86 & 43 & 1 & 28 & 4 & 8 & 2 & 8 & 175 & 170 & 78 & 11 \\
\hline T'ypes 4 and 5. & 116 & 127 & 115 & 4 & 108 & 72 & 94 & 13 & 2 & 99 & 47 & 1 & 33 & 6 & 11 & 1 & 4 & 125 & 113 & 63 & 12 \\
\hline Types 6 aud 7 & 196 & 177 & 150 & 2 & 131 & 74 & 97 & 8 & 2 & 74 & 37 & (9) & 25 & 4 & 7 & 1 & 5 & 175 & 162 & 58 & 6 \\
\hline All types. & 481 & 453 & \(\$ 23\) & 96 & 383 & 290 & 309 & 71 & 19 & 102 & 45 & 6 & 31 & 6 & 10 & 3 & 10 & 442 & 408 & 246 & 61 \\
\hline 0-249 & 16 & 13 & 11 & 2 & 10 & 7 & 6 & 1 & 0 & 54 & 22 & 6 & 16 & 3 & 5 & 2 & 0 & 13 & 12 & 7 & 1 \\
\hline 250-499 & 187 & 171 & 181 & 29 & 141 & 103 & 110 & 17 & 8 & 80 & 36 & 4 & 25 & 5 & 8 & 1 & 1 & 167 & 153 & 96 & 20 \\
\hline 600-743 & 201 & 193 & 179 & 52 & 170 & 127 & 136 & 38 & 9 & 116 & 50 & 8 & 36 & 7 & 11 & 3 & 6 & 187 & 171 & 101 & 29 \\
\hline 750-998 & 77 & 76 & 72 & 13 & 62 & 47 & 57 & 15 & 2 & 123 & 56 & 8 & 35 & 7 & 12 & 4 & 3 & 75 & 72 & 42 & 11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Type 1...---- & 77 & 71 & 66 & 11 & 57 & 49 & 19 & 8 & 2 & \(90 \mid\) & 38 & 5 & 27 & & & & & \(\begin{array}{r}69 \\ 160 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & & & 26 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 171 & 163 & 157 & 41 & 139 & 105 & 116 & 32 & 8 & 104 & 50 & 6
10 & \(\stackrel{28}{30}\) & 5 & 11 & 3
2
2 & 6 & 160
149 & 151 & 85 & 19 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5 & 163 & 152 & 138 & 39 & 126 & 92 & 102 & 21 & 6
3 & 104
105 & 43 & 10 & 30
44 & 7
6 & 11 & 2
2 & 1
0 & 149 & 136
59 & 77
46 & 19
9 \\
\hline Types 6 and 7. & 70 & 67 & 62 & 5 & 61 & 44 & 42 & 10 & 3 & 105 & 43 & & 44 & 6 & 8 & 2 & & & & & \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-NEGRO
OPERATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolina-South Carolina & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline All types & 433 & 374 & 280 & 5 & 333 & 141 & 139 & 12 & 1 & 56 & 21 & (9) & 30 & 2 & 3 & (9) & 2 & 368 & 285 & 208 & 9 \\
\hline 0-249 & 28 & 18 & 14 & 0 & 18 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 31 & 12 & & 19
20 & \({ }^{(9)} 1\) & \({ }^{(0)} 1\) & \({ }_{(9)} 0\) & 0
0 & 18
83
8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
13 \\
58 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & 8
38 & 0
1 \\
\hline 250-499 & 112 & 84 & 54 & 0 & 75 & 27 & 17 & 1 & 0 & 32
56 & 10 & \({ }_{(9)}{ }^{0}\) & 20
31 & 1
2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
1 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 0
1 & 83
95 & 58
71 & 38
50 & 12 \\
\hline 500-749 & 108 & 96 & 70 & 1 & 85 & 39 & 36 & 5
2
2 & 0 & 56 & 20
23
23 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 31
32 & 2
3 & 3
3
3 & (9) & 1 & 95
74 & 71
58 & 50
44 & 2 \\
\hline 750-999 & 84 & 76 & 59 & 1 & 68 & 28 & 29 & 2 & 1 & 61
77 & 23
28
38 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 32
39 & 3
3 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3 \\
6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \({ }^{(2)} 1\) & 1
1 & 74 & 58
44 & 36 & 3 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 54 & 54 & 43 & 2 & 48 & 26
9 & 30
12 & 3 & 0
0 & 77
66 & 28
30 & \({ }^{(9)} 0\) & 39
29 & 3
3 & 6
4 & (3) 1 & 1 & 52
24 & 44
23 & 36
15 & 1 \\
\hline 1,250-4,999 & 24 & 24 & 23 & 0 & 19 & 9 & 12 & 1 & 0
0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
66 \\
85 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 30
37 & \({ }_{(9)} 0\) & 29
36 & 3
7 & 4 & \({ }^{(1)} 0\) & 1
0
0 & 24
22 & 23
18 & 17 & \\
\hline 1,500-1,999... & 23 & 22 & 17 & 1 & 20 & 9 & 12 & & & & & & & & & 0 & 0 & 22 & 18 & 17 & 0 \\
\hline Type 1. & 49 & 39 & 24 & 0 & 36 & 11 & 11 & 1 & 1 & 41 & 19 & 0 & 19 & 2 & 1 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 0 & 38 & 25 & 20 & 1 \\
\hline 0-249 & 7 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 17 & 5 & 0 & 11 & 1 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 0 & 0 & 3 & 2 & & 0 \\
\hline 250-499 & 13 & 9 & 6 & 0 & 9 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 29 & 8 & 0 & 18 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 9
10 & 7
4 & 5
6 & 1 \\
\hline 500-749. & 12 & 10 & 4 & 0 & 10 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 46 & 20 & 0 & 21 & 3 & \(\left.{ }^{( }\right)\) & 2 & 0 & 10
10 & 4 & 6
6 & 1 \\
\hline 750-999 & 10 & 10 & 7 & 0 & 8 & 2 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 46 & 22 & 0 & 19 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 7 & 6
0 & 0 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 32 & 7 & 0 & 20 & 1 & 108 & 0 & 0 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 2 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 10104 102 & 1063
1025 & 100
10
10 & 1032
103 & 101
100 & 108
100 & 100
100 & 0
0 & 2 & \(\frac{2}{1}\) & 1 & 0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1028 & \({ }^{10} 25\) & \({ }^{10} 0\) & 103 & & & & 0 & 2 & & 1 & 0 \\
\hline Types 2 and 3 & 64 & 50 & 40 & 2 & 45 & 15 & 19 & 2 & 0 & 50 & 18 & (9) & 26 & 2 & 4 & ( \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 0 & 50 & 42 & 24 & 1 \\
\hline 0-249 & 9 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 39 & 18 & 0 & 21 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline 250-499 & 25 & 16 & 11 & 0 & 14 & 5 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 26 & 9 & 0 & 14 & 1 & 2 & \({ }^{0}\) & 0 & 16 & 13 & 5 & 0 \\
\hline 500-749 & 15 & 12 & 9 & 0 & 12 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 56 & 20 & 0 & 30 & 2 & 4 & \({ }^{(9)}\) & 0 & 12 & 8 & 7 & 0 \\
\hline 750-999 & 5 & 5 & 4 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 39 & 14 & \({ }^{0}\) & 19 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 5 & 5 & 2 & 1 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249. & 9 & 9 & 8 & 1 & 8 & 4 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 77 & 29 & (8) & 38 & 104 & \(\begin{array}{r}6 \\ 10 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & 0
10 & 0 & 9 & 8 & 4 & 0 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 2 & \(\stackrel{2}{2}\) & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1070
10 & 1038
1026 & 100
104 & 1025
10 & 104
106 & 103
1020 & 100
100 & 0
0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2 \\
2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
2 \\
2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & 1 & 0
0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{10} 107\) & 1026 & 104 & 1051 & & & & & 2 & & 2 & 0 \\
\hline Types 4 and 5. & 165 & 150 & 110 & 1 & 130 & 64 & 60 & 3 & 0 & 59 & 22 & ( \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 31 & 2 & 4 & (9) & 1 & 148 & 114 & 88 & 3 \\
\hline 0-249 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 36 & 16 & 0 & 18 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 250-499. & 33 & 28 & 16 & 0 & 25 & 11 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 38 & 12 & 0 & 24 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 28 & 18 & 13 & 0 \\
\hline 500-749 & 49 & 44 & 33 & 1 & 36 & 21 & 19 & 0 & 0 & 49 & 19 & (9) & 26 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 44 & 35 & 24 & 0 \\
\hline 750-999 & 36 & 32 & 26 & 0 & 29 & 14 & 13 & 0 & 0 & 66 & 24 & 0 & 35 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 31 & 24 & 17 & 0 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 & 26 & 26 & 18 & 0 & 23 & 11 & 12 & 2 & 0 & 90 & 34 & 0 & 46 & 2 & 7 & 1 & 1 & 25 & 20 & 22 & 2 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 10 & 10 & 9 & 0 & 7 & 4 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 61 & 23 & 0 & 29 & 4 & 5 & (9) & 0 & 10 & 9 & 6 & 1 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 80 & 32 & 0 & 39 & 3 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 5 & 4 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 57.-food canned at home: Number of households canning specified kinds of food, average quantilies of such food canned during a year, number of households having pressure cookers, and number of households producing more than half of their home-canned vegetables, fruit, poultry, and meat, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1935-36\)-Continued
[Households of normelief farm fumilies that include a hustand and wife, both native-born \({ }^{2}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars)
(1)} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Hoaseholds
(2)} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Households canning at home} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Average s number of quarts canned} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Households reportias-} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Any food \({ }^{3}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(4)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(5)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(6)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(7)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, reIishes \\
(8)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poul. try, meat \\
(9)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Other food \({ }^{\prime}\) \\
(10)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
All food \({ }^{6}\) \\
(11)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Vegetables \\
(12)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Sauerkraut \\
(13)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Fruit \\
(14)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Jellies, jams \\
(15)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pickles, relishes \\
(16)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Poultry, meat \\
(17)
\end{tabular}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pro-portion produced at home \\
(19)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Production of more than hat of their canned-} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Vegeta. bles? & Frint \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & Poul 1ry, meat \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & (18) & & (20) & (21) & (22) \\
\hline BoUTHEAST-NEGRO oreraturs-continued & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolina-South Carolina-Continued & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Typps 6 and 7.......... & \(N o\). 155 & No. 135 & No. 106 & \[
\mathrm{Nr}_{2}
\] & No.
\[
122
\] & No. 51 & \(N \mathrm{~N}\). 49 & No. \({ }_{6}\) & No, 0 & \[
Q t
\] & \(Q t\). 20 & \[
O t
\]
(9) & \[
Q t
\] & \[
Q t_{3}
\] & \(Q t^{4}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Qt. \\
(*)
\end{tabular} & No. & No. 132 & No. 101 & No. 76 & \({ }^{+} \mathrm{O}\). \\
\hline 0-249 & 11 & 7 & 4 & 0 & 7 & 1 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 30 & 9 & 0 & 21 & (9) & (9) & (0) 0 & 0 & 7 & 4 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 250-490 & 41 & 31 & 21 & 0 & 27 & 9 & 5 & 1 & 0 & 31 & 9 & 0 & 21 & 1 & (9) & (9) & 0 & 30 & 20 & 15 & 1 \\
\hline 500-749 & 32 & 30 & 24 & 0 & 27 & 12 & 11 & 3 & 0 & 69 & 20 & (9) \({ }^{0}\) & 44 & 2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3 \\
2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & (a) & 1 & 29 & 24 & 13 & 1 \\
\hline 750-099 \(1,000-1,249\) & 33 & 29 & 22 & 1 & 28 & 11 & 10 & 1 & 0 & \({ }_{6} 63\) & 23 & (9) \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 36 & 2 & 2
6 & (1) & 0 & 28 & 22 & 19 & 1 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499 & 10 & 10 & 10 & 0 & 1 & 10 & 11 & 0 & 0 & 63
68 & 22 & 1 & 28 & 4 & 6
4 & \({ }_{0}\) & 0 & 10 & 10 & 7 & 0 \\
\hline 1,500-1,999 & 12 & 12 & 10 & 0 & 11 & 5 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 93 & 42 & \(1)\) & 38 & 10 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 12 & 10 & 10 & 0 \\
\hline All types & 511 & 453 & 324 & 42 & 405 & 221 & 236 & 30 & 3 & 55 & 16 & 2 & 28 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 0 & 446 & 333 & 290 & 29 \\
\hline 0-249 & 31 & 26 & 19 & 2 & 20 & 9 & 7 & 1 & 0 & 37 & 13 & (9) & 20 & 2 & 2 & \(\left.{ }^{( }\right)\) & 0 & 26 & 18 & 15 & 1 \\
\hline 250-499 & 178 & 152 & 101 & 10 & 137 & 68 & 26 & 8 & 2 & 43 & 12 & 1 & 24 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 147 & 100 & 95 & 8 \\
\hline \(500-749\) & 147 & 137 & 94 & 9 & 127 & 75 & 79 & 8 & 0 & 58 & 15 & 1 & 32 & 3 & 5 & 2 & 0 & 136 & 101 & 94 & 6 \\
\hline  & 91 & 83 & 64 & 11 & 72 & 39 & 41 & 8 & 1 & 60 & 20 & 2 & 23 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 0 & 82 & 65 & 50 & 7 \\
\hline 1,000-1,249 .......... & 47 & 40 & 32 & 6 & 34 & 20 & 23 & 5 & 0 & 82 & 27 & 5 & 38 & 5 & 5 & 2 & 0 & 40 & 34 & 27 & 6 \\
\hline 1,250-1,499............ & 17 & 15 & 14 & 4 & 15 & 12 & 10 & 0 & 0 & 87 & 30 & 10 & 35 & 6 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 15 & 15 & 9 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

- See Glossary for definitions of terms such as bousehold, family type, income, analysis unit.
\({ }^{2}\) This table includes bouseholds of families io the consumption sample whose expentitures were alalyzed in detail. See Metherdology for the states and counties studied in euch region. Families of white operators only werestudied in all repions except the Southeast where special stadies of white shatecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for regionat comparisons.
\({ }^{3}\) In auldition, households repor ting that they eanned some food at home but could not give estimates of the total number of quarts canned were as follows: Vermont, 3 ; New Jersey, 1; Pennsylvania-Ohio, 6 ; Aichigan- \({ }^{\prime}\) isconsin, Kansas, 1 ; South Dakota-Montana Colorado, 1 ; North Carolina self-sufficing counties, 1
lucludes solps and other food mixtures.
Averages are based on the number of housebolds canning any food (columin 3)
Includes asmall umount of "other food" for which the number of households reporting s given in column 10 .
Includes sauerkraut, pickled vegetables, and relishes.
8 Inchudes jellies, jams, and pickjed iruit.
- 0.50 or less

10 Average based on fewer than 3 cases.

Table 58.-money value of food served at home per meal and per week ( 7 -Day record) : Distribution of households by money yalue of food per meal and per week per food-expenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{3}\) spring-summer 1996 and fall-winter 1936-37
[Households of monrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-horn]


\footnotetext{
I Data in this table are from food records furnished by farnilies in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the states and counties studied in each region; see Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table.
\({ }^{2}\) Figures for each 3-month period were adjusted to the June-August 1956 level by the U. S. Bureau of Lsbor Statisties index of retail food costs.
\({ }^{3}\) Households were classified by moncy value of food per food-expenditure unit per meal. The "per week" i- fervals are given here for convenience and may not correspond exactly to the "per meal" intervals due to roundi ig.
}

 per food-expenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall winter \(1936-87\)
[Households of nomelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both mative-born \({ }^{3}\) ]


See footnotes at eud of table.

 per food-expenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter 1936-37-Continued
[Households of aunrelief farm families that include a busband und wife, both nati ve-born s]



 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter 1936-97
[Пouseholds of notrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born 3]



See footnotes at end of table.

 8 analysis units in \(\$ 1\) States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall wiuler 1936 -. \(37-\) Continued
[Households of nourelief farm families that inciude a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{3}\) ]


I Data for the fall-winter season for the New England region, and for the spring-summer and fall-winter seasons for the Plains and Mountain region are based on the 7-day ealimutes (check lists). All other data in this table are based on food records.
\({ }_{2}\) See Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, food-expenditure unit, analysis unit. The consumption figures given in this table inchade food consumed by paid farm and household help, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the economic family \({ }_{3}\) This table includus households of families in the consumption sample that furnished food records or ford check lists. (See footnote 1.) See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of white sbarecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisous.
+ Adjusted to June-August 1936 level by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index of retail firid costs.

5 A verages are based on the number of households in each class (column 2)
Jvcludes one-third of the weight of cream (table 59 , column 9 )
Includes purchased mayonnaise only.
\({ }^{8}\) Includes money value of cream (table 59, column 17).

Table 61.- meat, poultry, and fisil consumed at home per person in a week (7-day hecord and 7-day estimate \({ }^{\text {b }}\) ): Average quantity and average money value of meat, poultry, and fish consumed at home per person in a week, by money value of food per week per foodexpenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter \(1936^{\circ} 97\)
[Houscholds of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{3}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit, season, money value \({ }^{4}\) of food per weak per foodexpenditure unit (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Ноиве. holds} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{A verage s quantity per person in a week} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{A verages money value per person in a week} \\
\hline & & All noest, poultry, fish & Beef & Veal & Muttou, lamb & Pork (other than bacou, sailt side) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Potil- } \\
\text { try } \\
\text { game }
\end{gathered}
\] & Fish, other sea food & Mis-cellaneous nleat products & All meat, ponl1ry, fish & Beef & \(V \mathrm{Cal}\) & Mutton, lamb & Pork (other than bacon. salt side) & Poultry. game & Fish, other sea food & Mis. cellsnemus meat produets \\
\hline (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) \\
\hline NEW ENGLAND & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Spring-summer 1936: & Number & Jounds & Pounds & Pounids & Pounds & Pounds & & Pounds & & Cents & Cents & Cents & Cents & Cents & Cents & Cents & Cents \\
\hline 2.08-2.76 & 26 & 1.36 & 0.64 & 0.02 & 0.03 & 0.11 & 0.13 & 0.30 & 0.16 & 30. 9 & 13.8 & 0.4 & 0.0 & 3.4 & 4.4 & 5. 7 & 3.3 \\
\hline \(2.77-3.45\).
\(3.46-4.14\) & 25 & 2.16 & . 75 & . 12 & . 06 & . 36 & . 29 & . 32 & . 25 & 51.2 & 16.6 & 3.7 & . 9 & 10.0 & 8.6 & 5. 3 & 6. 0 \\
\hline 3.46-4.14 & 16 & 3.03 & 1.18 & . 07 & .15 & . 50 & .40 & . 48 & . 24 & 79.4 & 31.1 & 2.1 & 4.1 & 16.7 & 11.1 & 7.5 & 6.8 \\
\hline Eali-winter 1936-37:
\[
2.082 .76
\] & 86 & 2.58 & 1.02 & . 04 & . 0.5 & . 51 & . 54 & . 28 & . 14 & 57.1 & 24.8 & & . 2 & 11.5 & 11.1 & 4.6 & 3.0 \\
\hline 2.77-3.45 & 56 & 3.14 & 1.15 & . 17 & . 08 & . 58 & . 64 & . 36 & .24 & 73.9 & 30.1 & 1.8 & 2.1 & 13.8 & 13.9 & 6. 6 & 5.5 \\
\hline middee atlantic and nobth CENTEAF. & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Spring-summuer 1936: & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1.38-2.07-......- & 27 & 1.73 & . 47 & . 00 & . 00 & . 51 & . 48 & . 09 & . 18 & 36.6 & 8.6 & . 0 & . 0 & 11.4 & 11.8 & 1.1 & 3.8 \\
\hline 2.08-2.76 & 63 & 2. 10 & - fis & . 01 & . 00 & . 74 & . 32 & . 11 & . 28 & 47.5 & 12.7 & . 2 & . 0 & 20.6 & 6. 6 & 2.1 & 5. 3 \\
\hline 2.77-3.15. & 48 & 2. 94 & . 64 & . 03 & . 00 & . 95 & . 76 & .11 & . 44 & 73.2 & 14.5 & .7 & .0 & 29.8 & 17. 2 & 1.9 & 9.4 \\
\hline \(3.46-4.14\).
4.15
4.83 & 24 & 2.97 & . 66 & . (1) & . 01 & 1. 30 & . 34 & . 22 & . 44 & 74.9 & 15.7 & . 0 & . 2 & 38.9 & 8.4 & 3. 6 & 8. 2 \\
\hline  & 11 & 4. 29 & 1. 53 & . 00 & . 00 & . 86 & .74 & . 22 & . 94 & 89.8 & 29.7 & . 0 & . 0 & 22. 6 & 14.8 & 4.4 & 18. 4 \\
\hline Pall-winter \(1936-37\); & 11 & 1.33 & . 45 & . 00 & & & & & & & & & & & 4.1 & & \\
\hline 2.18 -2.76. & 25 & 1.87 & . 33 & .10 & .00 & . 45 & . 49 & . 198 & . 32 & 45.1 & 12.4 & . 0 & . 0 & 12.6 & 11. 4 & 1.2 & 7.8 \\
\hline 2,77-3.45 & 32 & 3.23 & . 70 & . 00 & . 00 & . 86 & . 94 & . 07 & . 66 & 78. 3 & 16.3 & . 0 & . 0 & 22.8 & 22.0 & 1.5 & 15.8 \\
\hline 3.46-4.14 & 15 & 3. 96 & . 56 & . 03 & . 00 & 1. 14 & 1.19 & . 13 & . 91 & 92.8 & 13.1 & . 8 & . 0 & 31.9 & 26. 3 & 3.0 & 17.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 61.-meat, poultry, and fish consomed at home per person yn a week (7-day record and 7 -day estimate \({ }^{1}\) ): Average quantity and avcrage money value of meat, poullry, and fish consumed at home per person in a week, by money value of food per week per foodexpenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1986 and fall-winter \(1986-97\) - Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{3}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit, season, mozey value 4 of food per week per fordexpenditure unit (dollars)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Households} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{A verages quantity pur person in a weak} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{A verage s money valne per person in a week} \\
\hline & & All meat, poultry, fish & Beel
(4) & Veal
(5) & Mutkon, lamb & P'ork (other than salt
salt side) & Poultry, game & Fish, other food & Mis-cellaneous meat products (10) & Ah meat, poultry, fish (11) & Heef \(f\)
(12) & Veal
(13) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Muttan, lamb \\
(14)
\end{tabular} & Pork (other than bacon. side) (15) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Ponltry, game \\
(16)
\end{tabular} & Fish, ather food & Mis-cellaneous ineat products \\
\hline plains and molentain & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Spring-summer 1936:1
\[
1.38-2.07
\] & \[
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
N u b e r \\
8 y
\end{array}\right|
\] & Pounds & Pounds & Pounds
0.00 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pounds } \\
0.01
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds 0. 21} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
0.91} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
0.10} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pounds
0.37} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents
31.9} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cients
6.8} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents \({ }_{4}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cents 1.7} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\text { Cents } \\
5.2 \\
3.7
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 2.08-2.76.- & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
8 y \\
83 \\
85 \\
85
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1.08 \\
& 2.68 \\
& 3.47
\end{aligned}
\]} & 0.37 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 2.77-3.45 & & & .50 & . .02 & .00 & . 36 & 1. 70 & . 30 & . 24 & 45.8
58.3 & 7.3
11.5 & .1 & .2 & 8.4
8.6 & 22.3
25.1 & 3.8
4.9 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{18}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 2.08-2.76 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 70 \\
& 65
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2.47 \\
& 2.88
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .80 \\
& .93
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& .00 \\
& .01
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
.00 \\
.02
\end{array}
\] & .27
.28 & 1.07 1.26 & . 19 & . 15 & 38.5 & 13. 1 & . 0 & . 0 & 4.4 & 15.0 & 3.2 & 2.7 \\
\hline pactire & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{17}{|l|}{Spring-sinmmer lugis} & \\
\hline 2.08-2.76..... & & 2. 44 & 1.55 & . 02 & . 14 & . 03 & . 23 & . 11 & . 30 & 47.4 & 23.6 & 6 & 3.5 & 2.2 & 5.6 & 2.4 & 4.5 \\
\hline \multicolumn{18}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 2.08-2.76. & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{35
30
40
17} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12.36} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}.77 \\ 1.28 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
.14 \\
.12 \\
\hline 18
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{. 01} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{.32
.57
.57} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
.64 \\
.61 \\
.68 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{r}.74 \\ .84 \\ .48 \\ \hline\end{array}\)} & . 16 & 42.8 & 10.8 & 2.4 & . 2 & 6.9 & 14.4 & 5. 0 & 3.1 \\
\hline \({ }_{3}^{2.77-3.45}\) & & & & & & & & & . 18 & 58.3 & 20.4 & 1.9 & . 2 & 14.6 & 11.2 & \({ }^{6.5} 5\) & 3. 5 \\
\hline 3.46-4.14 & & 3.74 & 1.35 & . 08 & . 04 & . 52 & . 83 & . 68 & . 12 & 72.5 & 23.4 & 2.4 & I. 0 & 13.3 & 18.5 & 11.4 & 2.5 \\
\hline southeast-White operators & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Spring-summer 1936:} & & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{. 05} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{35
42
22} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & . 00 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& .00 \\
& .00
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{. 214} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{.34
.65
.84} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{.19
.09
.26} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{.07
.08
.14} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{17.0
32.2} & . 9 & . 0 & . 0 & 5.2 & 7.3 & 2.2 & 1.5 \\
\hline  & & & . 11 & . 000 & & & & & & & 1.7 & . 0 & . 0 & 12.8 & 14.4 \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & 1.3 & 2. 0 \\
\hline & & & . 23 & . 0 & . 00 & .74 & & & & 5.6 & 7.0 & .0 & .0 & 20.2 & 18.5 & 3.2 & 2.7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 62.-GRain products constmed at home per person in a week (7-day record and 7-day estimate \({ }^{1}\) ): Avetage quantity and
 unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter \(1986-37\)
[Enouseholds of nonrelief farm (amilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born \({ }^{\text {t }}\) ]



See footnotes at end of table.

 unil, 8 analysis units in \(\$ 1\) States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter \(1936-37\)-Continued
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a husbaud and wife. both uative-born \({ }^{3} \mid\)

\({ }^{1}\) Dala for the fall-winter weason for lhe New Fngland rew ion, and for the syrag-sammer and fall-winter seasons for the Plains and Mantain region are hased ou the \(\overline{\text { foday }}\) - estimates (eheck jists). All other data in this tahie are based on food records,
a See Glossary for definitions of terms such as household, fond-expenditure unit, analysis unit. The consurmption figures given in this tavle include food consumed hy yiaid farm and household help, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the economic family.
 counties studied in each region. Families of white operators only were stalited in all
regions except the Southeast, where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro fanilies were made. See Methodology before using these data for regiormal comparisons. 4 Adjusted to June-August 1936 level by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statisties index of retail food costs.
\({ }^{5}\) Averages are based on the number of households in ench class (colnmn 2).
6 Two-thirds of the weight of baked goods has been added to that of flour, meals, cereals.
t Includes purchased huked goods only
Includes purchased grits, rice, oats, uncooked wheat cereals, and other uncooked cereasb.

TAble 63.--vegetables and fruit consumed at home per person in a week (i-day record and p-day estimate \({ }^{1}\) ): Average quanity and average money value of vegetables and fruit consumed at home per person in a week, by money value of food per week per food-expendilure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter 1986-37
[Households of nonrelief farm families that include a hushand and wife, both native-bern 3 ]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 63.-vegetables and frutt consumed at home per person in a werk (7-day record and 7-day estimatel): Average quanity
 unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{2}\) spring-summer 1936 and fall-winter \(1936-37\)-Continued
[Households of nourelief farm farnilies that include a husband and wife, both antive-born \({ }^{3}\) ]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Analysis mit, season, and money values of food per week per food-expenditure unit (dollars)} & \multirow{3}{*}{Houstholds} & \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{Average \({ }^{\text {d }}\) quantity per person in a week} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Averages money value per jerson in a week} \\
\hline & & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Potatoos, sweet-potstoes \\
(3)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Other vegetables} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Nuts,
peanut
butter} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pota. toes, sweet-potatoes} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Other vegetables} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Fruit} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Nuts, peamut butter} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Mis-cellaneous items \({ }^{8}\)} \\
\hline & & & Leary, green, & Drieds & Tomatoes & Other & Citrus & Dried & Other & & & Leafy, green, & Dried \({ }^{7}\) & Tomatoes & Other & Citrus & Dried & Other & & \\
\hline (1) & (2) & & (4) & (5) & & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) & (12) & (13) & (14) & (15) & (16) & (17) & (18) & (19) & (20) & (21) \\
\hline \multicolumn{21}{|l|}{plains and mountain} \\
\hline Spring-summer 1836: 1 & No. & \(L b\). & Lb. & Lb, & Ib. & Lh. & \(L b\). & Lh. & Ih. & Lh. & Ct. & Ct. & Ct. & Ct. & Ct. & Cl . & Ct. & Ct. & \(\mathrm{Ct}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{Cl}_{7 .}\) \\
\hline 1.38-2.07.-.------ & 88 & 3.15 & 0.73 & 0.11 & 0.47 & 0.35 & 0.65 & 0.19 & 1.82 & 0.02 & 7.3 & 4.9 & 1.3 & 3.8
5.0 & 3.0
6.0 & 4.5
5.5 & 1.2 & 9.5
11.8 & 0.3
1.1 & 7.7
9.6 \\
\hline 2.08-2.76. & 130 & 3.66 & . 95 & . 19 & . 62 & . 78 & \(\begin{array}{r}.78 \\ \hline 108\end{array}\) & .17 & 1.80 & . 06 & 7.4
9.7 & 6.8
9.6 & 1.3
2.3 & 5.0
6.9 & 6.0
5.7 & 5. 5
8.2 & 2. 2.7 & 11.8
16.3 & 1. 2 & 13.1 \\
\hline 2.77-3.45 ...... & 85 & 3.91 & 1.15 & . 22 & . 86 & . 58 & 1.08 & . 20 & 2.67 & . 06 & 9.7 & 9.6 & 2.3 & 6.9 & 5.7 & 8. 2 & & & 1.2 & \\
\hline Fall-winter 1936-37: 1 & 70 & 3.20 & . 81 & . 22 & . 43 & . 60 & 55 & . 05 & 2.11 & . 03 & 8.5 & 5.4 & 1.9 & 2.8 & 5.5 & 3. 9 & - 5 & 11.1 & . 6 & 5.5
7.0 \\
\hline 2.08-2.76 & 65 & 3.14 & 1.01 & . 23 & . 67 & . 72 & . 69 & . 07 & 2.86 & . 04 & 7.8 & 7.3 & 1.9 & 4.2 & 7.0 & 4.6 & 76 & 15.7 & . 8 & 7.0 \\
\hline PACIFIC & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Epring-summer 1936: & 9 & 1. 72 & 2.01 & . 22 & 1.16 & 1.75 & 2. 05 & . 07 & 6. 73 & . 01 & 5.7 & 12.5 & 1.3 & 5.4 & 8.0 & 5.2 & . 6 & 19.9 & . 1 & 6. 6 \\
\hline 2.08-2.76.-------- & 13 & 2. 47 & 1.31 & .05 & 1.54 & 3.44 & 2.25 & . 02 & 9. 26 & . 08 & 6.8 & 7.2 & 1.2 & 6.2 & 14.2 & 9.0 & . 2 & 27.8 & 2. 5 & 18.8 \\
\hline Fall-wiuter 1936-37: & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 3.5 & 2.4 & 1.4 & 1. 5 & 11.2 & 1. 1 & 13. 1 \\
\hline 1.38-2.07- & 10 & 3.85 & 2. 4.5 & . 08 & 1. 22 & . 43 & . 21 & . 29 & 4.56
3.54 & . 05 & 8.3
8.4 & 8. 1 & .4 & 3. 0 & 8.5 & 1.4 2 & 1.7 & 12.8 & 1.3 & 13.6 \\
\hline 2.08 .2 .76 & 35 & 4. 29 & 1.88 & a
.11
.14 & 1.98
1.84 & 2. 1.00
1.76 & . 28 & . 13 & 3. 54
5.26 & . 08 & 8.4
7.7 & 8.4
9.5 & 1.3 & 3. 9 & 7.2 & 4.0 & . 9 & 15.6 & 2.0 & 15.0 \\
\hline \(2.77-3.45\)
\(3.46-4.14\) & 40
17 & 3. 79
4. 74 & 2.58
2.21 & . 14 & 1.84
1.59 & 1.76
3.09 & .59
.46 & . 15 & 5. 26
4.61 & .11
.10 & 7.7
9.9 & 9.5
7.6 & 1.3
.9 & 5. 5 & 10.1 & 3. 3 & 1. 9 & 13.1 & 1.9 & 21.0 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST-WIITE OPFRATORS & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 8pring-summer 1936: & & & & & & & & & & & & 18.1 & . 6 & 3.2 & 7.0 & 0 & .1 & 8.0 & . 2 & 6.8 \\
\hline \(1.38-2.07\)
2.082 .76 & 35 & 1.37
1.08 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3.32 \\
3.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & . 06 & .51
.90 & 1.53
2.69 & . 00 & .01 & 1.09
1.74 & . 02 & 5.2
4.1 & 19.6 & . 8 & 6. 7 & 9.8 & . 3 & .1 & 10.3 & . 1 & 8. 7 \\
\hline 2.77-3.45 & 22 & 1.64 & 2. 97 & . 54 & 1. 74 & 1.70 & .10 & . 06 & 2. 38 & . 05 & 4.9 & 18.6 & 2.5 & 11.9 & 9.4 & . 9 & . 8 & 11. 2 & 9 & 9.8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\({ }^{1}\) Data for the fall winter season for the New England region, and for the springsummer and fall-winter seasons for the Plains and Mountain region are based on the 7 -diay estimates (cherk lists). All other data in this table are based on food records.
i Soe Glossary for detinitions of terms such as household, food-expenditure unit, analysis unit. The consumption fgures given in this table include food enosumed by pald farm and household help, boarders, and guests as well as by members of the economic family.
\({ }_{3}\) This table includes households of families in the consumption sample that curaished food records or Jood check lists. (See footnote 1,) See Methodology for the states and counties studied in outh region. Framilies of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast, where special studies of white sharecroppers and Negro families were made. See Methodology before using these data for regional comparisons.

4 Adjusted to June-August 1936 level by TV. S. Bureau of Labor Statisfies index of retail food costs.

Averages are based on the number of households in each class (column 2). thaked beaus
such as baked beavs.
7 Inchades all of the money value of cooked or canned mature peas and beans, such us baked beans.

Incluades cooked mixtures, dry mixtures, prepared desserts, beverages, leavening agents, seasonings, uod-liver oil, and sales tax.

344 misc. publication 405, U. S. Dept. of agricutiture
Table 64.-Food classes as sources of energy yalue (7-day record): Average food-energy value of diets and percentage of calories derived from specificd classes of food, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 8 analysis units in 21 States, \({ }^{1}\) spring-summer 1986 and fall-winter 1996-37
[Households of nourelief farm families that include a busband and wife, both native-born 2]


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 64．－Food classes as socrces of exergy valle（7－day record）：Avetage food－anergy value of dicts and percentage of calories derived from specified classes of food，by money value of food per week per food－expenditure unit， 8 analysis units in 21 Stales，\({ }^{1}\) spring－summer 1986 and fall－winter 1986－87－Continued
\｛Houschoids of nomrelief farm farmilies that idelude a husband and wife，both native－born？
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Analysis unit，season，and money value \({ }^{3}\) of food per week per foodexpendi－ lure unit（dollars）} & \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
总
总
总 \\
（3）
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{A versure＇number of calories per day} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{F＇ercentage＇of calories derived trom－} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
（3） \\
（5） \\
（b） \\
（7） \\
（
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
（II）
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
（11） \\
（12）
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
 \\
（13）
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{SOLTHEAST－NEGRO SHATECHOPPERS} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Epring－summer 1936： \\
0． \(593-1.37\) ． \\
Fall－winter 1936－37： \\
\(0.69-1.37\) \\
2．10－2．76．
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cut．
\(2,4 \mathrm{c} 0\)} & Col． & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Cal．
3.510} & Pct． & ICt． & Pat． & \(P \phi\). & Pct． & Pd． & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pct．} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pat．} \\
\hline & & & 2． 180 & & & & 24.7 & & 49.8 & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 4812,4 \times 0 \\
& 10^{\prime} \quad 4,320
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,060,3,540 \\
& 4,940) \\
& 5,640
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 5. } 6 \\
\text { 11. } 5
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{21.6
26.0} & & 49． 4 & & & 0 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & 6.7 & 35.8 & 7. & 3.5 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
1 See Glossary for deflnitions of terms such as foodexpenditure unit，analysis unit．
：This table includes houscholds of fanilies in the constumption sampie that furnished food records．See Xfethodology for the States and conoties studied jn each region．Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the goutheast where specinl sturfies of white sbarecreppers and Negro families uare made．See Methodology hefore ming these data for reqional coniparisons．
\({ }^{3}\) Adjusted io June－Angust 1136 tevel by U．S．Burean of Lahor Statistics index of retail food costs．
－Based on the number of households in each class（column 2）．
\({ }^{3}\) Foodedergy unit．
}


\section*{Appendix C. Methodology}

\section*{Procedures used in collection and tabulation of the data}

The study of consumer purchases was planned to provide information about variations in family consumption with region, size of community, income, occupation, family type, and race. The procedures followed at every step-from the selection of communities through the tabulation and analysis of the data-were determined by this purpose. The plan of the study and the procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data have been described at length in other reports of the serics, parts 1 and 2 of volumes dealing with family income and summarizing expenditures (see Reports of the Study, p. 377). Only a brief summary of the general plan and procedures, as they affect this report on the money value and consumption of food, is given in this volume. The plan and procedures for collecting and tabulating data on food consumption are discussed in full.

\section*{Communities Included in the Study}

The study was limited to five broad geographic regions, New England, the Middle Atlantic and North Central region, the Plains and Mountain region, the Pacific States, and the Southeast. \({ }^{1}\) The communities within each region were selected to typify five distinct degrees of urbanization: Farm counties, villages, small citics, middle-sized citics, and large cities. New York City and Chicago, III., representing a sixth degree of urbanization, the metropolis, were also studied A wide variety of indexes were considered in selecting the regions and communities to be studied. The characteristics considered included: Climatic, geographie, and cultural characteristics; geographic extent; population density and composition; and economic importance.

Each farming section chosen was selected because of the prevalence in that area of a particular type of farming. The sections surveyed represent the major types of agricultural enterprise in this conntry. The States and counties included from each region are shown below, together with the chief types of farming that have been developed there in consequence of climatic, soil and topographical conditions, of labor supplies, and of marketing opportunities:

\section*{Region, State, counties:}

New England: Type of arming
Vermont-Franklin, Chittenden............ Dairy.
Massachusetts-Bristol, Plymouth \({ }^{2}\)-.....-- Dairy, poultry.
Middle Atlantic and North Central:
New Jersey-Camden, Gloucester, Salem_-- Truck.
Pennsylvania-Lancaster
General.
Ohio-Crawford, Knox, Richland
Michigan-Lenawee---------------...........
Ger

Dairy.
Illinois-DeWitt, Logan, Macon, Piatt-..- Corn, other cash grain.
Iowa-Madison, Mahaska, Marion, Mar- Animal specialty. shall, Poweshiek.
Southeast:
North Carolina-Jackson, Macon_----...... Self-sufficing.
North Carolina-Edgecombe, Nash--.-.-. Cotton, tobacco.
1 For each group of counties as a whole, according to 1930 consus.
\({ }^{2}\) Because of the small number of farm schedules obtained in Massachusetts, only a limited tabulation of the data has been made.

\footnotetext{
: Some of these regions do not correspond to the census elassification and have, therefore, been ofven distinctive names, as Southeast, and Flains and Mountain. The Southeast region of this stady includes some States from the East South Central and South Atlantic regions of the census; the Plains and Mountain, States [rom the West North Central and Mountain repions of the census; the Middle Atlantic and North Central. States from the Middle Atlantic, and East and West North Central census regions. Even the New England region of this study, which corresponds to the census region of that name in general geographic outline, does not include all the States listed by the census. In certain sections of this volume especially those dealing with data from supplementary food sehedules, it has been vecessary to consolidate figures on even brouder regional bases in order to have enough cases to give reliable averages Whenever this has been done a name distinctive from the designations given above has been applied.
}

Region, State, counties-Continued
Southeast-Continued
South Carolina-Clarendon, Darlington, Cotton, tobacco. Florence, Lce, Marion, Sumter.
Georgia-Clarke, Elbert, Greene, Jackson, Cotton. Madison, Morgan, Oconee, Wilkes.
Mississippi-Bolivar, Lefore, Sunflower, Do. Washington.
Plains and Mountain:
North Dakota-Barnes, Cass, Griggs, Steele. Wheat, other cash grain. Kansas-Edwards, Ford, Gray, Meade..... Do.
South Dasota-Pennington \({ }^{3}\).-............... Range grain.

Colorado-Eagle, Garfield, Rio Blanco \({ }^{3}\).... Range livestock and crop specialty.
Pacific:

Oregon-Marion, Polk ......................... General, fruit.
Oregon-Clackamas, Marion, Multnomah, Part-time.
Polk, Washington.
California--Orange, Riverside, San Joaquin. Fruit and nut, fruit and dairy.
\({ }^{3}\) Schedules from South Dukota, Montana, and Colorado have been grouped together for the analysis of income data.

The villages selected were located for the most part in the farm counties chosen for study. In a few cases it was necessary to include villages in adjacent counties in order to provide a sufficiently large sample. For the same reason several villages and small cities falling somewhat outside the population limits originally planned were selected. In the choice of the urban communities, independence of other larger communities, density of population and rate of growth, and the presence of large institutions which affect economic and social conditions were taken into account.

Within each region, the sample included 4 to 22 farm counties, 14 to 46 villages, 4 to 12 small cities, 2 to 5 middle-sized cities, and 1 or 2 large cities. The communities surveyed and the range of population of cities and villages included are shown in table 65. Figure 10 shows the location of each community. The Bureau of Home Economics was in charge of the work in all farm counties and villages and in 19 of the 29 small cities. The Bureau of Labor Statistics assumed responsibility for the work in the 10 other small cities and in all cities of larger size.

The sample provides for comparisons of expenditures and consumption between communities of different size in the same region and between communitios of the same size range in different regions. For a discussion of use of the consumption data from this survey in regional and national estimates, see pages \(351-354\), and Appraisal in regional volumes on Family Income and Expenditures, Part 2.

\section*{Population Groups Included in the Farm Sample, and Collection Procedures}

In planning the study, it was assumed that expenditure and consumption patterns within a community would vary with nativity, race, composition of family, and income. Since it was not possible, within the administrative limitations of the survey, to provide for adequate samples of all groups exhibiting variations in these factors, the study was confined to certain groups that numerically are important in the population-native, unbroken, nonrelief families. In order to select from the total population of farm families a representative group that satisfied certain predetermined requirements for this study, the following scheme of sampling, involving four samples, was used:

The first or record-card sample was a random sample of all dwellings of farm operators (and in the Southeast, of sharecroppers). Through personal interviews families were asked to give the information needed to fill a record card; the facts requested indicated whether the family satisfied the predetermined requirements for the income sample (see below). In most of the farm sections, the random record-card sample was obtained from a succession of subsamples. In some sections each subsample included one-eighth of the farm dwellings; in others, onefourth.

Table 65.-Cities, villages, and farm counties studied by the Bureau of Home Economics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by region


Table 65.-Cities, villages, and farm counties studied by the Bureau of Home
Economics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by region-Continued Economics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by region-Continued
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Degree of urbanization \({ }^{1}\) \\
(1)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
New England \\
(2)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Middle Atlantic and North Central \({ }^{2}\) \\
(3)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Southeast \({ }^{3}\) \\
(4)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Plains and Mountain \\
(5)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Pacific \\
(6)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Farmeounties. & \begin{tabular}{l}
Vermont: Chittenden. Franklin. \\
Massachusetts: \({ }^{12}\) Bristol. Plymentb.
\end{tabular} & New Jersey:
Camden.
Gloucester.
Salem.
Pennsylvania:
Lancaster.
Ohio:
Crawford.
Knox.
Richland.
Michigan:
Lenawee.
Wisconsin:
Dane.
ninois:
DeWitt.
Logan.
Macon.
Piatt.
Iowa:
Madison.
Mahasis.
Murion.
Marshall.
Poweshiek. &  & North Dakota: Barnes. Cass. Origgs. Steele. Kansas: Edwards. Ford. Gray. Meade. South Dakota: Pennington. Montana: Custer. Colarado: Eagle. Garfield. Hio Blanco. & \begin{tabular}{l}
Washington: \\
Whatcom. \\
Oregon: \({ }^{11}\) \\
Marion. \\
Polk. \\
Clackamas. \\
Multnomah. \\
Washington. \\
Californis: \\
Orange. \\
Riverside. \\
San Joaquin.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) The population range in each type of nonfarm community was as follows: Metropolis. \(3.376,438\) to 6,930,446; large city, 214,006 to 301,815 ; middle-sized city, 30,567 to 71,864 ; sragll city, 9,370 to 18,901; village 544 to 5,183 . Population Ggures are those given by the 1930 census.
2 Cities in this group that were studied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are classified as East Central and West Centralin the reports of that Bureau.
\({ }_{3}\) In all localities in the southeast except those indicated by footnotes both white and Negro families wers surveyed.

4 All metropolises, large cities, and middle-sized cities listed in this table were studied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
\({ }^{5}\) Consumption data are combined with those from the other small cities studied in this region and are published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
\({ }^{\circ}\) Consumption data are combined with those from the other small cities studied in this region and are published by the Burean of Home Economics.
\({ }^{7}\) All villages listed in this table were studied by the Bureau of Home Economics. Administrative problems and the objective of selecting villages in or near counties chosen for the study of farm families : nade it necessary to class as villages a few small towns with populations of approximately 3,000 , and 1 (Camden, S. C.) of slightly over 5,000 . Most of the communities, however, had populations under 2,500 .
\({ }^{8}\) Negro families only.
- Food records from New Jersey were tabulated with the New England analysis unit instead of the Midde Atlantic and North Central unit.
10 Jackson and Macon Counties, surveyed for white operators only, comprise the analysis unit described as "North Carolina self-sufficing counties."
\({ }_{11}\) Each of the 5 counties listed were ineluded in the special study of part-time farms. Marion and Poik Counties only were included in the study of full-time operators.
12 Because of the small number of farm schedules obtained in Massachusetts, only a limited tabulation of the data has been made. No data from family schedules, expenditure schedules, or tood check lists are presented in this report. Fifteen food records are included in the New England region tabulation.
\({ }^{13}\) White tamilies only.
*Designates small cities studied by the Bureau of Home Economics.
\#Designates small cities studied by the Bureau of Labor Statisties.
The second or income sample included families shown by entries on the record card to be eligible for the study of income. To be included in the income sample a farm family had to conform to the following description: The family included a husband and wife both native-white (or native-Negro in the Southeast) who had been married at least a year; the family was that of a farm operator (or, in the Southeast, a sharecropper); and the family had operated the farm on which it lived for at least a year. \({ }^{2}\) These families were requested to give information on

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) The home place had to meet the census definition of a farm, but to eliminate suburban dweilers the definttion was extended-a property was considered a farm only if some money income from the sale of farm products had been received, unless special circumstances such as crop failure, existed to explain the absence of such money income. This qualification was not imposed, however, in the communities of North Carolina where a special study of self-sufficing farms was made. Farm laborers and paid managers of farms were not included in this study.
}
family composition, occupation, and income (including food produced for household consumption).

The third sample consisted of the families from the second or income sample whose entries on the income schedule indicated eligibility for the consumption study. To be eligible, a family had to meet the following requirements in addition to those imposed on the income sample:

The family had not received relief at any time during the year.
The family was of specified family composition, i. e., of types \(1,2,3,4\), or 5 in certain communities. In other communities, types 6 and 7 also were included (see Glossary, Family Type).
The family had kept house for at least 9 months of the report year.
The family had not moved between the end of the report year and the date of interview.
The family did not have more than the equivalent of one roomer and/or boarder in the household for 52 weeks in the report year.
The family did not have more than the equivalent of one guest for 26 weeks.
The family had not been operating a part-time farm (except in Oregon where a special study of families of part-time farm operators was made).
For a discussion of the comparability of this third or eligible sample with all families in the community, see p. 353 .

The fonth or consumption sample was derived from the third. It included every eligible farnily willing and able to furnish data concerning its expenditures from the group drawn in the first of the series of random subsamples. Some limitation of the number of eligible familics asked to provide expenditure schedules was imposed in the later stages of field work.

The consumption sample was planned to provide enough cases for analysis by income and family type. A minimum of 6 or 10 cases was desired in each of the so-called cells, i. e., the subdivisions of the farm sample by a two-way classifica-tion-income and family type. (See Glossary, Cell.) Obviously, a group of eligible families large enough to provide six cases of a less frequent income and family-type class (such as high-income families of six or more members) would include more cases than were needed of the more usual groups, such as the threeor four-member familics with incomes of about \(\$ 1,000\). It was considered advisable, therefore, to exercise some control over the final stages of collection procedures in order to avoid obtaining an excessive number of families from some groups while securing a barely adequate number from others. Although it did not prove possible to obtain the preassigned minimum number of sehedules for all cells, many cells of the less frequent types were represented by more schedules than would have been securcd without this control of the sampling.

The percentage of eligible families included in the consumption sample was greater for some cells than for others because of this collection control. In other words, the consumption sample differed from the eligible group in that some of the family-type and income cells included a smaller proportion of the total number than they did in the eligible group, while in other cellis the proportion was larger. \({ }^{8}\)

\section*{Data from the Consumption Sample (Expenditure Schedules)}

\section*{Representative Character of the Consumption Sample}

In appraising the representative character of the consumption sample two questions must be answered: (1) Were the families in each of the eells representative of all eligible families within the same income and family-type class? (2) Was the distribution of families by cells in the consumption sample similar to the distribution of the eligible group? The answer to the first question affects the applicability of the data, concerning families within a given class or cell to other eligible familics of the same income and family type within the same group of communities. The answer to the second question affects the use of data relating to a group of families from a combination of several cells in the consumption sample (as from all family types at a given income level) as applicable to a similar group of eligible families. This second question, therefore, involves procedures to be followed in combining cells to obtain averages.

There is reason to believe that the first question may be answered in the affirmative. As a result of collection procedures, the individual cells of the consumption sample, i. e., the family-type groups at a given income level, may be judged ade-

\footnotetext{
\(\checkmark\) The procedures used in selecting the families included in the consumption sample are described in greater detail in the Methodology in regional volumes on Family Income and Expenditures, Pazt 1.
}
quately representative of all eligible families of the same family-type and income class. Although some families could not be reached, there is no evidence that the nonrcporting families differed from those included in respect to consumption patterns. Revisits and special visits by supervisors served to reduce the number of nonreporting families.

The answer to the second question is also affirmative, with minor qualifications. The consumption sample may be taken as fairly representative of the eligible group with respect to the distribution of families by family type and income, despite the control of collection. The differences between the consumption and the eligible sample were small enough that in the tabulation and analysis of the expenditure data, the consumption sample may be treated as a random sample.

The consumption sample from most of the farm sections included relatively more high-income families than the eligible sample. Thus, in the Pennsylvania-Ohio counties, 27 percent of the families in the consumption sample had incomes of \(\$ 2,000\) or more, compared with 24 percent of the eligible families. In the GeorgiaMississippi section these proportions for white operators were 16 and 13 percent, respectively. In the distribution of families by type, the consumption sample did not differ from the eligible sample in some of the analysis units, such as IllinoisIowa and North Carolina-South Carolina (white operators). However, in others, including the Pennsylvania-Ohio, Michigan-Wisconsin, Washington-Oregon, and California units, families of types 2 and 3 (husbend and wife, and one or two persons under 16) constituted a somewhat larger proportion of the consumption than of the eligible sample; families of type 1 and of types 4 and 5 were less numerous in the former than in the latter samples in these sections. In most of the analysis units in the Southeast, families of types 6 and 7 were not fully represented in the consumption sample.*

Procedures in combining cells-combining family types at each income level and combining income levels to form an all-incomes line-were determined on the basis of the answer to the second question, i. e., similarities in the eligible and consumption samples with respect to the distribution of families by income and family type. These procedures are discussed in the section that follows.

\section*{Combinations of Family-Type and Income Classes}

The eligible sample provides a somewhat more accurate picture than does the consumption sample of the relative numerical importance of the groups (cells) of families represented in the consumption study. In theory, therefore, it would be preferable to use the distribution of eligible families by income and family type as a system of weights to be applied to the average expenditures for each group in order to obtain averages for combinations of the groups, such as families of all types in a given income class. The calculation of averages for combined groups by pooling the data is equivalent to using the distribution from the consumption sample as a weighting system in place of the distribution from the eligible sample.

Practically, the two samples were sufficiently similar with respect to the distributions of families that averages computed in the two ways did not differ greatly. The procedure of computing the average by pooling, i. e., on the basis of consumption sample weights, has the advantage of simplicity; it is the simple average of all the reports for a given class. Since tests indicated that the differences between this type of average and that based on weights from the eligible sample were relatively small with few exceptions, the simpler average has been used uniformly for all tables in the reports on family expenditures.

The pooled averages for all family types combined for each income class, therefore, may be considered fairly representative of the consumption of eligible families with similar incomes. However, in using these averages it must be recalled that very large families (types 8 and 9 , and in some analysis units types 6 and 7) are excluded from the consumption sample.

Combinations of all income classes, however, present a somewhat different situation from combinations of family-type groups at a specified income level. Two points must be remembered: First, the consumption sample did not include those families drawn in the eligible sample that had very low or very high incomes; sccond, the eligible sample obtained by the survey tended to underrepresent the very high-income families in some sections. The consumption patterns of families of all income classes combined, as shown by pooled averages, may be considered representative of the patterns of the eligible families within the income classes

\footnotetext{
'A comparison of the two samples for each analysis unit is given in the Appraisal of the report on tamily Income and Expenditures, Part 2.
}
presented for the specified analysis unit, but not of all eligible families including the very high- and very low-income groups that were excluded.

Had the data for the most well-to-do families (omitted from the tabulations because of the small number of schedules obtained) been included and had weighted rather than pooled averages been used, the averages for the all-incomes line would have been improved somewhat. However, such averages would not provide an accurate estimate of the total consumption of all eligible families; both the weights in respect to the number of high-income families in the eligible sample and the data for consumption of high-income families (based on comparatively few cases) were inadequate for this purpose. The well-to-do families which have a large share of the aggregate income in relation to their number also have a large share of aggregate disbursements, especially for some so-called luxury items of family living. These considerations should be recognized, therefore, in the use of averages from the all-incomes line of a table to represent the total expenditures of all eligible families.

\section*{The Consumption Sample in Relation to the Total Population}

The consumption study was limited to the so-called eligible groups-nativewhite (except in the Southeast), unbroken, nonrelief families having certain characteristics. This restriction of the scope of the study limits the applicability of the data from the consumption sample to the entire population of the farm sections surveyed. Eligible families did not account for more than half of the total population of families in the sections surveyed except in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region. In several sections fewer than one-third of all farm operators' families were eligible for the consumption study, as the following estimates based on census, record-card, and income-sample data show:
Percentage of families eliginle for consumption study
Farm section:
Vermont ..... 23
New Jersey ..... 22
Pennsylvania-Ohio ..... 54
Michigan-Wisconsin ..... 52
Illinois-Iowa ..... 59
North Dakota-Kansas ..... 30
South Dakota-Montana-Colorado ..... 29
Washington-Oregon ..... 25
California ..... 21
North Carolina self-sufficing comenties ..... 30
North Carolina-South Carolina ..... 39
Georgia-Mississippi ..... 42

Since the eligible families generally were outnumbered by the ineligible, differences between the two groups must be carefully considered in adapting the data relating to the consumption sample to all farm families in these sections. The families excluded from the study of consumption on the basis of the eligibility requirements may be classified in two groups: Those ineligible for both the income and the consumption studies; those eligible for the former study but ineligible for the lattor.

The group ineligible for both studies consisted mainly of nonwhite families (except in the Southeast, where native Negroes were studied), one-person, broken and foreign-born families, those that had not lived on their farms at least 1 year, and families of farm managers and laborers. (Sharecroppers were eligible in the Southeast.) Information concerning this group of ineligible families was limited to the number excluded for each reason for ineligibility and to the income data obtained from a small sample in five farm sections.
The families ineligible for both siudies as a group were found to have incomes much lower than those of the eligible (native-white, unbroken) families in these five farm sections. That is, among the ineligible families the relative number in the lowest income classes was greater than among the eligible families. Since this group, ineligible for both studies, constituted one-fifth or more of the familics in each analysis unit, their exclusion from the survey served to limit the study of income as well as of consumption to a group whose median income was higher than that of the population of these communitics as a whole. Families tligible for the income study probably had median incomes a few hundred dollars above the medians for the total population. For example, the difference was estimated
to be about \(\$ 200\) in Washington and \(\$ 300\) in southern California. (See Appraisal in the regional reports on Family Income and Expenditures, Part 1.)

The second group of ineligible families-those eligible for the income study but ineligible for the consumption study-consisted chiefly of those that had received relief (however little) at any time during the report year and of family-type groups too infrequently encountered to permit analysis. Incomes of this second group of ineligible families tended to be below those of the consumption sample as a whole, chiefly because of the relatively large proportion of relief families in the former group. Income data, although incomplete, obtained from families that had received relief, indicate that few had incomes of \(\$ 1,000\) or more during the year. Moreover, in the farm sections, nonrelief families that were ineligible because of moving from one farm to another also tended to be concentrated in the lower income classes.

The two sets of eligibility requirements thus had the effect of excluding from the study of consumption a relatively larger number of families with incomes under than above \(\$ 1,000\). Estimates made for the Pennsylvania-Ohio section showed that only 41 percent of the families with incomes under \(\$ 1,000\) (including those receiving relief) were eligible for the consumption study, compared with 60 or 70 percent of the families in the classes above \(\$ 1,000\).

In addition to having a somewhat higher general income level, the families in the consumption sample may have differed somewhat from the excluded group with respect to expenditure patterns. For example, the families that were excluded because they had moved during the past year may have had less homeproduced food and higher food expenditures than families that had lived on the same farm a year or more. The extent to which consumption patterns were found to differ among the family-type groups included in the survey suggests that the consumption patterns of the one-person families, of those with two or more members not including a husband and a wife, and of the large unbroken families of types 8 and 9 may have differed appreciably from the patterns of the groups studied. The ways of living of the foreign-born and of the nonwhite families also may have differed from the native-white because of different cultural patterns.

In general, there is but limited information upon which to judge differences between the consumption patterns of the ineligible groups and the eligible familiee with comparable incomes. However, as the data in this volume show, income level and family type strongly affect family food consumption. Accordingly, the consumption patterns of the families studied may be judged representative in broad outline of those of all families of similar economic status. Estimates of community, regional, and national consumption may thus be made on the basis of data from this survey combined with additional information available concerning distribution of income and family size, to give a general picture of the ways of spending of all families.

\section*{Food Consumption Data}

The information on food presented in this report was obtained on four formsas a part both of the family-income schedule and of the expenditure schedule, and on two supplementary food schedules (see Glossary for definitions, and pp. 379-385 for forms).

Families filling the family-income schedule (the income sample) supplied figures on the quantity or money value of different kinds of food produced at home for household use. These estimates served as a basis for computing the contribution that the money value of food produced for home use made to family income during the report year; the quantities are published in appendix tables in part 1 of regional reports on income and expenditures.

Of the data on food provided by the family-income schedule only those relating to the number of families having each type of farm-furnished product are systematically presented in appendix tables of this report. A few tables appear in the text in which average quantities of home-produced food from the family-income schedule have been used to interpret data from the expenditure schedule. Otherwise, the figures presented on the home-produced share of diets were derived from the 7-day supplementary consumption schedules, described below. The decision to use the latter source for data on home-produced food rather than family-income schedules was made because the quantities home-produced and the total quantities consumed would then come from the same schedule and be directly comparable, whereas figures from the family-income schedule on production, even when reduced to a weekly basis, could not be compared directly with
the consumption data. The production figures tend to be higher than the quantities of farm-furnished products consumed; the former include the amounts lost through spoilage or shrinkage in storage; they also include the wastage that inevitably occurs because families must produce more than household needs in order to assure an adequate supply.

Families filling the expenditure schedule (consumption sample) gave information on the money value of food eaten at home, both purchased and farm-furnished, the quantity of different types of food canned at home, whether half or more of the various products thus canned were home-produced, and also on expenditures for food eaten away from home. The latter included board at school, meals eaten away from home, as at work, school, or while traveling, and between-meal food and drink.

Some of the familics in the consumption sample filled one or the other of two supplementary schedules giving detailed information on the food consumed during a 7-day period. The so-called check list furnished an estimate of the household's cousumption of food during the week immediately preceding the interview; the food record covered a week during which the housewife, under the supervision of a trained field agent, was able to keep an accurate account of the quantities of different kinds of food consumed by the household.

\section*{Combinations of Farm Sections into Analysis Units}

The four schedules affording information relevant to food were obtained in differing numbers, and provided differing degrees of detail on consumption. Fam-ily-income schedules and expenditure schedules both covered a 12 -month period; the eheek lists and food records were for 7 days. The expenditure schedules afforded over-all estimates of consumption in terms of money value only; the two latter, details regarding the quantity and money value of individual articles of food consumed. The data, therefore, have been combined into analysis units differing in scope, in order to obtain satisfactory averages for the different segments of information on food. The number of schedules of each type obtained, and the combination of data from the various farm sections into analysis units are shown in table 66.

In the analysis of the data furnished by the income sample on the number of families producing various types of food for household use, the combinations of communities were identical with those used in the analysis of family income. Combinations of farm counties did not cross State lines, with the exception of those in the range-livestock area, South Dakota, Montana, and Colorado. In the Southeast, where Negro families were studied, separate tabulations for Negro and white are presented. Sharecroppers, included in the Southeast, were studied separately from farm operators.

In the analysis of data furnished by the consumption sample on food expenditures, value of farm-furnished food, and the extent of home canning, further combinations of communities were necessary. Analysis units compriscd data from groups of counties in two or more States, except for the Vermont, the New Jersey, and the California sections. In the latter State the two farm sections studied were combined. Where special groups were studied, the principle of separate presentation of data was maintained. In the Southeast, there were separate analysis units for Negro and white families, and for farm operators and sharecroppers. The part-time farming sample in Oregon formed a separate analysis unit.

In the analysis of food records, data from Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Jersey were combined to form one unit, and data from Pennsylvania were combined with those from the North Central States to form a second. Because of the comparatively small number of cases, figures from records obtained in the Plains and Mountain region were not included in all tables. Data from Pacific Coast States were pooled, omitting those from the special part-time farm sample. In the Southeast, four analysis units were established-separate units for white and Negro families, and separate units for families of operators and sharecroppers. In text tables showing grade of diet by income and family type, all records from the New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions were combined; in the Southeast, records from white farm operators and white sharecroppers were analyzed separately; but records from all Negro families (operators and sharecroppers) were combined. In appendix tables, data were presented in two groups by season, insofar as available.

In the ana-ysis of food check lists for consumption of groups of food, as fats, baked goods, beef, or canned vegetables, schedules from the New England, Middle Atlantic, and North Central States were grouped together to form one analysis
unit; and schedules from the Plains and Mountain and the Pacific regions, another. In presenting data regarding the consumption of individual food items, as butter, rye bread, round steak, or canned tomatoes, these two analysis units were combined into one. In the Southeast, all data for Negro and white families were tabulated separately, and for the white farm group, those from farm operators and sharecroppers were treated separately. In combining schedules from the various communities no weights were applied, but all those obtained were pooled.

Table 66.-Combinations of data from farm bections: Number of farm counties studied, number of each of four types of schedules tabulated, and number of analysis units presented for each type of schedule in this publication, by region and State


See footnotes at end of table.

Table 66.-Combinations of data from farm sectione: Number of farm countiee studied, number of each of four types of schedules tabulated, and number of analysis units presented for each type of schedule in this publication, by rogion and stake. -Continued


1 See table 65 for list of counties studied.
\({ }^{2}\) See Nutritive Value, Section 2, page 52.
\({ }^{3}\) Season March-November 1936.
4 Includes 19 check lists for families having net losses which are not inciuded in the tables for the New Eneland, Middle Atlantic and North Central regions.
\({ }^{\wedge}\) Because of the small number of farm schedules obtained in Massachusetts, only a limited tabulation of the data bas been made.
"Because of the small number of records obtained in this region, no tables for this analysis unit are presented in this report.

\section*{Income Intervals}

A \(\$ 250\) interval has been used in classifying by income the families included in the consumption sample. Families included in the income sample and those filling supplementary schedules (food check lists) have been classified by a \(\$ 500\) interval. Depending upon the number of cases, combinations into broader income intervals were made for the relatively bigh-income classes. Such combinations in tables with \(\$ 250\) intervals begin at \(\$ 2,000\), first into \(\$ 500\) intervals, and beyond \(\$ 3,000\) into intervals of \(\$ 1,000\) and more. The upper income limits for which figures are presented differ for the several analysis units, depending upon the income distribution characteristic of the sample.

\section*{Combinations of Family-Type Groups}

Although nine family types were defined in planning the study, data from all nine were obtained only from the income sample. In the study of consumption, five types were included in the sample in all sections, and seven in some. (See Glossary, Family Type.)

In presenting the results of the consumption study, data are given for each of the seven family types separately only for the Pennsylvania-Ohio farm unit of the Middle Atlantic and North Central region; for other sections, the five or seven family types studied were combined into broader type groups. Data from the five family types studied in farm sections of the New England, the Plains and Mountain, and the Pacific regions are presented for three type groups-1, 2-3,
and 4-5. Types 6 and 7 were included in the consumption sample of sections studied in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region and for both white and Negro families in most of the farm sections in the Southeast; for these sections, excepting the Pennsylvania-Ohio unit, the data are presented for four family-type groups-1, 2-3, 4-5, and 6-7. The number of family types studied in each farm section and the combinations of types for purposes of analysis are as follows:

Region and analysis unit: \({ }^{1}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline New England: & Family types as combined for analysis \\
\hline Vermont & 1, 2-3, 4-5. \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Middle Atlantic and North Central:} \\
\hline New Jersey & 1,23, 4-5, 6-7. \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline Pennsylvania-Ohio & 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. \\
\hline Michigan-Wisconsin & 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7. \\
\hline Illinois-Iowa & 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7. \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plains and Mountain:} \\
\hline North Dakota-Kans & 1, 2-3, 4-5. \\
\hline South Dakota-Montana-Colorado & 1, \(2 \cdots 3,4-5\). \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Pacifie:} \\
\hline Washington-Orego & 1, 2-3, 4-5. \\
\hline California_ & 1, 2-3, 4-5. \\
\hline Oregon, part-time f & 1, 2-3, 4-5. \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Southeast:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{White operators:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{North Caroina-South Carolina \(-\ldots-\ldots-\ldots . . .--_{-}\)1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Gcorgia-Mississippi-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.--
North Carolina, self-sufficing counties}} \\
\hline & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{White sharecroppers:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{North Carolina-South Carolina_-...-..........- 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7. Georgia-Mississippi \(1,2-3,4-5,6-7.3\)}} \\
\hline & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Negro operators:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{North Carolina-South Carolina_-.---------.- 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Ceorgia-Mississippi.----------------------- 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7.3} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Negro sharecroppers:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{North Carolina-South Carolina Georgia-Mississippi \(\qquad\) \(1,2-3,4-5,6-7\).
\(1,2-3,4-5,6-7.3\)}} \\
\hline & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) For a list of farm counties included in each analysis unit see table fir.
\({ }^{9}\) Because of the small number of cases, data are shown ouly for all family types combined, except in table 42 where data are shown by fanily type and income-
\({ }^{3}\) Data for family types 6 and 7 were obtained only in farm counties of Georgia; expenditure data were not collected for these family types in the Mississippi farm counties.
- Counties in which solf-sufficing farms were the principal type.

Supplementary schedules were classified into the same family-type groups shown above, except those from the Pennsylvania-Ohio unit, for which the separate types were combined into four groups, 1, 2-3, 4-5, and 6-7.

Data on the number of families producing different types of food for household consumption, obtained from the income sample which included all nine family types, are presented for five family-type groups: \(1,2-3,4-5,6-7\), and 8-9.

In comparing the consumption of families of different types, the differences in the income distributions of the type groups should be recognized. In most of the analysis units families of type 1, within the range of income studied, had luwer median and average incomes than other types. A larger proportion of families of types 4, 5 , and 7 than of other types were in the higher income classes. The consumption of families of these types ( 4,5 , and 7 ), therefore, is greater by comparison with other types, when the comparison is based on all income classes combined, than when it is made within each income class. Also, because the proportion of these types ( 4,5 , and 7 ) tended to increase with income, while the relative number of other types decreased, some part of the apparent increase in food consumption with income (all family types combined) is due to an increase in the average size of family. The effect of this probably is more pronounced with respect to food consumption than with respect to most other consumption or expenditure groups.

\section*{Representative Character of Groups Furnishing Supplementary Food Schedules}

The relation of the consumption sample to the portion of the population that this study was designed to cover, and also to the whole population has been summarized briefly in preceding sections. A discussion follows of the extent to which the partial samples of families furnishing supplementary food schedules were representative of the consumption sample as a whole.

The number of supplementary food schedules olvained in each community did not bear a constant ratio to the number of families in the consumption sample. This was due in part to local administrative problems and in part to the varying interest that different supervisors had in the several supplementary schedules to be obtained. However, when the data from the several communities were pooled into broad analysis units, it was found that the groups of families giving supplementary information on food were similar to those in corresponding consumption and income samples, with respect to their distribution both by income and by family type. This is shown in table 67.

As combined for analysis, the median income of the group furnishing check lists was within 4 percent of that of families giving expenditure schedules in corresponding analysis units, except in the case of white operators' families in the Southeast, where the difference was 8 percent. The median income of the group of families furnishing food records and those filling expenditure schedules in corresponding aralysis units did not differ by more than 8 percent except in the case of white sharecroppers in the Southeast; the median income of the small group of white sharecroppers' families furnishing food records (106) was 12 percent lower than that of the large group of families \((1,111)\) of this color-tenure group in the consumption sample. The reader should note that the food record-keeping group of the West for which data are presented in table 67 includes only families from the Pacific farm sections; although the median income of this group was considerably higher ( 20 percent) than that of the families giving expenditure schedules in the unit comprising Plains and Mountain and Pacific States, it was 8 percent lower than that of families filling expenditure schedules in the Pacific region alone.

The distribution of families by type in the groups furnishing supplementary schedules was similar to that of families filling expenditure schedules in the corresponding analysis units. The group furnishing check lists and expenditure schedules in the North and West were almost identical in distribution by farnily type; in the Southeast, there was a tendency toward underrepresentation of families of types 6 and 7 and a corresponding overrepresentation of types 4 and 5 among those giving estimates as compared to those in the consumption sample. The groups keeping food records included a slightly smaller percentage of families of types 6 and 7 , and a slightly larger percentage of families of types 4 and 5 than did white families filling expenditure schedules; the reverse was true for the Negro families.

Median incomes of families filling the income schedule and of those filling the expenditure schedule differed by less than 1 percent except among white sharecroppers' families and Negro families in the Southeast. The largest difference in the latter region, less than 4 percent, was for Negro families.

In the North and West families filling expenditure schedules included somewhat fewer, proportionally, of family type 1 and somewhat more of family types 2 and 3 than did those filling the income schedule. In the Southeast white families of types 6 and 7 were underrepresented among those giving expenditure schedules as compared to those filling family-income schedules.

\section*{Comparisans of Data Afforded by the Two Types of Supplementary Schedules}

Although the food check lists and the food records were obtained from groups of families that were fairly similar with respect to income and family-type distribution, there was a tendency for the money value of food and the quantities of major food groups reported on food check lists to fall below those appearing on food records. The median money value of food actually reported on check lists of the five analysis units was from 5 to 18 percent below the median reported on corresponding food records (table 68).

TABLE 67.- FAMILY TYPE AND INCOME OF FAMILIES FURNISHING FOUR TYPES OF sChedoles: Distribution by income and by family type of families keeping food records, families furnishing estimates of food consumption (March-November 1986), families in the consumption sample, and families in the income sample, 6 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1995-36\)
[Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-borv]


Food-recording group
Fond-estimating group Consumption sample- --------Incone sample

Food-recording group
Fond-secoratig group
Cugumptions zou lucone single.
\(\qquad\)


I See Glowsary for definitions of terins usid in this table. Families of whitc oporators only were studied in all regions exerpt the sout heast where special studies of sharemepparers aud Negroes were made. Spe Methodology for the statas and wuntics studied in cach repion. Fercentage distributions by income class are based on the tolal mumber of famThes in the sample (column 2) except for the foot-recordiug group where exceptions are noter by footnote. Perentage distributions by family type are based on the number of Fxalue that
Phxeludes all familes of types 8 and 9 , and famities of types 6 and 7 in the Naty IEncland

 bepanse of alipibility rectirements. 1 Nuw Hmeland Mtdie
New Hogland, Morth Central, Plains and Muntain, and l'acific regions, except for food-reoording groun which does not freclude auy houscholds from tho 4 Includes 12 families for wh ecords.
\({ }^{5}\) tncludes 19 families with negative incomes which were not inciurled in the frootastimating group of the New England, Middic Atlantic and North Certral regions. 5 Includes 9 families for which family tyme and income were not reported on the food records.
0.50 perent or less.

Oragon part-time families not iucluded in any sample.
- Indindes only families from the I'acific resion, The median incomes of the corrisponding income nad consumption samples were \(\$ 1,300\) and \(\mathbf{x} 1\), 4 -1t respectively.
\({ }^{10}\) Inclades 3 families for which family type and incorae were bot reported on the food rors.
It Includes 11 families for which damily type and fincome were not reported on the food records.
\({ }^{12}\) Includes 2 familits for which family type and income were not renorted on the food records.
\({ }^{13}\) Inclades 8 fimithes for whigh family tybe and income were not reported on the food records.

On both types of supplementary schedules, purchased food was valued at the retail prices reported as paid, and home-produced food at prices the family would have paid had the food been purchased from neighbors in the quantity and quality used. There was this difference, however: On food records each family entered its own estimate of the value of farm-furnished products. These values reflected differences in the quality of food from family to family, and also differing family attitudes toward the worth of farm-furnished food. On food cheek lists a uniform price for each item was entered on all seherdules from a single farm section. These values were estatilishert by averaging the estimates made by the first 12 housewives interviewed, or if the estimates were unasually variable, by averaging the estimates made by the first 24 housewives interviewed. The prices used in valuation of home-produced food reported on cheok lists are shown in table 69.
Table 68.-money yalee and guantites of food reported on check lists as a percerntage of those herorted on food records: honey value and quantities of food reported on check lists expressed as a percentage of corresponding data from food records (jood record data \(=100\) ), 5 analysis units in 20 States, 1996-37
[Households of nonrelief darm families that include a hushand and wite, both native-born]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Analysis unit} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Relative money vatue} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Relative quantities reported of-} \\
\hline & As re. portel? & When Falued at ider. tienl prices \({ }^{3}\) & kirgs: & Miłk Ellliva\{ent \({ }^{\text {4 }}\) & Fats, meath. poultry, fish & F]ntir elfuiva lent. \({ }^{3}\) & Surar, Sirtip, Ireserves & Potal.oes, sweet. potatoes & Other vegetsbles, \({ }^{\text {and }}\) fruit \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{New England, Middie Atlentic, and North Central} & Percent & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text { Lercer:f } & \text { Percest } \\
92 & 11 t
\end{array}
\]}} & Percent & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent
\(y \Delta\)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent 101} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent 80} \\
\hline & \(\stackrel{\text { ric }}{ }\) & & & 92 & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Plajns. Nountann, and} \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline White sliarectoppers & 9.5 & [级 \({ }^{1}\) & (fil) & 111 & 815 & 101 & 120 & 63 & 114 \\
\hline Fegro famsilies... & \(\times 5\) j & 94, & 187 & स & -5 & 107 & 133 & 58 & 123 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
 by the distribut ion of ali records collected do obtain an average for the repions shown lapte.
- Based on mipuian utoney values of all ford.

F Valaed at the averace prices reporied on Vow Englamd, Midale Athantic, and North Central food cheok lists.
\({ }^{4}\) Approximately the quantaty of flid milk to which the various dairy piroducts (except hat ter) are equivarent 50 far as proteins and mineruls are concerned.
\({ }^{5}\) Two thiruls to the wejpht of baked roods has been witiel to that of flow, meals, and tereals.
\(\epsilon\) Does not include dried vegetables.
- Food-record data only tor the Pracific region,

Although prices reported on both types of supplementary schedules generally were below city or village retail prices, the prices reported for most food groups, and for eggs and fats in particular, were higher on food records than on check lists.

Not all of the differences in average price per unit are to be attributed to the method of pricing farm-furnished products. Field collection of records lagged behind the collection of cheek lists, and there was an upward trend in price levels during much of the period covered by field work. Although the rise in the retail cost index for all food was most marked in the latter part of May and in June, prices of fats, dairy products, meats, and graim products continued to go up slowly throughout the summer months, and cgg prices rose more than seasonally until early winter. These facts undoubtedly affected not only the prices paid for purchased food, but the families' estimates of the worth of home-produced food.

When average quantities reported from each analysis unit are valued at identical prices (those reported on check lists for the New England, Middle Atlantic, and North Central unit), the average money value of the food reported on the check lists for the several units ranged from 1 to 12 percent below that based on food records (tiable 68). This indicates that the quantities reported on the food records, especially those from the analysis units of the North and West. tended to he somewhat larger than those reported on the food check lists; and compared with a difference of 5 to 18 percent (obtained by contrasting the median money value actually reported on the two types of supplementary schedules for each
analysis unit), these figures indicate also that prices used in computing value of food for the food records were generally higher than those used in valuing food for the check lists.

Except for eggs, smaller quantities of which were reported on food records than on check lists in each analysis unit, there was a tendency in the North and West for equal or larger quantities of each major food group to be reported on the food records than on the check lists. In the Southeast, there was less consistency in this respect; the quantities reported on food records were usually larger than on check lists for milk, fats and meats, and potatoes and aweetpotatoes, but smaller for other food groups.

Some trend in the direction of a more ample food supply among those families keeping records in the North and West as compared with those filling check lists might be expected from the slightly higher economic status of the former group. Other factors which might contribute to the tendeney for recorded consumption of food to exceed estimated consumption are as follows:
1. Although families were asked to make no change in their customary ways of living, it is possible that some families may have maintained a somewhat higher than usual dietary level during the week in which they kept the food record and were subjected to visits from the food-record supervisor.
2. Errors in family reports of food consumption are likely to be omissions of entries and hence lead to understatement. The fact that quantities based on records tend to exceed those based on check lists may, therefore, point to a more complete reporting of consumption on the former type of schedule than on the latter. Investigators depending on estimates (check lists) for information on consumption hope that errors due to over and underestimation, and to inaccuracies in recalling practice over a defined period will tend to compensate each other in averages based on large numbers of families. Unfortunately, families keeping records did not furnish estimates of their consumption and vice versa, so that data for identical families from the two types of schedules cannot be compared. It is possible, however, that the interest in food and the painstaking attitude of some housewives which prompted the keeping of a food record differentiated them from those filling check lists, and had record-keeping families given both types of schedules, this trait might have resulted in check lists with few omissions, and little underestimation. (Because the compensation of errors discussed above is inapplicable when schedules are treated one by one, food check lists have been used in this study only for group averages, and not for the appraisal of variations in nutritive content of diets.)
3. Representation of farm sections within the broad regional analysis units for the two types of schedules---records and check lists-may have led to differences in averages for some food groups. Thus in the Plains, Mountain, and Pacific analysis unit, estimates of food consumption (check lists) were obtained in each farm section, whereas so few food records were obtained from the Plains and Mountain States that data are presented in table 68 for the Pacific Coast only. Averages for many groups of food-milk, meat, fats, and grain products-were nevertheless within 10 percent for the two types of schedules from the broad regional unit (Plains and Mountain and Pacific regions). But for vegetables and fruit, there was a wide difference, probably attributable not so much to the method of obtaining the information, as to the fact that there were sectional differences in economic status and in food production and consumption habits within the broad regional unit. Home production of vegetables and fruit is much more rewarding in the humid coastal region of the Northwest than in the dry wheatgrowing and ranching sections of the Plains and Mountain region, and prices for purchased fruit and vegetables tend to be relatively low on the Pacific Coast. Hence, higher consumption of these products is to be expected from a sample comprising only families living in the Pacific region, as compared with a sample including families from the Plains and Mountain region as well as the Pacific region.
4. Differences in the collection period of the two types of supplementary food schedules, with the collection of food records lagging from 1 to 2 months behind check lists (table 72), may have resulted in some differences in averages associated with seasonal trends in the availability of foods. As the months advance through the year from spring to midwinter (the collection period), decreases in the farm consumption of some items, as eggs, and an increase in others, as meat, are to be expected. A seasonal increase from May to October in the consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables (other than potatoes) would be expected in the North and

West. In the Southeast, however, probably some decrease from early summer to fall or early winter would occur in orchard and garden productivity, and therefore in the consumption of fruit and vegetables other than potatoes, but there would be a marked increase in the consumption of potatoes and sweetpotatoes. In general, these are the differences found between the data furnished by records and check lists.

An exaggeration of some of these expected trends, and a minimizing of others was brought about by unusual weather conditions in 1936. There were late spring frosts in some sections that reduced usual fruit crops. From March to August, rainfall totalled from less than one-fourth to about one-half of the average precipitation recorded in these months for the several States of the Central region. In the Southeast there also was a drought-most marked in May and June, but lasting until September in some States. During July and August temperatures were from 3 to 10 degrees above long-time averages in the Central States, and also above average, but to a lesser degree, in the Southeast. As a result of these weather conditions, apple, grape, cherry, and peach crops were unusually low (pears and citrus fruit were abundant, however). As summer advanced, garden supplies increased but were less plentiful than usual in the heat- and droughtridden sections. Egg prices went up more than seasonally from late spring to early winter. This price advance probably curtailed home consumption of eggs somewhat. The poor feed situation that reduced milk production per cow (not necessarily reducing home consumption, however) may have contributed also to a relatively high consumption of farm-furnished meat. With scarcity of feed and water, some farm families slaughtered more meat animals for bome consumption than usual.

Although the quantities of food reported on the two types of supplementary food schedules do not agree precisely, due, as has been suggested, to a combination of factors including the method of obtaining the data, in general the differences are in the direction to be expected. The similarity between the two sets of figures should be regarded as more remarkable than the differences between them.

Table 69.--Prices used in valuation of home-produced food for food check lists, 1936-87
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Item} & \begin{tabular}{l}
New \\
Eng- \\
land
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Middle Atlantic and North Central} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Plains and Mountain} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Pacifie} & Southeast \\
\hline & Ver. mont & \begin{tabular}{l}
New \\
Jersey, Penn-sylvania, Ohio, Michi-璺解ronsin
\end{tabular} & Illinois. Iowa & North Dakota, Kansas & \begin{tabular}{l}
South \\
Dakota, Montana, Colorado
\end{tabular} & Wash-
ington, Oregon & California & North Carolins, South Carolina. Georgia, Missis-
sippi \\
\hline meats, lard, poultry, fish & Dollars & Doliars & Dollars & Dollars & Dollars & Dollars & Dotlars & Dollars \\
\hline Beef.---..-.-.----------.-. . pound & 0.13 & 0.15 & 0.14 & 0.10 & 0. 10 & 0.13 & 10.106 & 0.16 \\
\hline  & . 13 & . 18 & . 20 & . 12 & . 10 & . 14 & & . 20 \\
\hline  & . 16 & . 17 & . 20 & . 11 & . 22 & . 19 & 1.07 & . 28 \\
\hline Pork, fresh........-.......... do & . 15 & . 17 & . 17 & . 11 & . 10 & . 19 & & . 17 \\
\hline Pork, smoked.....---......... do... & & . 25 & . 17 & . 21 & & & . 11 & . 22 \\
\hline  & & . 12 & . 13 & . 12 & & . 11 & & . 13 \\
\hline Bacon --....-.........-......-do & & . 27 & . 22 & . 23 & & . 28 & & . 22 \\
\hline Salt pork-.-.------.......... do.. & & . 18 & . 12 & . 14 & & . 15 & & .14 \\
\hline  & . 23 & . 19 & . 17 & . 14 & . 15 & . 23 & . 12 & . 17 \\
\hline  & . 2 & .12 & & . 14 & . 3 & & & .10 \\
\hline Eggs .........-..---....... dozen. & . 28 & . 19 & . 18 & . 14 & . 15 & . 17 & . 20 & . 18 \\
\hline dairy products & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Milk, whole..........------ quart. & . 09 & . 06 & . 07 & . 05 & . 08 & . 10 & . 05 & . 10 \\
\hline Buttermilk.................-- do...- & & . 05 & . 07 & . 02 & . 05 & . 02 & 05 & . 04 \\
\hline Skim milk..---------------. do.... & . 01 & . 02 & . 02 & . 02 & . 02 & & & . 04 \\
\hline Cbeese ---........-----.--- pourd. & & . 14 & . 16 & . 18 & . 20 & & & . 21 \\
\hline Cream..-----.............-- pint & . 28 & . 18 & . 30 & . 12 & . 15 & . 34 & . 18 & . 21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 69.-Prices used in valuation of home-produced food for food check lists, 1936-37-Continued


\footnotetext{
\({ }_{1}\) Price per pound on the hoor.
2 Price reported as \(\$ 0.01\) per pound,
3 Price reported as \(\$ 0.02\) per pound.
}

Table 70-money value of food per food-expenditure onit as reported on three types of schedtuis: Distitibution of households by money value of food, households keeping food records, households furnishing estimates of food consumption, and all households in the consumption sample, 6 analysis unts in 20 States, \({ }^{1}\) 1985-37
[Households of nonrelief farm families that inelude a husband and wife, both native-born]

\({ }^{1}\) See Cllossary for definitions of terms used in this table. Families of white operators only were studied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of sharecroppers and Negroes were made. See Methodology for the States and enunties studied in each region. The food records cover one-week periods during 1936-37. Thr food check lists furnished by the food-estimating group cover one-week periods during March-November 1936. The expenditure schedules of the consumption sample cover a 12 -month period in 1935-36.
\({ }^{5}\) Adjusted to June-August 1038 price level by the U. S. Burcau of Labor Statistics index of retail food costs.
\({ }^{3}\) New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions, except for the food-recording group which does not include any housebolds from the Plains and Mountain region.
+ 0.50 percent or less.
© Oregon-part-time families not included in any sample.
\({ }^{-}\)Includes only families from the Pacific region.

\section*{Distribution of Families by Level of Money Value of Food}

Food records, obtained to provide data on consumption accurate enough to justify computing the nutritive value of diets, family by family, were few in number compared with other schedules. They require close cooperation on the part of the homemaker and are expensive to collect and analyze. Except for an appraisal of over-all grade of diet, the small number of records makes it impossible to classify them by income and family type and have reliable averages for the nutritive value of diets, even after combining data from communities, income classes, and family-type groups into the broadest feasible categories. Hence the food records from the several farm sections werc combined essentially as for the analysis of expenditure scheduies, but within analysis units, the records were classified by
money value of food per food-expenditure unit (see section on Measurement of Household Size in Dietary Analyses; and Glossary, Food-expenditure Unit), rather than by family type and income. Food check lists and expenditure schedules have also been classified in this way, both to make possible an extension of the findings from the food-record analysis to the entire consumption sample, and to throw light on the variations in the money value of so important an item in family living.

In classifying food records, food check lists, and expenditure schedules into groups according to level of money value of food per food-expenditure unit, the intervals selected were those that had been used in earlier studies of the Bureau of Home Economies, adjusted for relative changes in retail food costs as shown by the index of the E.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

For each 3-month period (season) covered by the study, the intervals used in classification were as follows:

\section*{Season:}

Money value of food per foodexpenditure unit per meal
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { March-May 1936--.----------------------------- \$0. } 0312
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { September-November } 1936 \\
& \text {. } 0327
\end{aligned}
\]

In tables and charts referring to 7 -day supplementary schedules, the intervals reported or plotted are those corresponding to June-August 1936. These were the months of heavy collection of supplementary schedules in most localities (table 72).

The corresponding interval used in classifying the 12 -month schedules was \(\$ 0.0316\) per food-expenditure unit per meal (as of the period May 1, 1935-April 30, 1936). This same interval was used for each analysis unit, although the level and trend of food prices may have differed somewhat from one region to another.

The distribution of families by level of money value of food is shown in table 70. The figures from both types of supplementary schedules-food records and food check lists-refer only to meals prepared and served at home, whereas those from the expenditure schedule (consumption sample) include also expenditures for meals in restaurants, for between-meal food, such as candy, or ice cream, and soft or other drinks in short, all expenditures for food, drink, and meals, except board of children at school and expenditures for food incurred while traveling or on vacation.

Since a somewhat larger proportion of the expenditures for food reported by the consumption sample represents payment for services, the value of food per food-expenditure unit per meal as derived from the expenditure schedule might be expected to exceed that derived from data afforded by the two supplementary schedules. As a rule, the median money value of food per unit-meal as shown by data from expenditure schedules (consumption sample) was higher than that from the food check lists. Food records, however, showed a somewhat higher median money value of food than the corresponding expenditure schedules, except among white families in the Southeast, where there was little difference. In part, the higher values shown for the food-record sample as compared with the food-check-list sample reflected the larger quantities of food reported by the families keeping food records; in part, they reflected the higher prices at which recordkeeping families valued their farm-furnished food. These points were discussed in the preceding pages. The shifting interval used in classifying the schedules was designed to compensate for shifts in food-price levels in determining the proportion of families elassified in each money-value-of-food group. It could not, however, compensate for a change that might have occurred in the proportion of the family's food supply that had to be purchased as weather conditions in some areas interfered with home-production programs, or for the influence that the purchase of a larger than usual proportion of the food supply at retail outlets had on the family's attitude toward the worth of farm-furnished products.

\section*{Reliability of Data}

The completeness and reliability of all types of schedules were insured by various procedures adopted for field collection, and for editing and tabulating the data. r'ield agents were carefully trained before they began to interview families. The work of each interviewer was checked by a supervisor. One out of eight or ten
families interviewed was visited a second time to determine whether the schedule was an authentic report. In addition, the families keeping food records were asked to verify ccrtain items on their expenditure schedules. This system of checking served to eliminate the invention of schedules on the part of agents.

Each schedule was subjected to careful editing for reasonableness and internal consistency first in the local collection office and later in a regional office. If a achedule was incomplete or inconsistent, the supervisor or field agent revisited the family to obtain the missing information. In general, no schedule was considered complete unless an entry was given for every item. A few schedules were accepted, however, in which expenditures for certain minor items were unknown if the total for the group of which the item was a part could be given. Expenditure schedules judged to be reliable were accepted for tabulation only if the total receipts and total disbursements balanced within 10 percent.

Supplementary schedules were rejected if circumstances made the week of the study an unusual rather than a normal one for the family. This was considered to be the case when either the husband or wife had fewer than 11 meals at home during the week, or when the entire family was absent from home 2 or more days of the week, or when the number of meals served to guests amounted to one-fourth or more of the total number of meals served to all household members. Schedules were considered incomplete or of doubtful accuracy, and hence were returned to the field office for verification or rejection, if the food supply as reported furnished less than half of the estimated energy ren!urements of the family, or if entries were entirely lacking for some major class of food, such as grain products or fats. Unless the points in question could be verified, schedules also were rejected if entries appeared unreasonably high, suggesting that purchases rather than consumption had inadvertently been reported.

The data furnished by the supplementary schedules on quantities of major groups of food consumed probably are fairly representative of customary consumption among the families studied. Less reliance can be placed on figures for individual food items classified under each major group because not all individual articles of foods are consumed in any given 7 -day period; every week there are many alternates between which a family may choose both in purchases at the market and in selections from farm-furnished products. In addition, there are weeks of seasonal abundance of individual foods which may give undue prominence to some article when the study of consumption covers only a 7 -day period. The time of the heaviest record collection differed somewhat from one farm section to another (see p. 371 ).

The data obtained by the use of food check lists and food records represent consumption in the economic rather than in the strictly physiological sense. The figures show what was available for consumption, but not what actually was eaten. No attempt was made to obtain information regarding food spoilage or food waste although, of course, food produced or purchased primarily as foed for pets, chicks, or domestic animals was excluded. In evaluating the nutritive content of the diet, account was taker of inedible refuse, such as bones, peelings, egg shellis, or fruit pits, to the extent of average figures on composition. Under some circumstances these average figures may be too low to represent farm household practices. This point is discussed also in the section on nutritive value of diets.

In intcrpreting the relationship between expenditures or consumption of food and income, it should be recalled that the basis of income classification in this study was a single year's net income. Both income and expenditure data applied to the same 12 -month period, called the report year.

Outlays for living made by families on farms and by those from entrepreneurial groups in cities and villages are not likely to follow directly the year-to-year fluctuations in income; probably they are much more closely related to average income over a period of some years than to that of a single year. If the group of families in an income class is large, this element of variation probably does not affect average expenditures except in the lowest income classes, and in communjties where the year of the study was out of the ordinary for all families. In each income class above the lowest there will be found some families whose incomes for the year were higher than usual that chose to fit their expenditures to their usual income and spend less than do families that customarily live at this level; on the other hand, there will be found others, whose incomes were lower than usual, that chose to keep their outlays for living at the height to which they were accustomed, i. e, above that of the income class in which they temporarily found themselves. These two deviations probably tend to balance in income classes above the lowest.

In the lowest income classes, however, such a balancing of the high and low variations does not take place since there is obvionsly a limit below which family spending cannot fall if life is to be maintained. Average expenditures in the jowest income class, therefore, are biased unduly by the outlays of families that were living on a pattern of higher income levels. Moreover, because of the exclusion of relief familics and certain other low-income groups from the study of consumption, schedules were obtained from a relatively small number of families with incomes uncler \(\$ 250\) and in the class \(\$ 250-\$ 499\). (See p 353., The Consumption Saruple in Relation to the Total Population, for a discussion of excluded groups.) The expenditures of a few atypical families (those accustomed to higher incomes) therefore exert considerable influence on the average expenditures of these small samples. As a consequence, the average expenditures for the entire group of farnilies at the lower end of the income distribution often are not representative of the lowest levels of expenditures found in the population groups studied; they are a composite both of (a) the expenditures of families that are in a low-income class for a single year because of temporary reverses, but that have resources enabling them to live at a level materially higher than current income would permit; and of (b) the expenditures of families whose incomes have been low over a long period, and whose resources are meager so that they must fit consumption patterns rather closely to net receipts.

These facts explain why the data in the lowest income classes are not used in the text in discussions of trends in consumption with income, or in interunit comparisons.

\section*{The Variable Report Period}

\section*{The 12-Month Schedules}

The period covered by the survey cannot be defined exactly. Each family that supplied facts on income and expenditures was left frec to choose for its report a continuous 12 -month period, beginning not carlicr than January 1935 and ending not later than December 1936. The period of sehedule collection in a community affected the dates chosen by families. Many preferred to give information for the year ending only a few weeks before the date of interview; others, interviewed late in 1936, still preferred 1935, because of availability of data from their business records and household accounts. Obviously, families in the communities in which field work was concluded in the summer of 1936 had less choice of a period for the report year than those interviewed in December (table 71).

The proportion of reports applying to the calendar year 1935 ranged among the analysis units from 39 percent in Mlinois and lowa to 94 percent in North and South Carolina. Except in the Illinois-Iowa sample, fewer than 14 percent of the reports related to periods ending June 1936 , or later.

Wlether a 12 -month difference between two alalysis units with respect to the periods covered by the majority of the reports is of major or only minor consequence in a study such as this depends upon the economic conditions prevailing during the two periods. Consumption patterns of families at a given income level in a farming section may differ appreciably in 2 consecutive years if there are marked changes in the general price level or if a large number of the group suffer a marked change in income due to local crop conditions. Although in certain sections differences in gross farm income in the 2 years were appreciable, national income from agriculture and the index numbers for prices paid by farm families for maintenance were sufficiently similar during 1935 and 1936 to justify the assumption that appreciable shifts in consumption patterns of farm families the country over would not have occurred during the period. (See Appraisal in regional volumes on Family Income and Expenditurcs, Part 1, Farm Series.)

An unusual event during the period, namely the distribution of the soldiers' bonus, may have cxerted considerable influence on family expenditures in the months covered by the study. The families whose outlays were affected by the bonus payment influenced the level of average expenditures of the entire group. This effect probably was distributed unequally among the expenditure items, since it is reasonable to assume that under such circumstances large single outhys, such as those for purchase of an automobile or an expensive piece of household equipment, would be frequent, and that the bonus probably would have more effect upon average expenditures for such eategories than upon those for an expenditure group such as food.

Table 71．－report year：Percentage distribution of families by date of end of report year， 19 analysis units in 20 States，\({ }^{2} 193.5-3 t\)
［Mourelief farm fatuilies that include a husband and wife，both native－born］
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Region and analysis unit &  &  &  &  & 愹 &  &  &  & 号：第 & 令 & 咨 & 空 \\
\hline New england & Pct． & Pct． & Pct． & Pct． & Pet． & Pd． & Pct． & Pct． & Pci．Pct． & Pct． & Pci． & fld． \\
\hline Vermont & 64 & （＊） & （2） & 2 & 6 & 20 & 1 & （？） & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline MidDIE ATLANTIC AND NORTH ctNTHAL & & & & & & & & &  & & & \\
\hline New Jersey & 59 & 1 & 2 & 6 & 7 & 13 & 2 & 2 & 1． 1 & 6 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Pennsylvania－Ohio & 51 & （3） & （3） & 3. & 4 & 7 & （\％） & 0 & 1 （2） & （2） & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Michigan－W isconsin & （i＊） & （3） & 3 & 1 & 2 & 17 & （2） & 1 & 51 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Illinois－Iowa． & 39 & （＊） & 14 & 5 & 2 & \(\checkmark\) & \(\left({ }^{2}\right)\) & \(\left({ }^{(2)}\right.\) & （－） 2 & 12 & （3） & 18 \\
\hline plains and mountain & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Dakota－Kansas．． & 85 & （3） & 2 & 5 & 1. & 2 & 1 & （ \({ }^{3}\) & 1 （3） & 3 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline rado． & 73 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 16 & 3 & 0 & 0． 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline FACIFIC & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Washington－Oregon． & 46 & （2） & （2） & 6 & 7 & 28 & （c） & （2） & 1． 5 & 7 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Oregon－part－time & 50 & （2） & 1 & 4 & 9 & 36 & 3 & （ \({ }^{(2)}\) & 1.3 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline California． & 76 & 0 & \(\because\) & 2 & 4 & 11 & （－） & 0 & （2）（2） & 2 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline SOUTHEAST & & & & & & & & & ！ & & & \\
\hline White operators & & & & & & & & & ＋ & & & \\
\hline North Carolina selmefficms & & & & & & & & & － & & & \\
\hline counties．．．．．．．．．．．． & \(\times 0\) & （ \({ }^{2}\) ） & （：） & 1 & & & 0 & 0 & （\＃） 1 & & （ \({ }^{2}\) ） & 0 \\
\hline North Cerolina－Enuth Crarolina & 4 & 1 & （2） & 1 & （3） & （2） & 0 & 0 & 0 （ \({ }^{2}\) ） & 3 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline Georgia－Mississiproi－．．．．．．．． & 85 & （i） & 9 & （：） & （－） & 3 & （－） & v & （3）（（ ） & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline White sharecropuers & & & ！ & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carulina－Routh Carolina． （ieurgia－Mississippi & 98
8.3 & （ \({ }_{\text {（i）}}\) & 12 & 1 & 01 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0
0
0 & （－）\({ }^{+}\) & 0 & \\
\hline Geurgia－illississipri & \[
83
\] & 4 & 12 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 ： 0 & （－） & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Aegro operators & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carolina－South Carolina & 86 & 0 & （2） & & （） & & （） & 0 & \(0 \quad 0\) & 13 & \({ }^{1}\) & （ \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline Georgia－Mississimpi－．－．－．－．－．．．－ & 72 & 6 & 14 & （＊） & （\％） & 0 & & 0 & 0 0 & 9 & 0 & （3） \\
\hline Negro sharpcreppeers & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline North Carnlina－Suath Carulima． & 94 & （＊） & & 1 & 0 & & & ， & 0 ） 0 & E & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Georgia－Mississippi．．．－．．．．．．．．．．． & 69 & & 24 & （＊） & 1 & （2） & （2） & ， & 0 （ \({ }^{\circ}\) & & 0 & （ \({ }^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Includes farilies in the consumption sammle，See Cllossary for definitions of terms used in this table． ？ 0,50 percent or less．

\section*{The 7－Day Supplementary Food Schedules}

The 7 －day period covered by a supplementary food schedule was determined chicily by the date of interview．The food check lists gencrally pertained to the week immediately preceding the interview，and the food record to some week shortly afterward，when appointments could be made for the visits of the special food－record agent to assist the homemaker with inventories of stacks of food on hand，to give instructions fur keeping the record，and to supervise entries．The proportion of supplementary schedules obtained during each month covered by field work is shown in table 72．E＇arlier in this spetion，there has been a brief discussion of the possible influence upon consumption of the uneven seasonal dis－ tribution of schedules，of variations in the relative abundance of different kinds of food on the farm and in the markets，and of consequent shifts in farm and retail prices of food．

Bceause relatively few supplementary schedules were obtained during winter months，appendix tatles showing quantities of food consumed as reported on food check lists，present only the results obtained by pooling data from schedules collected from March through November 1936．Such figures，of course，cannot be used for regional or national estimates of consumption for any item or groups of
items the consumption of which has a definite seasonal trend, without adjustment for this factor; this point should be considered in addition to those discussed on page 368 that are applicable to the study as a whole. Differences in consumption of important food groups during four 3-month periods in a year are shown in table 12 for check-list data from two units, and in tables 59 to 63 inclusive for two 6 month periods for food-record data.

Table 72--month of collection: Distribution of supplementary food schedules by month of collection, 5 analysis units in 20 States, \({ }^{1} 1936-37\)
[Households of nonrelief farm farnilies that inciude a husbund and wife, both native-born]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Month of collection} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{New Tngland, Nidrile Atlantic, and North Central}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Plains, Morn- } \\
& \text { tain, and } \\
& \text { Pacific }^{2}
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Southeast} \\
\hline & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{White operators} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{White sharecroppers} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Negro families} \\
\hline & Food check lists & Food & Food check lists & Food records \({ }^{3}\) & Food check lists & Food
records & Food check lists & Food records & Food check lists & Food records \\
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|r|}{3936 Percent Percent Percent Percent Percent Percent Parcent Percent Percent Percent} \\
\hline March & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percent \\
(1)
\end{tabular} & Percent & Percent & Percent & Percent & Percent & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percent \\
( \({ }^{\text {( })}\)
\end{tabular} & Percent
0
0 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percent \\
( \({ }^{1}\) )
\end{tabular} & Perceml \\
\hline April & \begin{tabular}{|c}
3 \\
18 \\
\hline 1
\end{tabular} & & \(\stackrel{2}{5}\) & & & 0
0 & 1
6 & 0
0 & 1
9 & 0 \\
\hline Jurie & 21 & 11 & 14 & 6 & 19 & 4 & 12 & 0 & 13 & 3 \\
\hline July & 17 & 24 & 16 & 9 & 17 & 8 & 21 & 3 & 14 & i \\
\hline August & 10 & 28 & 24 & 8 & 13 & 14 & 16 & 19 & 10 & 23 \\
\hline September. & 9 & 8 & 15 & 31 & 10 & 26 & 11 & 24 & 16 & 17 \\
\hline Ontober-.- & 7 & 7 & 11 & 21 & 9 & 24 & 10 & 18 & 12 & 21 \\
\hline Noverrmer- & 4
4 & 8 & 8
3 & \({ }_{11} 1\) & 7
8 & 11 & \({ }_{7}^{6}\) & 14 & 7 & 10 \\
\hline December. & 4 & 4 & 3 & 11 & 6 & 7 & 7 & 14 & 7 & 11 \\
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{1937} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{4}{*}{}} & \multirow{4}{*}{,} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{2
0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{0
0
0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{6
4
1
0} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{4
2
0
0
0} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{(4) \(\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 3 \\ & 0\end{aligned}\)} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{5
4
1
0} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{7
4} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
10 \\
4 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & (4) & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Nee Clossary for definitions of terms used in this table. Families of white operators only were stadied in all regions except the Southeast where special studies of sharecroppers and Negroes were made. Sce Methedology for the States and counties studied in each region. Percentages in this table are based on the number of schedules collected during all months.
: Orefon-part-time schedules not included in either sample.
\({ }^{3}\) Includes schedrules from the Pacific region only.
- 0.50 percent or less.

\section*{Measurement of Household Size in Dietary Analyses}

Direct comparisons of food consumption between one family or group of families and another are complicated by differences in the number of persons eomprising the housebolds and differences in such characteristics of the constituent members, as age, height, sex, body build, and physical activity. For some phases of this study comparisons can be made between families with approximately the same number of persons in various age, sex, and activity classes. But for others, especially data from food records, it has been necessary to resort to devices for equating different families or groups of families before comparing consumption. This has been done by determining the number of "units" to which each family is equivalent with respect to specific criteria, and then reducing total family consumption figures to consumption per unit.

\section*{Week-Equivalent Persons}

To determinc the number of persons to which each household furnishing supplementary food schedules was equivalent, the total number of meals served to all persons during the week was divided by 21 , since in this country 21 meals is the usual number served to each person. Meals for an entire week were expressed as this number, even though the food was apportioned into more than 21 servings for infants and invalids, or fewer than 21 for persons habitually not eating breakfast or lunch. Lunches purchased and eaten away from home were not counted
as family meals but were recorded separately. This procedure made it possible to adjust for meals eaten away from home by household members, as well as for meals served at home to guests or boarders. In this computation, based only on the number of meals, each individual, regardless of age or activity, was considered equally important insofar as food consumption was concerned.

The chief use made of household size in terms of week-equivalent persons was in determining the average per capita consumption of various articles or groups of food in the tabulation of supplementary schedules. These averages were obtained by dividing aggregate consumption for the week by the number of equivalent persons comprising the household, or other consuming group. Data on the consumption of food on a per capita basis are satisfactory for comparisons between large population groups composed of similar proportions of children and adults. For groups dissimilar in the ratio of children and adults, such figures are not comparable when they refer to commodities that are consumed more largely by persons in some age groups than in others.

\section*{Food-Expenditure Units}

Since it costs more to feed adults than infants and more to feed young people in the teen age than moderately active adults, the money value of a farnily's food is affected by the age and activity of the household members as well as by their number. In order to compare the money value of food among families differing in size and age composition, investigators often compute the number of moderately active men (units) that could be fed for the amounts spent for the food of the family. By dividing the aggregate money value of food for each family by the number of units to which the family is equivalent, the money value per unit may be computed.

To compute the number of expenditure units to which a family is equivalent, it is necessary to know the relative money value of the food of persons differing in age, size, and activity. For this study, these relatives were estimated from the money value of food budgets for different individuals spriced according to June-August 1936 retail food prices. The estimated money value of the food of a moderately active man (about \(\$ 2.40\) a weck) was taken as the unit, and figures for persons of other age, sex, and activity were expressed in terms of ratios to this value. Two scales of relatives were developed-a detailed one for the 7 -day supplementary schedules (both check lists and food records) and a condensed one for the 12 -month expenditure schedules.

The scale of relatives used in conjunction with 7-day schedules was as follows:
Equivatents in
expenditure units

Age group:
\[
75 \text { years or older: } 1
\]

Moderately active.
Active 20-74 years:

Moderately active
Active
\({ }^{21} .00\)
1. 12
1. 14
1. 12

14-15 years
1. 07
1. 03
. 98
12 years
11 years .95
9 years. ..... 91
8 years ..... 87
7 years ..... 80
6 years ..... 73
5 years ..... 65
4 years ..... 61
Women
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Men & Women \\
and \\
and \\
gitls
\end{tabular}
gitls
0.85 . 90
. 92
1. 00
1. 01
1. 01
. 97
. 93
. 90
.88
.84
.79
. 73
.67
.63
. 60


. 58
1 year----.-----..----------------------------- . 54
. 55

. 54
.51

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{4}\) Stiereling, Hazel K, and Phipard, Esther F. dietg of families of employed wage earnehs and clerical wobkers in cities. U. S. Dept. Agt. Cír. 507: 7, 1939.
}

The condensed modification of this scale used for the 12 -month schedules of the consumption sample is shown below:
Person and age group:
Members of economic family:
20 years or older: Equizalents in expenditure units

City and village
1. 0


Under 6 years----------------------------------------- 6
Other members of household:
Boarders, guests (overnight or longer), and paid household help
1. 0

Nurse for sick 9

The number of meals served to each individual in the household was multiplied by the appropriate factor for that individual shown in the pertinent scale, and the products added to obtain total number of equivalent food-expenditure unit-meals for the household. The aggregate money value of food divided by this total gives the money value of food per food-expenditure unit-meal. The resulting figure - on a meal, day, or week basis-has been used in this report as a measure of the level of money value of food.

\section*{Nutrition Units}

Just as it is more precise to compare food expenditures of two families or groups of families, differing in size and age composition, on a food expenditure-unit basis rather than on a family or per capita basis, so also it is more precise to judge the nutritive content of diets of two dissimilar groups on some basis that will tend to equate nutritive needs. The problem is complex, however, because human requirements for the several nutrients change at differing rates during the life cycle, and changes are not always in the same direction. For example, a child of 2 years may require only one-third as many calories as a moderately active man of average size, but at the same time he may require twice as much calcium. As many separate scales of equivalents are nceded for determining family size in terms of adult units as there are nutrients to be studied.

In developing scales of nutrition-equivalents, the task was to set reasonable dietary allowances for individuals differing in age, sex, and activity for each separate nutrient, and then to find for each nutrient the ratio existing between the allowances for persons differing in age, sex, or activity and the allowance for a moderately active 70 -kilogram man. Dietary allowances for various nutrients do not rest on the same amount of experimental evidence. Requirements for food energy, for example, have been studied more extensively than those for minerals. Requirements for vitamins have been least explored, although more deeply for some vitamins than for others. Some of the factors involved in setting dietary allowances have been discussed in a previous publication. \({ }^{\text {b }}\)

\footnotetext{
© Stifbeling, Hazel K., add Phipard, Esther F. ditets of families of employed wage earners and ClERICAL WORKEHS IN CITIEs. U. S. Dept. Agr. Oir. jijr, 141 pp. 1939.
}

The relatives used in this study for determining family size in terms of equivalent nutrition units are given below for several nutrients:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Equivalents in nutrition units & Equinglents in nulrition units \\
\hline Nutrient and sex-age groun: & Nutrient and sex-age group-Continued \\
\hline Protein: & Boy, \(7-10\) years; girl, \(8-13\) \\
\hline Adult, 20 years or older \(\ldots\) - 1.0 & years_--..-------.-.-. . 90 \\
\hline Boy, 9-19 years; girl, 11-19 years & \begin{tabular}{l}
Boy, 4-6 years \({ }^{-1}\) girl, 4-7 \\
years
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Boy, 7-8 years; girl, 8-10 & Child, under 4 years \(-\ldots-\ldots .75\) \\
\hline years -----....---..... 1.0 & Thiamin (vitamin \(\mathrm{B}_{1}\) ) : \\
\hline Boy, 4-6 years; girl, 4-7 & Adult, 20 years or oider....- 1.00 \\
\hline years \(\ldots\)-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-- . 8 & Boy, 16-19 years.........-.- 1.20 \\
\hline Child, under 4 years........ . 7 & Boy, 13-15 years \(-\ldots . . .-\ldots\) - 1.00 \\
\hline Calcium: & Boy, 11-12 years; girl, 14-19 \\
\hline Man, 20 years or older_..... 1.0 & ycars------.-.---- . 83 \\
\hline Woman, 20 years or older... 1.3 & Boy, 9-10 years; girl. 11-13 \\
\hline Child, under 20 years.-.-.-- I. 5 & years--------------- . 80 \\
\hline Phosphorus: & Boy, 7-8 years; girl, 8-10 \\
\hline Adult, 20 years or older....- 1. 0 & years_--..-------------- . 70 \\
\hline Boy, 13-19 years..-- 1.0 & oy, 4-6 years; girl, 4-7 \\
\hline Boy, 9-12 years; girl, 11-19 years &  \\
\hline & Ascorbic acid (vitamin C) : \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Boy, 4-8 years; girl, 4-10 \\

\end{tabular} & Adult, 20 years or older. . . - 1. 00 \\
\hline Child, under 4 years.------- 8 & Boy, 16-19 years.--------- 1. 20 \\
\hline Iron: & Boy, 13-15 years_--.-.-1. 1. 00 \\
\hline Iron:
Adult, 20 years or older_-.- 1.0 & Boy, 11-12 years; girl, 14-19 \\
\hline Boy, 13.19 years.........-1. 0 & Boy, 9-10 years; girl, 11-13 \\
\hline Boy, 11-12 years; girl, 14-19 & years.-.-........-. . 80 \\
\hline years --....-.- 9 & Boy, 4-8 years; girl, 4-10 \\
\hline Boy, \(9-10\) years; girl, 11-13 years.--------.-.......... . 8 & Years_-------7. 70 \\
\hline Boy, \(7-8\) years; girl, \(8-10\) & Ribofavin: \\
\hline years & Adult, 20 years or older _ ... 1.00 \\
\hline Boy, 4-6 years; girl, 4-7 years & Boy, 11-19 years; girl, 14-19 \\
\hline Child, under 4 years------------ 4 & Boy 7-10 years: girl 8-13 \\
\hline Vitamin \(A\) value: & years.-.-.-.-. . 90 \\
\hline Adult, 20 years or older _..- 1. 00 & Boy, 4-6 years; girl, 4-7 \\
\hline Boy, 11-19 y ears; girl, 11-19 & years...---..-.---..--- . 75 \\
\hline years---------------1.00 & Chiid, under 4 years........ . 75 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The fact that the same relative allowance is assigned to groups of persons representing a wide age range indicates something of the approximate and often arbitrary character of the scales of cquivalents. The order of magnitude represented by unity is shown by the following figures, although too much significance should not be attached to the exact values: Protein, 60 to 75 grams; calcium, 0.68 gram; phosphorus, 1.32 grams; iron, 15 milligrams; vitamin A value, 6,000 International Units; thiamin (vitamin \(\mathrm{B}_{1}\) ), 1.5 to 2.0 milligrams; ascorbic acid (vitamin C), 60 to 75 milligrams; riboflavin, 1.5 to 2.0 milligrams. These values allow some margin of safety over probable average minimum needs for each nutrient, but the margins probably are not equally generons for all. The allowances for the moderately active man and the relatives for other persons will require revision as the knowledge of human requirements grows, and with each marked revision, household size and the average nutritive content of the diets per nutrition unit should be recomputed.

Two scales for determining household size in terms of food-energy units have been used: (1) The Bureau of Home Economics scale, shown in table 73, and (2) the International scale, proposed in 1932 by a committee of experts meeting under the auspices of the League of Nations.?

\footnotetext{
i teagtif of Nations, Health Orgamisation. conference of experts for tile sidndardisation OF CERTAIN MFTHODS USED IN MAKING DIETAHY STLDES, HELD IN ROME ON SEPTEMBER 2ND AND 3RD, 1932 . Health Organ. Quart, Bull. 1; 477-483. 1932.
}

The latter scale is based on a value of unity of 3,000 calories, gross, or 2,700 caiories, net. The cocfficients used in the International seale for individuals of different age and sex are as follows:
Age or sex group:
Under 2 ycars
Unit
23 years
0. 2
4-5 years
3
6-7 years
.4
8-9 years
Age or sex group-Continued:
Unit
10-11 years_..-.-....-.--- 0.7
12-13 years-.-.--------- . . 8
14-59 years, male_......- 1. 0
\(14-59\) years, female.---.- . 8
60 years or older..-.-.-. . . 8

In general, caloric allowances are set fairly close to probable requirements, as indicated by the usual food intake of healthy persons. No addition is made for a margin of safety, as in the case of proteins, minerals, and vitamins, since there is believed to be no advantage and some distinct disadvantages in a surplus of calories. The discussions of average values for food energy per unit in this publication are confined to computations based on the Bureau's scale for foodenergy equivalents, because this scale is believed to reflect more closely than the International scale the food-energy needs of persons living under American conditions. Household size in terms of the International scale of units is included in tables referring to food-energy values, however, in order to make possible direct comparisons of these data with results of studies of other countries.

Table 73.-scale of relatives for food-energy allowances: Suggested daily allowances and Bureau of Home Economics scale of equivalents
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Description of individual} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Suggested allowances} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Food-energy equiv. ajents} \\
\hline Sex, age, and activity & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{A verage height} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average weight} & & \\
\hline Men, 20-59 years \({ }^{\text {- }}\) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Inchess } \\
68
\end{gathered}
\] & Centimeters 173 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Pounds } \\
154
\end{gathered}
\] & Kilograms 70 & Net calories & Units \\
\hline Moderately active work & & & & & 3.000 & 1.00 \\
\hline Very active work. & & & & & 4,500 & 1. 50 \\
\hline Active work & & & & & 3,900 & 1. 30 \\
\hline Light work.... & & & & & 2,700
2,400 & .90
.80 \\
\hline Wornen, 20 -59 years \(1 . . .\). & 64 & 163 & 132 & 60 & & \\
\hline Moderately active work & & & & & 2,500 & . 83 \\
\hline Very active work. & & & & & \(3,0 \subset 0\) & 1.00 \\
\hline Active work. & & & & & 2,700 & . 90 \\
\hline Sight work Sedentary work & & & & & 2,300
2,100 & .77
.70 \\
\hline Boys \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & & & & & & . 70 \\
\hline 16-19 years. & 68 & 173 & 139 & \({ }^{63}\) & 3,600 & 1.20 \\
\hline 13-15 years & 63 & 160 & 111 & 50 & 3,000 & 1. 00 \\
\hline 11-12 years. & 57 & 115 & 82 & 4 & 2,500 & . 83 \\
\hline 9 9-10 years & 53
49 & 135 & 68
55 & 31
25 & 2,400
2 & .80 \\
\hline \({ }_{4}^{7.8} 4\) years. & 49
42 & 125 & 55
40 & 25
18 & 2, 100
1,500 & .70
.50 \\
\hline Girls: & & & & & & \\
\hline 14-19 years.. & 64 & 163 & 121 & 55 & 2,500 & . 83 \\
\hline 11-13 years & 58 & 147 & 89 & 40 & 2, 400 & . 80 \\
\hline \(8-10\) years. & 52 & 132 & 64 & 29 & 2,100 & . 70 \\
\hline 47 years & 42 & 107 & 39 & 18 & 1,500 & . 50 \\
\hline Children under 4 years & 35 & 89 & 29 & 13 & 1, 200 & . 40 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
I A reduction of about 10 percent was made in caloric allowances for persons between the ages of 60 and 75 , and of about 20 percent for those over 75 years. Some adjustments according to a sliding scale were also made for persons in each group whose height was alove or below average.
}

The computation of the number of adult nutrition units to which a family is equivalent is illustrated by the following example, referring to energy requirements:
Equivalents in
food-energy
Family member:
units




Total-----------------------------------------------3. 13

Thus, a family of four persons is considered equivalent to only 3.13 moderately active men so far as energy requirements are concerned. Usually the average number of food-energy units to which a family is equivalent is smaller than the number of persons; hence the energy values of diets are higher when expressed on a food-energy-unit basis than on a per capita basis. This is generally the case for most nutrients other than calcium.

The total content of the diet in food-energy value or in a specific nutrient divided by the number of nutrition units to which the family is equivalent with respect to food energy or the specific nutrient, gives the average nutritive value per nutrition unit, as shown in the various text tables.

\section*{Classification of Foods}

A consistent classification of food items facilitates comparisons of food expenditures and consumption from one study to another. The classification adopted in this study is similar to that used in previous studies of this Bureau and is based on the similarity of foods both as sources of important nutrients, and as products of different agricultural and processing enterprises. Insofar as there are differences in the classifications used in the analysis of data from the two types of supplementary schedules, the first consideration was given more weight in the analysis of food records; the second, in the analysis of the check lists.

The chief difference in the classification followed in the analysis of data from the two schedules was with respect to fruit and vegetables (apart from potatoes, mature legumes, and dried products). In the analysis of food records, the nutritionally important leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, tomatoes, and citrus fruit have been separated from other fruit and vegetables, without distinguishing whether they were fresh or canned products. In the check lists, the emphasis has been placed on whether fruit and vegetables were fresh or canned, without distinguishing between their inherent nutritive qualities.

The following list shows the main headings, with examples, used in the classification of data from food records:

\section*{Eggs.}

Milk and milk products other than butter:
Milk:
Fluid-whole, skim, buttermilk.
Evaporated and condensed.
Dried.
Cheese.
Cream.
Ice cream and milk custards.
Fats:
Butter.
Table fats othor than butter.
Oils, salad and cooking oil, mayomaise and salad dressings.
Lard and other shortenings, including rendered animal fats, vegetable shortenings, and compounds.
Bacon, salt side, suet, and other fatty tissues.
Meats and poultry, fresh, cured, canned:
Beef.
Veal.
Mutton and lamb.
Pork (exclusive of bacon, salt side, and lard).
Miscellaneous meat products, including sausages, lunch meats, liver, kidney, heart, tripe.
Poultry and game.
Fish and sea food, fresh, canned, preserved.
Sugars:
Sugars, granulated, powdered, loaf, white, brown, maple.
Sirups, cane, corn, maple and sorghum; molasses; honey; and candies.
Freserves, jellies, jams, marmalades, and candied fruits.

Grain products:
Bread and other baked goods.
Bread, white, whole wheat, rye.
Crackers.
Cakes, cookies, rolls, other baked goods.
Ready-to-eat cereals.
Flour, other cereals, and cereal products:
Flours and meals, including wheat, rye, and prepared flours, and corn meal.
Uncooked cereals, as hominy grits, rice, oatmeal, farinas, tapioca.
Pastes, as macaroni, spaghetti, noodles.
Vegetables and fruits, fresh, canned, cooked:
Potatoes and sweetpotatoes, including yams.
Green-colored and leafy vegetables, as green asparagus, broccoli, cabbage, lettuce and other salad plants, okra, green peppers, snap beans, spinach and other greens.
Yellow-colored vegetables (except sweetpotatoes), as carrots, pumpkin, yellow squash, pimiento, red peppers.
Tomatoes, whole, juice, puree, pastes.
Other vegetables, as beets, cauliflower, bleached celery, corn, cucumber, eggplant, mushrooms, onions, parsnips, radishes, turnips, white squash.
Citrus fruit.
Other fruits, as apples, apricots, avocados, bananas, berries, cantaloup, cherries, grapes, peaches, pineapple, plums, prunes, rhubarb, watermelon.
Vegetables and fruits, dried:
Vegetables, as dried corn.
Fruits, as dried apples, apricots, dates, figs, peaches, prunes, raisins.
Mature legumes:
Dry, as beans, peas, cowpeas, soybeans, lentils.
Canned and cooked, as pork and beans, baked beans.
Nuts:
In shell.
Shelled, including prepared coconut, peanut butter.
Miscellaneous:
Soups and other food mixtures, as meat-, fish-, or cereal-containing products. and prepared desserts.
Beverages, flavorings, and leavening agents, including coffee, tea, cocoa, chocolate, bottled beverages, salt, spices, yeast, soda, and baking powder.

\section*{Reports of the Study}

The reports of the study of consumer purchases published by the Bureau of Home Economics cover the communities for which this agency had the responsibility for the survey except for certain small citics. This Bureau surveyed two cities in the Northeast-Greenfield, Mass., and Westbrook, Maine-for which it presents only income data. Data concerning family expenditures in these cities are presented by the Bureau of Labor Statistics along with those for Wallingford and Willimantic, Conn., which it surveyed. In turn, the Bureau of Home Economics presents expenditure data for certain small cities surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statisties-two in the Southeast, Gastonia, N. C., and Albany, Ga., and one in the Plains and Mountain region, Billings, Mont.

The reports in the series published by the Bureau of Home Economics fall in two groups: (1) Those presenting data concerning family income and the summary of expenditures. The reports of this group are in two parts-part 1, family income, family composition, occupation and, for city and village families, rents paid and rental values of owned homes; and part 2, a summary of expenditures for the major consumption categories. (2) Those presenting details of expenditures for specific commodities.

378 MISC. PLBBLICATION 405 , L. S. DEPr. OF AGRICULTUTE
The publications included in these two groups of reports are as follows:
(1) lncome and expenditure summary:

Urban and village series:
Part 1, Income, family composition, and housing:
Pacific region. Misc. Pub. 339, 380 pp., illus. 1940.
Plains and Mountain region. Misc. Pub. 345, 330 pp., illus. 1939.
Middle Atlantic and North Central region and New England region. Mise. Pub. 370, 447 pp., illus. 1940.
Southeast region. Misc. Pub. 375, 390 pp., illus. 1940.
Part 2, Summary of expenditures:
Five regions. Mise. Pub. 396, 410 pp., illus. 1940.
Farm series:
Part 1, Income and family composition:
Pacific region and Plains and Mountain region. Mise. Pub, 356, 276 pp., illus. 1939.
Middle Atlantic, North Central, and New England regions. Mise. Pub. 383, 259 pp., illus. 1940.
Southeast region. Misc. Pub. -, - pp., illus. -.
Part 2, Surmmary of expenditures:
Five regions. Misc. Pub. -. - pp., illus. -.
(2) Expenditure detail:

Family Housing and Facilities-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm. Misc. Pub. 399, 223 pp., illus. 1941. Family Expenditures for Medieal Care-

Five regions, urban, village, and farm. Misc. Pub. 402, 241 pp., illus. 1941.
Family Expenditures for Automobile and Other Transportation-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm. Misc. Pub. 415, 272 pp., illus. 1941.
Family Expenditures for Household Furnishings and Equipment-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm.
Family Expenditures for Education, Reading, Recreation, and Tobacco-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm.
Family Expenditures for Personal Care, Gifts, Taxes, and Miscellaneous Items-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm.
Changes in Assets and Liabilities of Families-
Five regions, urban, village, and farm.
Family Food Consumption and Dietary Levels- -
Five regions, urban and village series.
Five regions, farm series. Mise. Pub. 405, 393 pp., illus. 1941.
Family Expenditures for Clothing-
Five regions, urban and village series.
Five regions, farm series.
Family Expenditures for Housing and Household Operation-
Five regions, urban and village series.
Five regions, farm series.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline vII. FALUE Of PRODUCTS FURNISHED BY FARM FOR FAMILY'S OWN UBE durlag echedile gent & Total valus Jot yerr \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1. Mink for drinking and cooklng:} \\
\hline & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2. Cream for table use and for butter:} \\
\hline Quarts per weel & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
3. Eggs: \\
Fall and winter:
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Dozen per week & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Number of weekt \(\qquad\) \\
Spring and sumnier: \\
Dozen per week \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
4. Poultry for meat: \\
Winter and kpring: \\
Nurather per month \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Nimber of months \\
Bummer and fall: \\
Number per month
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline Number of months & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{5. Pork, Aressed welght:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Pounda for year.-.....................} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{6. Other meats, dressed weight:} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Pounds for year \(\qquad\) \\
7. Potatoes (white): \\
Bushels for year. \(\qquad\)
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{8. Value of other food from farm garden.-} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{9. Value of fruits..........n-....................} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{10. Value of other food (eirups, grain producte, etc.) \(\qquad\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{11. Yalue of fuel_} \\
\hline 12. Value of other product (wool, to. bacco, etc.). & \\
\hline 13.1 Totalı........ & \$...................... \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Family Income Schedule, Section VIII.
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VII. FODD

USUAL EXPENGE FOR FODD AT HOME DLRING EACH BEASON OF SCHEDULE YEAR


Expenditure Schedule, Section VIII.
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Tho informetfon regueated in thin echodule

 of the coopmiting agrncto and mell not be


Number peraons fo economic family
Occupation of husband
 Beef:

1, Bteak: Round
2. Slrloin.
3. Other
4. Pot roast: Rump
5. Cbuck
6. Lower round.
7. Roast: Loin
8. Rib.
9. Other
10. Bolling: Plate
11. Other
12. Ground
13. Liver
14. Comed beef
15. Dried beef
16. Other

\section*{Veal:}
17. Chopa
18. Cutlet.
10. Roant.
20. Btew.
21. Other.

Lamb:
22. Chopn
23. Leg.
24. Bresat
25. Chuck, Bhoulder.
28. Other.

Pork, freah;
27. Chopa
28. Loln roast.
29. Sausage.
30. Other

Pork 1 moked or cured:
31. Baeon: Sliced.
32.
U. S. Departiment of AGriculture BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS in ceoreration with
NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE WORKS PROGRESS ADMIMISTRATION ANID DEPARTMENT OF LAMOR washinaton

STUDY OF CONSUMER PURCEASES
a pEDERAL FORES PROTECT
FOOD CONSEMRD dariat last 7 dags
(Check let)

Code No.
Expenditure Schadule No.
Town, viliage
County \(\qquad\) Itats
E. D. or M. C. D. \(\qquad\)

\section*{Agent}
\(\qquad\)
Date of
Interylew' ..........................-, 1038
Seyen days covered
-





\section*{U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE bureau of home economics \\ WASHINGTON}

Agent \(\qquad\) _.

Food Record No.
Information requested is confdential and giving it in voluntary, It will be seen only by aworn emploges of the Federal Government

\section*{RECORD OF FOOD CONSUMPTION FOR ONE WEEK \\ INVENTORY OF FOOD ON HAND}
KIND OF FOOD

\author{
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS wabrington
}

Agant \(\qquad\) Information reguested is conflential, and giving to ts boluntary. it will be seen only by suorn employees of the Federal Government

\section*{RECORD OF FOOD CONSUMPTION FOR ONE WEEK}

DAIIY RECORD OF FOOD BBOUGHT INTO THE HOUSE
Date
Day of weak


\section*{Appendix D. Glossary \({ }^{8}\)}

Analysis unit.-The schedules from a group of counties combinod for purposes of tabulation. In all regions schedules from farm families in a State or group of States were combined into units on the basis of geographic location of the farm section in which the family lived. In the Southeast, separate analysis units were established for Negro families and for white families, and also for families of farm operators and of sharecroppers. The number of communities combined to form a single analysis unit varied with the type of data presented and the number of cases needed to give reliable averages. Thus in the report on the food of farm families, there are as many as 33 analysis units presenting data on a 12 -month basis for food produced for household consumption, but only 4 presenting data on a 7 -day basis for the consumption of individual articles of food. (See Methodology, table 66.)

Cell.-A group of families of specified family type and occupation, at a specified income level. In the case of data from the food records, also, a group of families at a specified level of money value of food per food-expenditure unit.

Consumption sample.-See Methodology p. p. 351.
Diet, grade of.--See Grade of Diet.
Economic family.-A group of persons living in the same dwelling, sharing a common table, pooling incomes, and dependent upon family funds for most of their support. In addition to such persons living in the home, the economic family as defined for this study included sons and daughters who were away from home, yet dependent on the family income for at least 75 percent of their support. Sons or daughters living at home, who earned but paid nothing for room and board, and guests who lived in the household 27 weeks or longer during the year, making no payment for room or board, were considered family members. Information concerning the income and expenditures of all such members was required for an acceptable expenditure schedule.

The economic family did not, however, inciude related dependents living apart from the family, such as aged parents; sons in Civilian Conservation Corps; sons and daughters living at home who had separated their finances from those of the parents; or persons living in institutions at no expense to the family.

Eligibility requirements.-Characteristics which an economic family must have had in order to be included in the study. For enumeration of these requirements, see Methodology, Population Groups Included in the Farm Sample.

Expenditure schedule.-Schedule on which were recorded the amounts spent by all family members for food and other goods and services; quantities of certain items purchased and the prices paid; kind of housing facilities in the dwelling unit; ownership of automobiles and certain major types of household and recreational equipment; change in net worth; and other items. (See food section of expenditure schedule, p. 380 .)

Expenditures for family living.- Money expenditures incurred for family living, whether or not payment had been made. All items of expenditure were classified in 15 expenditure groups: Food; household operation; housing; furnishings and equipment; clothing; automobile; other travel and transportation; personal care: medical care; recreation; tobacco; reading; formal education; gifts, welfare, and selected taxes; and other items of family expenditure. (For items included in food group, see Food Expenditures.) Value of housing, food, fuel and ice, and clothing received without direct expenditure was not included. (See Value of Family Living.)

Family.-See Economic Family.
Family income.-See Income.
Family occupation.-See Occupational Classification.
Family-income schedule.-Schedule on which were recorded data on family and household composition during the report year; gross money receipts from farming; farm expenditures; net change in value of crops stored and livestock owned; tenure status; size and value of operated farm; money income of all family members from employment not pertaining to the farm enterprise, and money income from sources other than earnings; quantity and/or value of products furnished by the farm for family use; relief status. (See section on products furnished by farm for family's own use, family-income schedule, p. 379.)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{8}\) The Clossary is arranged alphabetically throughout except for terms used in the discussion of family type, farm type, household size, and income.
}

Family size (economic family).-See Family Type.
Family type.- In this study every family included both husband and wife, and many families included other family members. The classification of the economic family by family type was devised to take account not only of the number of persons in addition to husband and wife, but also of the distribution of these other persons in two age groups-those under 16 years, and those 16 or older.

Since not all persons were members of the economic family for the full 12 months covered by the study, classification as to family type was based on the number of year-equivalent persons. In determining the type of an individual family, the total number of weeks of membership for persons (other than husband and wife) was obtained for each of the two age groups (under 16, and 16 or older); these totals were divided by 52, and the quotients were rounded to the nearest whole numbers. The results are the numbers of year-equivalent persons represented in each age group.

In computing average size for a group of families, two methods of handling year-equivalents were used, as follows:

All members.-.The total number of weeks of membership of all members of families in the group was divided by 52 times the number of families in the group.

Members other than husband and wife, by age groups.-The sum of the number of year-equivalent persons under 16 years and of those 16 or older (computed separately for each family as described above) for all families in the group was divided by the number of families in the group.
Because in classifying families by type the number of year-equivalent persons was rounded to the nearest whole figure, families may have included persons who were present too short a time (aggregating fewer than 27 weeks) to affect classification. Families with additional members appeared frequently enough to aftect the average size of the group; for example, type-1 families (by definition, husband and wife only) may have averaged 2.02 instead of 2.00 year-equivalent persons.

The classification of a family as one of nine family types depended on the number and age grouping of persons other than husband and wife, as follows:


These nine types provided for the classification of all families included in the income sample. Only a partial analysis, however, has been made of data for the types least often found, 8 and 9 . The consumption sample included the first five types in all communities, and types 6 and 7 in some; consumption data (other than the home-produced food on farms obtained from income sample) were not obtained for types 8 and 9 in any community. (See Methodology, Combinations of Family-type Groups.)

Farm.-A plot of land outside the boundary limits of a city or village at least 3 acres in size, upon which farming operations were conducted. Plots less than 3 acres in size were included if the value of products sold or used by the family was \(\$ 250\) or more. To exelude suburban homes which were not farms, a further requirement was made that some money income from the sale of farm products must have been received, unless special circumstances such as crop failure existed to explain the absence of money income. This qualification wos not imposed in Edgecomb and Nash Counties, North Carolina, where self-sufficing farms predominate. (See Farm Type, Self-sufficing.) In the special study of part-time farming in Oregon, a property of less than 3 acres was classed as a farm if the value of products sold and used by the family was \(\$ 100\) or more.

Farm family income.-See Income.
Farm operator.-A person responsible for the farm enterprise, either performing the labor himself or directly supervising it. Salaried farm managers and wage-earning farm laborers were excluded. Sharecroppers in the Southeast region were distinguished from operators in all analyses as a separate occupational group. (See Sharecropper.)

Farm type. The classification of a farm either according to its predominant crop, or as part-time, or self-sufficing. A farm was classed as one of the product types listed below when receipts from sales of the products specified plus the value of the product paid as sbare rent were greater than receipts from sales of any other product and were equal to at least 40 percent of the sum of gross receipts from sales, value of farm products used by the family, and value of share rent.

Wheat.-Wheat, but not buckwheat.
Corn and small grain.-.Corn, oats, barley, rye, emmer, spelt, buck wheat, rice, flaxsced, grain sorghums. If not a wheat farm, wheat was included also.

Truck.-Potatoes, tomatoes, dry edible beans, and all other vegetables, rhubarb, watermelon, and cantaloup.
Fruit and nuts.- Small fruit, tree fruit, berries, and nuts.
Tobacco:-Tobacco.
Cotton.-Cotton and cottonseed remaining after deductions were made to cover the cost of ginuing when such costs were paid with a part of the crop.

Dairy.-Milk, cream, butter, and cheese.
Poultry.-Eggs, chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, squabs, baby chicks, and income from poultry breeding.

Animal specialty; range livestock.-Livestock or livestock products, such as beef cattle, hogs, sheep, rabbits, wool, mohair. Animal speciaity and range livestock were distinguished by the ratio of the number of acres in pasture to the number of acres in crops. East of the Mississippi a farm was classed as animal specialty when the ratio was less than 5 acres in pasture to 1 in crops; west of the Mississippi, when the ratio was less than 10 acres in pasture to 1 in crops.

Other products.-Alfalfa, sugar beets, hops, foxes, bees, honey, wood, seeds of various kinds, nursery products, and by-products.

General.- When none of the groups of products listed above provided 40 percent or more of the total value of products (gross receipts from sales, value of farm products used by the family, value of share rent), and the farm was neither part-time nor self-sufficing.
If not classifiable as one of the above product-types, a farm was classed as one of two special types:

Self-sufficing.-The value of products furnished by the farm and consumed by the family during the past 3 years was cqual to or greater than the value of products sold and used as share rent during that period. (For method of valuation, see Income, Value of Farm-furnished Products Used by the Family. This valuation, tending to be higher than the lump-sum estimates reported to census enumerators, served to increase the number of self-sufficing farms in some areas above that reported by the census.) Selfsufficing farms were included with those of other types in all sections: in one farm section, Edgecomb and Nash Counties in North Carolina, self-sufficing farms were the predominating type.

Part-time.-A farm whose operator spent 150 days or more in nonfarm busincss and from which the gross income from sales, value of products used by the family or paid as share rent was less than \(\$ 750\). In Oregon, where a special study of part-time farm families was made, a slightly different definition was used. In that special sample, time spent at nonfarm occupations was not used as a criterion for decision as to whether a farm was part-time; instead, the value of farm products not only had to be less than \(\$ 750\), but also less than the operator's nonfarm income (carnings plus other money income, excluding relief).

Occasionally a farm was classed as of a specified product type because that was the usual type of farming followed, even though because of crop failure, the sale of products during the report year did not justify this classification. If the income from sales of each of two products was the same and each was 40 percent or more of the value of farm products, the farm was classed as of the type more prevalent in the county. A farm meeting the definition of both part-time and self-sufficing was classified as part-time.

In general, the classifications followed those used in the 1930 census, but there were a few differences; e. g., potatoes were classed by the census under Crop-specialty and by this study under Truck; tobacco was classed under Crop-specialty by the census but as a separate type in this study; wheat was classed under Cash-grain by the census whereas it was a separate type in this study; and a few other differences of less importance.
Food check list. - See Supplementary Schedule, Food Check List.
Food expenditures, family ( 12 -month schedule).--Expenditures for all food consumed by members of the economic family at home or away from home (including board at school) and by paid household help and guests fed from family food supplies. Expenditures for boarders' food and food for paid farm help were deducted. (The amount deducted was computed by multiplying the total number of unit-meals served to such persons by average expenditures per food-expenditure unit-meal.)

Food at home.-Expenditures for all food purchased for consumption at family and vacation homes and as meals carried from home. Expenditures for feed for pets were excluded.

Food away from home.-Meals and lunches bought at work or school; meals bought while traveling or on vacation and other meals away from home (except those purchased on a business trip for which there was reimbursement by employer); board for children away at school; between-meal food and drink, such as ice cream, candy, beverages, bought and consumed away from home. Expenditures for items such as coffee or milk bought to supplement meals carried from home, were included. Expenditures for food away from home included in many cases some outlay for service and entertainment as well as for food.
Food-expenditure unit.-The money value of the food of a moderately active man was taken as a unit and expressed as 1.0. Scales of numbers representing the relative money value of the food of houschold members of other ages and activity were devised. Two different scales have been used in this study, a fairly detailed one for use with supplementary 7 -day food schedules, and a much condensed modification of this, for use with the 12 -month income and expenditure schedules. See Methodology, p. 372, for scales and their derivation.

To obtain the average money value of food per food-expenditure unit-meal for a specific family, the product of the number of meals served each individual multiplied by the appropriate factor (relative money value) shown in the pertinent scale for that individual, was obtained for each household member. The sum of such products for the various individuals gave the number of food-expenditure unit-meals to which the household was equivalent. Aggregate money value of food divided by the aggregate number of food-expenditure unit-meals gave the average money value per unit-meal for the household.

To obtain an average of money value per food-cxpenditure unit-meal for a group of families (such as an income class, or family-type group), the averages obtained for each family in the group were added; the sum was divided by the total number of families. Thus all families were given equal weight in the computation, regardless of the number of food-expenditure unit-meals to which each family was equivalent.

Food groups.-The classification of foods into groups having similar nutritive value or significance. See Methodology, Classification of Foods.

Food, home-produced.-See Income, Farm-furnished Products Used by Family.
Food, money value of.- The sum of expenditures for all purchased food and the imputed money value of home-produced food and food received as gift or pay. Home-produced foods and other food received without direct expenditure were valued at prices families would have paid, had they purchased food of similar quality and quantity from neighbors or other likely place of purchase.

Food received as gift or pay.-Foods such as garden produce, poultry, eggs, baked goods, jellies, or milk, received as gift or pay. Included also were foods brought home by a proprietor or employee of a store; meals furnished by an employer without charge; and free meals received as guest in excess of those furnished to guests.

Food record.-See Supplementary Schedule, Food Record.
Grade of diet.-Diets were classified as excellent, good, fair, or poor on the basis of their content of each of the nutrients. See p. 82 for specifications for each grade.

Home-produced food, value of.-See Income, Farm-furnished Products Used by Family.

Table 74.-computation of income: Methods of computing family income from schedule entries for income and consumption samples, farm families

a. Food, home-produced
b. Housing furnished by farm.
c. Fuel and other nonfood products furnisbed by farm for family ure.
3. Net change in value of livestock owned and of crops stored.
B. Money income (net) from sources other than farm.
1. Earnings from employment.
a. Occupations other than keeping roomers and boarders.
b. Keeping romers and boarders.
(1) Gross income.
(2) Expense for boarders' food.
2. Money income (not earnings) from sources other than operated farm.
3. Business losses other than from operating farm.

Derivation of income data
Income sample

Corrected sum of A and B.
A. Corrected sum of 1 and 2 plus or minus 3.
1. Difference between a and \(b\).
s. Reported gross income
1. Corrected difference between \(a\) and \(b\).
a. Same as income sample.
b. Reported major items plus other 1 items of farm expenditures.
2. Corrected sum of \(a, b\), and \(c\).
a. Reported value of food home-produced, minus value of home-produced tood served farm help and boarders.
b. Same as income sample.
c. Same as income sample.
3. Same as income sample.
B. Corrected sum of 1 and 2 minus 3.
1. Corrected sum of a and b.
a. Reported net earnings minus other ' items of occupational expenditures.
b. Corrected difference between (1) and (2).
(1) Same as income sample.
(2) Computed from reported total food expenditures and number of meals served to boarders.
2. Sarue as income sample.
3. Same as income sample.

\footnotetext{
1 These were items of occupational expenditures reported as family expenditures, such as: Automobile expenditures chargeable to business, other transkortation chargeable to business, food expenditures for farm belp, dues to business associations, technical books and periodicals.
\({ }^{2}\) These estimates were made from data collected in the Study of Consumption and Money Disbursements of Families of Employed Wage Earners and Lower Salaried Clerical Workers, conducted by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1934-35.
}

Household.-In this report on food, all persons who had meals with the family during the year, including, in addition to members of the economic family, the following nonfamily members: Boarders, tourists or transients, paid household help, paid farm help, nurse for the sick, and guests. Meals furnished to household help were considered part of family food expenditures. Meals furnished to boarders and farm help were considered business expenditures.

Household size - Except for expenditures for food and money value of all food, which are reported in terms of the consumption of the economic family (including paid houschold help and guests), all data on food in this report pertain to the household as the unit rather than the economic family as the unit. All computations of household size for purposes of dietary analyses were based on the total number of meals served, including those served to guests, boarders, paid help, and others as well as to members of the economic family. The size of the household has been computed on several bases, including week-equivalent persons, food-
expenditure units, and several nutrition units, such as food-energy units, protein units, calcium units, or vitamin A units. See Methodology for scales of equivalents, cond use made of each measure of household size. Brief descriptions follow:

Week-equivalent person.--One person in the household for 21 meals or several persons consuming an ag!gregate of 21 meals. Thus seven guests in the household for three meals each would count as one week-equivalent person.

Food-expenditure unit.-The expenditure for the food of a moderately active adult expressed as 1.0 was taken as a unit, and scales of numbers were devised to represent the relative expenditures for the food of individuals of other ages and activity. Two different scales of equivalents have been used in this study, a fairly detailed one with supplementary 7-day food schedules, and a condensed modification of this with the 12 -month family and expenditure schedules. (See Methodology, Food-expenditure Units.)

Nutrition unit.-This general term refers to any one of a series of units for specific nutrients, such as protein, calcium, or vitamin A. In determining household size in nutrition units, food allowances (with reference to each nutrient separately) were expressed as 1.0 for the moderately active man, and scales of numbers were devised to show the relative allowances for other household members. (See Metbodology, Nutrition Units.)
Income. - The term income was limited to current income for the year, excluding funds made available to the family through liquidation of capital assets, through borrowing, or through the accumulation of debt. It included net money and nonmoney income (housing, food, fuel, etc.) from the farm, net money earnings from employment other than operating the home farm, and net money income from sources other than earnings.

Because the expenditure schedule supplied data for calculating net income in addition to those appearing on the family-income schedule, the income figures by which income and expenditure schedules were classified differed slightly. In computing the adjusted income figures (used in the analysis of consumption), adjustments were made for automobile and other transportation expenditures chargeable to business and for other minor occupational expenditures (farm and nonfarm), as dues to business associations, technical books, and journals; the money value of food seryed to farm help; and for differences between estimated and actual money value of food served to boarders.

The two methods of computing income are shown in table 74. Brief definitions of some of the items included in these income computations follow. For further detail see Methodology and Glossary of volumes on Family Income and Expenditures, Part 1 and Part 2, Farm Series.
A. Farm income, net.-Sum of 1,2, and 3 .
1. Farm money income, net.-Gross money income received from farm (including receipts from sale of farm products; government payments in connection with agricultural programs; and income from work off the farm involving the use of farm equipment) minus money expenditures for farm operations.
2. Farm nonmoney income, net.-Includes a and b below:
a. Farm-furnished products used by family, value of.-Estimated value obtained by multiplying the quantity of products used, as reported by the family, by a price estimated for each locality. Price estimates were based upon what a sample of farm families in the locality reported they would have paid had they bought products of similar quality and quantity from neighbors, or from the most likely place of purchase. This method of valuation gives a higher figure than that obtained when valuation is based on farm prices or wholesale market prices. Products included were: Milk, cream, eggs, poultry, meat, potatoes, garden produce, fruit, other food such as sirups and grain products; fuel and other products, such as tobacco and ice.
b. Occupancy of farm dwelling, value of.-Value of the year's occupancy was arbitrarily set at 9 percent of the estimated present value of the dwelling on an owned farm, and 11 percent of the estimated value of the dwelling on a rented farm, except in the Southeast and in California, where 10 and 12 percent were used because of the more rapid depreciation of farm houses. These percentages were hased on interest rates, taxes, depreciation, and a reasonable return on money invested. In estimating the present value of the house, its
replacement value, as estimated by the family, was, reduced to present value by taking account of the agc of the house and the family's estimate of its remaining years of usefulness. For example, if the probable replacement value of the house was \(\$ 1,600\), its probable life 40 years, and its present age 10 years, its estimated value would be \(\$ 1,200\) ( \(\$ 1,600\) divided by 40 , multiplied by 30 ).
3. Crops stored and livestoch owned, net change.-Net increase or decrease in value of crops stored for sale and of livestock owned between the beginning and end of the report year. Only differences in value due to quantity changes were included; differences in value due to price changes were excluded.
B. Money income from sources other than the operated farm, net. Sum of the net earnings from employment of individuals not pertaining to the farm enterprise, from keeping roomers and boarders, and from the sale of home-made products; other net money income from nonfarm sources, such as rent from property, interest, and dividends from investments.
Income sample.-See Methodology, p. 350.
Native-Negro family.-Any family in which both the husband and wife were Negro and were born in continental United States or outlying territories or possessions, or of American parents temporarily residing in a foreign country.

Native-white family.-Any family in which both the husband and wife were white and were born in continental United States or outlying territories or possessions, or of American parents temporarily residing in a foreign country.

Nonfamily members.-See Household and Economic Family.
No report. - A schedule was not accepted for tabulation if there was no report on any basie item of information necessary for the computation of total family income, or if the family was unable to report on any of the main expenditure groups, such as clothing or automobile expenditures. A schedule was accepted for tabulation, however, if there was no report on an item of relatively small importance, such as the number of guests entertained during the year, or expenditures for specific items within a main expenditure group. In the latter case, it was assumed that entries of no report rather than zero meant that the family had some expenditure for the items but was unable to say how much. In tabulating the data, the total expenditure reported was allocated to the individual items of expenditure on the basis of data from other families in the same income, family-type, and occupational group having and reporting expenditures for the specific ilems. Adjustment for no-report entries was made only in this food report on data from the 12 -month expenditure schedules.

Nutrition unit. - See Houschold Size, and Methodology, Nutrition Cnits.
Occupational classification.-Only farm families in one occupational group, farm-operator (as distinguished from farm laborers and paid managers), were studied except in the Southeast where sharecroppers were studied separately. However, earnings of farm family members from work not pertaining to the farm enterprise were classified as business and professional, clerical, or wage-earner, according to the procedure followed for city and village families. No data on occupational classification of nonfarm enterprises are given in this report on food.

Paid help, farm.-Farm employees living in the household were considered as members of the household. Their food was included in all sections of this report that deal with the household as a unit, but was excluded in sections that deal with the economic family as a unit. The value of their food was deducted as a form business expenditure in determining the adjusted farmily income. (See Income.) It was not included in figures on the money value of the food of the economic family.

Persons per economic family.-See Family Type.
Record card.-Schedule used for the random sample of addresses visited. It shows color, nativity, whether the family included both husband and wife, whether married for more than a year, and other qualifications affecting eligibility for the family-income schedule. See Methodology, p. 348.

Relief family.-Family in which any member received direct relief in eash or kind at any time during the report year; work relief from public or private agencies; charity donation received upon proof of need; any pension of noncontributory type paid upon proof of need. Receipt of money from a son in Civilian Conservation Corps was considered direct relief. Earnings from the National Youth Administration were not considered relief.

Report year--Any 12 -month period between January 1, 1935, and December 31,1936 , for which the family chose to give the information. If more than one 12 -month schedule was filled, the year reported was the samee on all schedules for a family.

Sales tax on food.-The tax paid in addition to the regular purchase price of food. When paid at a percentage rate for all foods, as specified by State regulations, the amount was computed for the total food expenditure and added to the money value of the food for the week. If the tax was paid only on certain items, it was added to the cost of each item concerned.

Samples and sampling.-See Methodology, Population Groups Included in the Farm Sample, and Collection Procedures.

Schedule.-See specific kind of schedule, such as Family-income Schedule, Expenditure Schedule, or Supplementary Schedule.

Sharecropper.-Farmer in the Southeast who rented land on shares and was furnished work animals and, in some cases cquipment by the farm operator. The operator usually made the important decisions relating to the operation of the farm and supervised operations. The sharecropper was thus a type of laborer who was paid wages in kind on the basis of what he produced, his share usually being half the crop or less.

Supplementary schedule.-Requested only from families that furnished expenditure schedules and were willing to give the necessary additional details regarding food, clothing, or furnishings. Brief descriptions of the two types of supplementary food schedules follow:

Food check list.-A schedule used to obtain information on quantities and money value of food consumed by the household during the week preceding the interview. The number of meals furnished to household members of differing age and sex was also recorded. (See schedule form, pp. 381-382.)

Food record.-A record of the weight or other measure of each kind of food consumed by the household during 1 week. An inventory was taken of the weight or other measure of each kind of food on hand at the beginning and end of the week. A daily record was kept of the weight of all foods brought into the house during that period, and of the number of meals served to each houschold member including guests, boarders, and paid help. A record of the age, height, weight, and day-by-day occupations of each person fed also was included. These records were used for the study of adequacy of diets. (See forms pp. 383-385.)
Type of family.- See family Type.
Type of farm.-See Farm Type.
Value of family living.- Value of all goods and services purchased for family Jiving and other goods and services received without direct expenditure, concerning which data were obtained on the schedule. For farm families value of living included total expenditures for living; the value of food, fuel, and other goods received from the farm, including occupancy of farm dwelling; value of housing from a rent-free farm; value of nonfarm family housing, fuel, ice, and food received without direct payment, and value of clothing received as gift or pay.

It. is recognized that this figure for value of family living does not represent total value, since it does not include value of all goods received without direct expenditure (furnishings, automobiles, and radios were among those omitted); nor does it include value of services provided by family members or the services received free from others.

Value of home-produced food.-See Income, Farm-furnished Products Used by the Family.
Value per meal per food-expenditure unit.-Average money value of all food, purchased food, and home-produced food in terms of food-expenditure unit-meals. See Food-expenditure Unit.

Year-equivalent person.-See Family Type.```


[^0]:    - 

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Some of these regions do not correspond to the census classification, and hence have been given distinctive names, as Southeast, and Plains and Monntain. Even when the names are identical, as New England, not allof the States listed by the census were included in this study. (See Methodology, Communities Included in the Study.)

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Family types 4 and 5 combined. See Glossary, Family Type, and Metbodology, Combinations of Fermily-type Groups.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Special analyses have been rade of data obtained in these counties; a large number of sohedules were collected there to provide for a detailed study of consumption by income and family type.
    ${ }^{2}$ The money value of the home-produced share of the farm family's foot supply was based on prices which Fonld have been paid had it been purchased from neighbors. (See the Methodology in part 1 of the report, Family Incote and Expenditures.)

[^4]:    $81207^{\circ}-41-2$

[^5]:    I Includes farm-operator families in the consumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table.
    ${ }^{2}$ Fot the income comparison family-type groups have been assumed to have equal frequencies within each income class; for the family-type comparison, income classes have been assumed to have equal frequencies within each family-type group.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ineludes farm-operator fumilies in the consumption sample in the Penasylvania-Ohio, Michigan-Wisconsin, and Illinois-Iows analysis units. See Glossary for definitions of terns used in this table.
    ${ }^{2}$ All income classes bave been assumed to have equal frequencies in computing these relatives.

[^7]:    ${ }^{4}$ The median income and average size of nonrelief families of each type is shown below:

    | Family type: | Average size | Median income |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | -2.02 | ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ |
    | 2 | -. 3.01 | 1,250 |
    | 3 | -. 4.01 | 1, 410 |
    | 4. | - 3.52 | 1,388 |
    |  | 5. 54 | 1,690 |
    | 7 | 5.38 | 1,510 |

    or older. Average expenditures of these families in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ were about a fifth higher than those of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 999$; and in the class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$, about twofifths higher. The increases with income were somewhat less, though not markedly so, among families of types 2 and 3 combined and of 6 and 7 combined-families with a smaller proportion of their members aged 16 or older--than among those of types 1 or 4 and 5 combined.

    Relative to the expenditures of type 1 families within the income classes $\$ 500-\$ 2,999$, average expenditures of families of types 2 and 3 combined were about a fifth higher; those of types 4 and 5 combined, somewhat more than a third higher; and those of types 6 and 7 combined, about half again as high. There were, however, no consistent variations in these relationships from one income class to another.

    Table 5.-purchased food: Average expenditures for food per family in a year and distribution of families by expenditures for food per family in a year, by family type and income, 3 Middle Atlantic and North Central analysis units combined, ${ }^{1}$ $1985 \cdot 36$
    [White nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Family type and income class (dollars) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fam- } \\ & \text { ilies- } \end{aligned}$ | Average ex-pendifor food | Famllies having expenditures of - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1- \\ & \$ 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{\$ 5 1 -} \\ & \$ 99 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\$ 100-$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 150-1 \\ & \$ 199 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 200-1 \\ & \$ 249 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \left.\begin{array}{l} \$ 250-2 \\ \\ \$ 2299 \end{array} \right\rvert\, \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 300- \\ \$ 349 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \$ 350- \\ \$ 399 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400- \\ & \$ 449 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 450- \\ \$ 499 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 500 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
    | 'rype 1 | No. $1,063$ | $\underset{\substack{D_{143}}}{ }$ | $P_{2}$ | $P_{23}^{P_{c t}}$ | $\underset{36}{P_{c t}}$ | $\underset{23}{P_{20}}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct. } \\ 10 \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{Pct.}_{3}$ | ${ }_{P c t} .$ | $\mathrm{Pct}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $P c t .$ | $P_{(2)}^{P_{(2)}}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Pct } \\(2)}}{ }$ |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 1-499 \ldots \\ & 500-999 \\ & 1,000-1,499 . \\ & 1,500-1,999 \\ & 2,0000-299 . \\ & 3,000-4,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128 \\ & 396 \\ & 261 \\ & 165 \\ & 84 \\ & 329 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118 \\ & 127 \\ & 155 \\ & 162 \\ & 183 \\ & 152 \end{aligned}$ | 1 1 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 34 \\ 29 \\ 19 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & 39 \\ & 34 \\ & 34 \\ & 34 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 21 \\ & 26 \\ & 27 \\ & 23 \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 7 \\ 11 \\ 15 \\ 12 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 7 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \left.(2)^{0}\right) \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ \left(r^{2}\right) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 1 2 0 0 | 0 0 2 2 0 |
    | Types 2 and 3 - | 1,157 | 151 | (2) | 10 | 27 | 30 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 1 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | (3) | 1 |
    |  | $\begin{array}{r} 72 \\ 294 \\ 294 \\ 310 \\ 145 \\ 42 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145 \\ & 166 \\ & 181 \\ & 187 \\ & 211 \\ & 203 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 0 \\ \left(\begin{array}{r} (2) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right. \end{array}$ | 21 14 8 9 6 10 10 | 38 31 37 27 25 19 19 | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 31 \\ & 32 \\ & 32 \\ & 28 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 12 \\ 17 \\ 13 \\ 10 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}8 \\ 9 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 17 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3 <br> 2 <br> 4 <br> 7 <br> 8 <br> 7 | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | (2) (2) 0 0 1 2 | ${ }_{(2)}{ }^{0}{ }^{1}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |
    | Types 4 and 5 | 1,723 | 213 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 19 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 2 |  |  |
    | 0-499. <br> 500-999 <br> 1,000-1,499 <br> 2,000-2,989.. <br> 3,000-4,999 | $\begin{array}{r} 93 \\ 348 \\ 349 \\ 434 \\ 328 \\ 117 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 158 \\ & 174 \\ & 205 \\ & 228 \\ & 246 \\ & 279 \end{aligned}$ | 1 1 0 0 1 0 | 14 12 12 5 | 35 28 19 19 14 15 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 28 \\ & 30 \\ & 26 \\ & 22 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | 11 14 20 20 20 17 17 | 9 15 17 17 11 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 3 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 8 \\ 11 \\ 13 \end{array}$ | 3 3 3 8 | 0 <br> 1 <br> 1 <br> 3 <br> 3 <br> 3 | 1 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 3 | (2) $\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 8 \\ 8\end{array}$ |
    | Types 6 and 7 .- | 984 | 232 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 3 |  | 3 |
    | $0.499 \ldots$ $500-199$. $1,000-1,499$. $1,506-1,999$. $2,000-2,999$. $3,000-4,989 \ldots$ | $\begin{aligned} & 327 \\ & 220 \\ & 298 \\ & 298 \\ & 211 \\ & 175 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 190 \\ & 197 \\ & 227 \\ & 242 \\ & 242 \\ & 253 \\ & 211 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 7 9 4 2 1 3 | 15 23 16 16 14 14 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 25 \\ & 25 \\ & 22 \\ & 17 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 15 19 17 17 22 20 16 | 19 11 19 19 16 21 16 | 0 8 9 9 12 11 14 | 3 5 5 6 6 11 | 4 1 3 4 3 3 5 | 0 (2) (2) 1 1 2 | $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 6 \\ 12 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |


    ## Variations in Money Value of Food Within Family Type-Income Cells

    The range in the money value of all food, value of farm-furnished food, and expenditures for purchased food found among families at each income level or among families of each type, was extremely wide in every analysis unit (table 44). Even apart from the fourth of the families spending most and the fourth spending least for food, the middle half of the families of type 1 in the income class $\$ 0-\$ 499$, for example, had food expenditures in the range $\$ 85-\$ 155$ in three farm sections in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region (table 5). Figures for this and other income classes appear below for families of type 1 and of types 4 and 5 combined:

    |  | Range in food expenditures for middle half of families of - |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Family-income class: | Type 1 | Types 4 and 5 |
    | \$0-\$499 | \$85-\$155 | \$115-\$200 |
    | 8500-\$999 | \$95-\$160 | \$125-\$215 |
    | \$1,000-\$1,499 | \$110-\$185 | \$150-\$255 |
    | \$1,500-\$1,999 | \$120-\$200 | \$165-\$275 |
    | \$2,000-\$2,999 | \$120-\$215 | \$165-\$295 |

    Differences in home production of food, in dictary standards, and in expenditures for other family needs and desires-all contribute to this variation. Fully adequate diets can, of course, be had at differing cost levels. But families must take special care in food planning care to select assortments of food, both purchased and home-produced, that yield excellent returns in nutritive value for their cost-if on a relatively small food allowance they are to be fed as adequately from the nutritive standpoint as are families with diets relatively much higher in money value. Small as well as large families must exercise such care whenever they decide to keep expenditures for food comparatively low in order to spare cash for other required or desired objectives.

    ## Relationships Between Money Value of Farm-Furnished Food and Food Expenditures

    Among families of the same size and spending similar amounts for family living, the general relationships between expenditures for food and the money value of farm-furnished food are shown in table 6 . The data are from a special tabulation made for Pennsylvania-Ohio families of type 2 (husband, wife, and one child under 16 years of age) spending differing amounts for family living. Figure 2 indicates that among families with expenditures for living in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$, the amount spent for food decreased steadily with increasing value of home-grown products until a minimum of about $\$ 150$ a year was reached. This minimum represents the expenditures for food that the family desired, but which could not be furnished by the farm, or which, in the judgment of the families, it did not pay to produce. At any given level of home production, however, average expenditures for food were increased as more money was available for family living. Thus, with home-produced food of a money value in the range $\$ 250-$ $\$ 349$, the average amounts spent for food increased from $\$ 118$ when expenditures for all living were in the class $\$ 250-\$ 499$, to almost twice as much, $\$ 214$, when $\$ 1,000$ or more was spent for living (table 6).

    The possibility of decreasing the money outlay for food while maintaining or raising dietary levels is of much concern to farm families that have relatively small money incomes. To add to our information of current home-production practices among families in the lower income classes, a special tabulation was made to find the differences in programs on farms of such groups living in Pennsylvania and Ohio. In this were included families of type 3 (husband, wife, and two children under 16 ycars) whose net family incomes (money and nonmoney) were in the class $\$ 500-\$ 999$, and whose money expenditures for living were in the class $\$ 250-\$ 499$.
    

    Figure 2.-Food expenditures as related to money value of home-produced food, families of type 2 (husband, wife, and one child under 16) with expenditures for living in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$, nonrelief white farm operators' families in the Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, 1935-36.

    The families meeting this description were arranged in order according to the money value of their farm-furnished food, and divided into two groups-those having the higher and those having the lower amounts. The money value of their food, home-produced and purchased, is shown below:

    |  | Average money nalue of food- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Scope of food-production program: | $\begin{gathered} \text { Home- } \\ \text { produced } \end{gathered}$ | Purchased | Total |
    | Relatively small. | \$224 | \$149 | \$373 |
    | Relatively large_ | 326 | 113 | 439 |

    The farm-furnished food of the families with the larger food-production programs was valued at 46 percent more than was that of families with the smaller production programs, but their expenditures for purchased food were considerably less (24 percent).

    The chief differences between the food supply of those with the smaller and with the larger food-production programs were found to be in the animal products, especialiy in milk and meat. Those with the
    smaller production programs had an average of about 2 cups of milk for each individual per day, less than 4 ounces a day of meat (dressed weight, but including bone and trimmings), and fewer than 5 eggs a week. Corresponding figures for those with the larger programs were: Of milk, almost 3 cups; of meat, almost 7 ounces; and of eggs, about 1 each day. Some of these increases were more liberal than nccessary for an economical but fully adequate diet. Both the assortment of products and the quantities produced could have been better adapted to the dietary needs of the family. Such points should be considered in planning home-production programs if they are to serve the family most economically and advantageously.

    Table 6.-money value of food by valde of home-produced food: Average money value per family in a year of home-produced food and purchased food, by value of home-produced food, for families with one child under 16 and no others (type 2) at selected levels of tolal money expenditures for living, Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, ${ }^{1}$ 1995-36
    [White nonrelief families that inciude a husband and wife, both nativeborn]

    | Value of homeproduced food (dollars) | Families | A verage money value of food per family in a year |  |  | Families | Average money value of food per family in a year |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Total | Jome. produced | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pur- } \\ & \text { chased } \end{aligned}$ |  | Total | Homeproduced | Purchased |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 50-149 \ldots \\ & 150-249 \\ & 250-349 \\ & 350 \text { or ower } \end{aligned}$ | MONEY EXPENDITURES CLASS \$250-\$499 |  |  |  | MONEY EXPENDITURES CLASS |  |  |  |
    |  | Number | Dollars ${ }^{253}$ | ${ }_{\text {Dollarg }}^{114}$ | Dollars 139 | Number | Dollars 320 | Dollars ${ }^{113}$ | Lollars 207 |
    |  | 44 | 326 | 205 | 121 | 32 | 388 | 212 | 176 |
    |  | 25 | 407 | 289 | 118 | 29 | 469 | 298 | 171 |
    |  | 18 | 532 | 413 | 118 | 15 | 574 | 422 | 152 |
    |  | MONEY EXPENDI'TURES CLASS |  |  |  | MONEY EXPENDITURES CLASS |  |  |  |
    | 50-149 | 6 | 377 | 114 | 26.3 | 3 | 423 | 99 | 324 |
    | 150-249. | 13 | 408 | 202 | 206 | 7 | 394 | 190 | 204 |
    | 2200)-349. | 17 | 469 | 291 | 178 | 9 | 510 | 296 | 214 |
    | 350 or over. | 14 | 607 | 424 | 1*3 | 7 | 621 | 419 | 202 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Inciudes farro-operator families in the eonsumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table.

    On most farms much of the production of food for family consumption is related to, or incidental to, production for sale. Diet plans may well be evolved that will make maximum use of the particular kinds of food that can be economically produced on farms in cach type-offarming area. Although some low-income families hesitate to withhold from the market any product that will add to cash income, the majority tend to consume generous quantities of those foods that can be economically farm produced. They find it poor economy to sell these at farm prices and to buy similar products at retail prices.

    There is less agreement, however, as to the wisdom of a program of food production for houschold use exclusively. The usual argument for concentrating on commercial farming is that each farm section is more efficient in the production of certain commodities than of many others and that the farmer would do well to raise these commodities for family use and for sale. From market proceeds he then could
    purchase other needed foods, grown in sections where soil, climate, and the labor situation are better adapted to their economical production.

    Farm families as consumers should inquire whether the differences from one farm section to another in the cost of producing different classes of foods are sufficient to more than offset the charges of transportation, processing, and other middlemen's services. They also should consider whether economic conditions are stable enough so that succes:ful production and sale of a few commodities would enable the family to buy all of the other products and services needed for wholesome living. A further and important question is whether they would maintain so satisfactory a dictary level if they lived solely in a money economy, purchasing all food needed; or whether, impressed by food costs, they would try to economize on purchases and in so doing, reduce their chances for dietary adequacy. The competition of other goods with food may be such that adequate diets would not be purchased even though money incomes were considerably increased.

    Whether it is actually cheaper to produce certain foods for home consumption rather than to purchase them must be decided on the basis of cost accounting, with due regard to available labor and the possible alternative uses of time, land, and capital. But there may be circumstances under which home production is advisable even though, counting all costs, it is no cheaper to produce the food than to buy it. The farm-production program may be such that considerable food could be farm furnished with little direct cash outlay. If opportunities for increasing cash income are few, adequate foodproduction programs may make it possible to reduce cash expenditures for food and thus release funds for other living expenditures, or for getting ahead financially, without lowering dietary levels. Even when circumstances are such that it would cost more to produce a generous food supply than to buy the least expensive assortment of food to compose an adequate diet, it still would be well to ask whether the more-than-minimum supplies that could be available through home production would raise levels of living, by increasing dietary adequacy, to a point that would more than compensate for the added cost.

    There can, of course, be no ready-made answers when familics or communities ask whether it would be better in the long run to press for an expansion of home food-production programs or for a reduction with more emphasis on production for sale and food purchasing. The answers depend upon many factors-including the economic status of the family and its standard of living.

    ## Money Value of Food in Other Farm Sections

    Since the money value of a family's food supply is greatly influenced both by income and by family size, it is necessary in making intersectional comparisons to keep in mind that the farm sections studied differed in general income level. The groups eligible for the consumption study seldom included the majority of families in the farm sections studied and the consumption sample included proportionally more of the high-income families in some sections than others, and proportionally fewer of the families of relatively large size in some sections
    than others. Consequently, comparisons should not be made from one section to another on the basis of all-incomes lines shown in the tables in Appendix B. Rather, comparisons should be made at a specilic income level for a specific family type, or at a specific income level on a food-expenditure-unit basis. The reader should also be aware in making intersectional comparisons, that there were differing proportions of food purchased and home-produced, differing retail price levels (and sales taxes) in the various sections studied, and differing values assigned to farm-furnished products.
    Because of the complexity of the situation, it has seemed most satisfactory to make intersectional comparisons of the money value of food first on the basis of money expendilures for food, then with respect to the moncy value of farm-furnished food, and finally with respect to the money value of the food supply as a whole.

    ## Expenditures for Purchased Food

    The 13 analysis units comprising families of white farm operators can be divided roughly into three classes, insofar as money expenditures for food are concerned. The first includes those analysis units in which families were spending comparatively little for food, and allocating to food a relatively low proportion of their expenditures for living. In the 3 analysis units of the Southeast, familics in the income class $\$ 750-\$ 999$, for example, spent an average of less than 3 cents for food per food-expenditure unit-menl, amounting in the aggregate to a third or less of their money for living (table 7).

    At the other extreme are those analysis units in which families allocated a relatively high percentage of their expenditures for living to food making comparatively large outlays for the food of each person. In the same income class, $\$ 750-\$ 999$, families in the counties studied in Vermont, in South Dakota, Montana, and Colorado, in New Jersey, and in California spent amounts averaging from 6 to 9 cents for food per unit-meal, allocating about two-fifths of their expenditures for living to this purpose. Other analysis units occupy intermediate positions.

    ## Income in Relation to Expenditures for Food

    As incomes rose, expenditures for food rose in almost every farm section but, as a rule, at a relatively slower rate than expenditures for other goods and services purchased for family living. In most analysis units there was a distinct drop with rising incomes in the percentage of total expenditures for living that represented food (table 7).

    Total money expenditures for food increased as incomes rose at different rates within the several farm sections. In two analysis units-Georgia-Mississippi and North Carolina-South Carolinatotal expenditures for food of families of types 4 and 5 practically doubled as incomes rose from the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ to the class $\$ 2,500-$ $\$ 2,999$. Elscwhere, rates of increase were less.

    On a food-expenditure-unit basis, only in the Georgia-Mississippi farm section were expenditures for food of families of types 4 and 5 as much as doubled with a rise in income from the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ to the class $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,999$. Otherwise the increases ranged from 14 percent in the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado analysis unit to 76
    percent in farm counties in Washington and Oregon. (The part-time farm unit in Oregon and the self-sufficing counties in North Carolina are omitted in this comparison; the range of incomes found in the groups included in the consumption sample in these sections was inadequate for the purpose.)

    The extent to which increases in money expenditures for food indicate higher dietary levels with rising incomes depends in part upon the constancy in the share of the total food supply that is purchased; with an increase in the proportion purchased, increased expenditures may not mean corresponding dietary advantages. The most marked increase in the proportion purchased as incomes rose was found in the counties studied in Georgia and Mississippi. Other sections showing some increase within the income range most characteristic of families included in the consumption sample were California, the self-sufficing counties of North Carolina, and the part-time farming unit of Oregon.

    Table 7.-purchased food: Average expenditures for food per food-expenditure unit-meal and percentage of total expenditures for family living allocated to food, selected income classes, 13 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-36
    [White nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | fegion and amalysis unit | A verage value of purchased food per unit-meal, in income class- |  |  |  |  | Percentage of total expenditures for living sllocated to food, in income class- |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | All | \$250- | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 750- \\ & \$ 999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,000- \\ & \$ 1,249 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,750-1 \\ & \$ 1,989 \end{aligned}$ | All | $\$ 250-$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 750- \\ \$ 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,000- \\ & \$ 1,249 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,750- \\ & \$ 1,999 \end{aligned}$ |
    | NEW ENGLAND | Cts. | $\begin{gathered} C t s . \\ 5.2 \end{gathered}$ | Cts.$6.1$ | Cts. <br> 6.3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cts. } \\ 6.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct. } \\ 35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} P c t . \\ 43 \end{array}$ | Pct. | Pcti39 | $P$ Pt. 30 |
    | Vermont. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | MIDDLE ATLANTIC AND MORTH central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | New Jersey .-. | 8.1 | 7. 2 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 34 | 44 | 40 | 3429 | 35 |
    | Pennsylvania-0hio | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 23 | 32 | 31 |  | 24 |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4. 6 | 4.9 | 5. 1 | 29 | 34 | 33 | 32 | 26 |
    | Illinois-Lown | 4.4 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 4,3 | 4.8 | 28 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 23 |
    | FLAINS AND MOUNTAIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Dakotr-Kansas - -Col-----South Dakota-Montana-Colorado-- | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 5. 2 | 28 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 21 |
    |  | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 31 |
    | Pactiple |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Washington-Oregon ..................- | $\begin{array}{r} 5.1 \\ 8.0 \\ 10.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \\ 24.5 \\ 8.4 \end{array}$ | 4. 85.8 | 5. 06.50.2 | 6.08.6 | 2830 | $\begin{array}{r}38 \\ 234 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3332 | 313535 | 273032 |
    | Oregon-part-time...---------------- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  | 8.6 |  | 10.4 | 32 | 36 | 39 | 35 |  |
    | SOUTHEAST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Carolina self-sufticing counties | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1. 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ | 1.9 | 29 | 38 | 33 | 30 | 17 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Carolina-Sonth Carolina..- | 3. 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \\ & 1.7 \end{aligned}$ | 2.72.6 |  | 3.44.1 | 2324 | 3535 | 2927 | 26 | 21 |
    | Georgis-Mississippi .............-- | 3.2 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2.9 \\ & 3.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 28 | 25 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes families in the consumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. All averages and percentages are based on the number of families in each income class.
    ${ }^{2}$ Based on fewer than 3 cases.
    In most farm sections, however, the changes with income in the proportion of the food that was bought were comparatively slight over a wide income range; the share of the food supply that was purchased appeared to be a characteristic of the section. In round numbers, families of types 4 and 5 generally purchased 30 percent or
    less of their food in the counties studied in North and South Carolina and in Georgia and Mississippi; from 30 to 40 percent, in Pennsylvania and Ohio and in Illinois and Iowa; and from 40 to 60 percent in other sections except in California where the proportion was still higher.

    ## Family Type in Relation to Expenditures for Food

    In all farm sections, as already shown for Pennsylvania and Ohio, family expenditures for food increased with size of family. For the 13 analysis units, simple averages for three income classes, $\$ 750-\$ 999$, $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, and $\$ 1,250-\$ 1,499$, of the food expenditures of two type groups relative to those of type 1 are as follows for white farm operators' families:

    |  | Pelative expenditures for food, ithome range $\$ 750-\$ 1,499$, of families of types- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Analysis unit: | 1 | 2ands | 4 and 5 |
    | Vermont. | 100 | 116 | 130 |
    | New Jerscy | 100 | 137 | 137 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio | 100 | 121 | 133 |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin | 100 | 120 | 129 |
    | Illinois-Iowa | 100 | 127 | 143 |
    | North Dakota-Kansas | 100 | 116 | 139 |
    | South Dakota-Montana-Colorado | 100 | 125 | 144 |
    | Washington-Oregon | 100 | 126 | 142 |
    | Oregon part-time farms | 100 | 101 | 119 |
    | California--------- | 100 | 124 | 143 |
    | North Carolina self-sufficing counti | 100 | 138 | 142 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina_ | 100 | 118 | 132 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi | 100 | 114 | 128 |

    The several analysis units tend to agree, as shown by the above figures, in that the average food expenditures of families of types 2 and 3 usually are from an eighth to a fourth higher than those of type 1 families, whereas those of types 4 and 5 usually are from a fourth to nearly a half more; differences between types tend to be smaller in the part-time farming unit of Oregon than elsewhere. In no farm section were the increases on a family basis sufficient to maintain the dietary level of the larger families on the same plane as that enjoyed by the smaller. This is shown by figures corresponding to those just given, but on a food-expenditure-unit basis:

    |  | Relative expenditures for food (food-expenditure-unit basis, income range $\$ 7 \overline{0}-\$ 11,499$ of families oftypes-lypes- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Analysis unit: | 1 | 9 and s | 4 and 5 |
    | Vermont. | 100 | 82 | 71 |
    | New Jersey | 100 | 91 | 74 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio | 100 | 82 | 71 |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin | 100 | 82 | 68 |
    | Illinois-Iowa- | 100 | 88 | 81 |
    | North Dakota-Kansas | 100 | 78 | 69 |
    | South Dakota-Montana-Colorado | 100 | 85 | 74 |
    | Washington-Oregon.- | 100 | 88 | 79 |
    | Oregon part-time farms | 100 | 70 | 66 |
    | California | 100 | 83 | 77 |
    | North Carolina self-sufficing counties- | 100 | 92 | 71 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina.- | 100 | 84 | 69 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi...... | 100 | 81 | 66 |

    As a rule, the purchases of families of types 2 and 3 in these income classes were about a fifth lower than those of type 1 (food-expendi-ture-unit basis) ; and those of types 4 and 5 from a fourth to a third lower than for type 1 families.

    ## Expenditures for Food Away From Home

    Farm families incur but small expenditures for food away from home. This category of expenditures includes board at school; meals purchased and eaten at school, at work, or while traveling or on vacation; and between-meal food and drink, such as ice cream, candy, and beverages. In the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ families of types 4 and 5 ranked first more frequently than those of other type groups in the proportion of families having these expenditures, and usually ranked first in the average amounts spent for food away from home. Average expenditures of such families were $\$ 10$ or less in the farm sections of the New England and Middle Atlantic and North Central regions. In sections of the Southeast average expenditures for food away from home ranged from $\$ 10$ to $\$ 16$; in Kansas and North Dakota and sections of the Pacific region, between $\$ 17$ and $\$ 29$. The only higher average, $\$ 40$, was found in the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado farm section.

    The proportion of families having expenditures for food eaten away from home differed widely from one farm section to another. Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, from 15 to 42 percent had such expenditures in four of the analysis units in the New England and the Middle Atlantic and North Central regions (New Jersey unit omitted); 44 and 52 percent in the two Plains and Mountain units; and 59 and 69 percent in two Pacific units (the parttime farm unit omitted). In analysis units in the Southeast (white operators), the proportion of families of this type group and income class having any expenditure for food away from home ranged from 45 percent in the Georgia-Mississippi unit to 66 percent in the North Carolina self-sufficing counties. As incomes rose, there was an upward trend in the percentage of families having these expenditures and in the average amounts so spent.

    ## Board at school.

    The burden of expenditures for board at school fell, as might be expected, on the families with children of high school and college age. Of the farm families having these expenditures ( 373 out of 13,559 families in the consumption sample in white-operator units), only 1 was of type 1,22 of types 2 and 3 combined, and 33 of types 6 and 7 combined. The remaining 317 were of types 4 and 5those families including at least one person 16 years or older in addition to husband and wife.

    Among families of types 4 and 5 , expenditures for board at school were incurred infrequently in most analysis units among families with incomes below $\$ 1,000$, but the percentage having these outlays sharply increased as incomes passed the $\$ 2,000$ mark. However, more than one-tenth of the families in every income class had such expenditures in the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado analysis unit. There the percentage was as high among families with incomes under $\$ 1,000$ as was found in most of the analysis units in the North among families with incomes of $\$ 2,000$ or more. Distances from farms to
    high schools and travel hazards in winter in the Plains and Mountain States may explain the frequency of this outlay, regardless of income, among families with older children.

    Since few families in any farm section had expenditures for board at school, average expenditures were low; for all families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,999$, averages ranged from $\$ 1$ in counties studied in New Jersey to $\$ 18$ in the South Dakota-MontanaColorado unit.

    Averages based on the number of families having such expenditures give a better idea of what a family might expect in estimating magnitude of these expenditures or in planning ahead for them. These, as well as averages for all families, are shown in table 8 for families of types 4 and 5 grouped into three broad income classes. Among families that had such expenditures, the average outlay for board at school, income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,999$, ranged from $\$ 83$ per family in a year in the Michigan-Wisconsin farm section and the Oregon part-time unit to $\$ 156$ in counties in South Dakota, Montana, and Colorado. The average amounts spent by familics having such expenditures increased less rapidly with income than did the percentage having expenditures-average expenditures seldom more than doubled within the range of income shown in table 8, whereas the percentage of families having expenditures increased threefold or more, except in the Plains and Mountain States.

    ## Other food away from home.

    Expenditures for meals and between-meal food and drink bought and eaten away from home were small. The amounts spent for meals away from home differed from one farm section to another, usually being greater in the more western sections than elsewhere. In the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ among families of types 4 and 5 , expenditures for meals ranged in the West from an average of about $\$ 7$ in the North Dakota-Kansas section to more than $\$ 16$ in the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado section. Included in the latter figure was $\$ 5$ for meals while traveling or on vacation, and $\$ 8$ for meals while at work. Among New England, and Middle Atlantic and North Central families, average expenditures for meals away from home were less than $\$ 4$. The average amounts spent by families of white operators of this family-type group and income class in the farm sections studied in the Southeast were between those of the Northeast and the West.

    Between-meal food and drink were the items of food away from home for which expenditures were most frequently incurred in most farm sections, but the average amounts spent for them were low. Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, the averages seldom were as much as $\$ 5$ in a year. They exceeded this amount somewhat in the farm sections of North Dakota and Kansus, and North Carolina and South Carolina, but did not reach an average of $\$ 6$ in a year in any unit.

    ## Money Value of Home-Produced Food

    In most sections, all farm families included in the consumption sample produced some food for home consumption. The wide differences from one group of counties to another in the average money value of the home-produced share of the food supply represent to

    Table 8.-board at school: Percentage of families having expenditures for board at school, and average expenditures based on all families and on families having expenditures, by income for families of types 4 and 5, 13 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-36
    [White nonreliel families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    


    some extent real differences in practices of production for household use; in part, however, the money-value differences between sections are due to the varying values assigned to farm-furnished products.

    As explained in the Glossary, the prices used in valuing farmfurnished products in each farm section were those that families reported they would have paid had food of similar quality and quantity been bought at the most likely place of purchase, in most cases from a neighboring farmer. Ont the whole, these prices were higher than farm or wholesale prices. Availability of a market for food undoubtedly affected the prices quoted. Families in a section near a large city, able to make sales from a roadside stand or by delivering products to urban homes, probably charged their neighbors prices more like those charged by retail merchants than did families living in more isolated communities.

    This method of valuation complicates intersectional comparisons of the money value of home-produced food. The following figures show the ratio of the value of farm-furnished food priced in each section, as described, to the value that would have resulted had uniform prices (Pennsylvania prices) been applied everywhere to the quantities recorded:

    | Analysis unit: | Ratio of local value to Pennasylvania value | Analysis unit: | Ratio of local palue to Pennsyivania value |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Vermont. | 0.94 | Washington | ---- 0.78 |
    | New Jersey | . 1.15 | Orcgon. | 1.14 |
    | Pennsylvania | 1.00 | Oregon part-ti | 1. 20 |
    | Ohio- | 96 | Central Califo | . 80 |
    | Michigan | 86 | Southern Cali | 1. 04 |
    | Wisconsin | . 80 | North Carolin | 1. 13 |
    | Illinois_ | . 89 | North Carolin | ficing |
    | Iowa- | . 92 | countics | --- 1.07 |
    | North Dakota | . 70 | South Carolin | -1.12 |
    | Kansas. | 86 | Georgia- | . 79 |
    | South Dakota-Colorado.-. | $75$ | Mississippi | . 80 |

    Valued at uniform Pennsylvania prices, the three analysis units showing the highest average figures for farm-furnished food per expenditure unit-meal (income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ ) were the GeorgiaMississippi farm section, the self-sufficing counties in North Carolina, and the counties in Illinois and Iowa. The three farm sections showing the lowest average figures in this income class were those studied in California, in Oregon (part-time farms), and in Vermont.

    Valued at locally reported prices, the three analysis units (income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$ ) showing the highest average levels of farmfurnished food per expenditure unit-meal were found in the counties in North Carolina where self-sufficing farms predominate, in the other counties studied in North and South Carolina, and in those in Georgia and Mississippi. The three farm sections showing the lowest values were those in California, in Michigan and Wisconsin, and in Vermont (table 9).
    In almost every section, home-produced food formed a large share of the total food supply of families. In 9 of the 13 analysis units for white operators among families of types 4 and 5 with incomes in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, the average value of food from the farm ranged from 44 percent to 65 percent of the total. Much lower proportions were found in California; and higher, in the analysis units of the Southeast.

    Table 9.-Home-produced food: Average money value of home-produced food per food-expenditure unit-meal and percentage of the money value of all food that was home-produced, selected income classes, 13 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-36
    [White nonreljef families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Region and amalysis unit | Average value of home-produced food per unit-meal, in income class- |  |  |  |  | Percentage of total monty value of food that was home-produced, in income class- |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | All | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 250-2 \\ & \hline \$ 999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 850- \\ \$ 8999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,000- \\ & \$ 1,249 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \$ 1,750 \\ \$ 1,998 \end{array}\right.$ | All | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \$ 250- \\ \$ 499 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 750- \\ \$ 9999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1.000 \\ & \$ 1,249 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,750- \\ & \$ 1,999 \end{aligned}$ |
    | Vermont-.---------------- | $\begin{gathered} C t s . \\ 4.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} { }_{C t g .}^{C t g} \\ \hline .8 \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{Cls}_{4.6}$ | $\begin{gathered} C t s .2 \\ 5.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C t s . \\ 5.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pct. } \\ 43 \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{Pat}_{42}^{\mathrm{Fe}} .$ | $\begin{gathered} P c t . \\ 41 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{4}{ }_{4} \mathrm{ct}$ ¢ | ${ }_{\text {Pct }}^{45}$ |
    | middle atlantic and nohth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | New Jersey | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \\ & 6.9 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 7.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \\ & 5.3 \\ & 4.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \\ & 6.5 \\ & 4.7 \\ & 8.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.4 \\ & 6.8 \\ & 5.6 \\ & 78 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \\ & 7.0 \\ & 5.6 \\ & 8.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 63 \\ & 49 \\ & 69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 57 \\ & 47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 63 \\ & 49 \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ | 45464608064 | 4483525383 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | plains and mountain | $\begin{aligned} & 5.0 \\ & 7.9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Dikota-Kansas South Dakota-Montan | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \\ & 6.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.1 \\ & 5.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.5 \\ 7.1 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6.8} 8$ | 7.4 8.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \\ & 46 \mathrm{j} \end{aligned}$ | 56 51 | 56 50 | ${ }_{53}^{58}$ |
    | pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Washington-Oregon... | 7.06.52.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.4 \\ 21.5 \\ 2.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \\ & 6.1 \\ & 3.4 \end{aligned}$ | 7.26.53.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 7.1 \\ 7.2 \end{array}$ | 574.321 | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ 214 \\ 214 \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | 57484828 | 594848 | 5.2 <br> 4.1 <br> 2 |
    | Oregon- part-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | southeast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Caroline self-sufficing coun- ties | 9.88.77.7 | 6.74.24.8 | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ 7.2 \\ 7.8 \end{gathered}$ | 11.68.68.7 | $\begin{gathered} 11.2 \\ 10.6 \\ 8.0 \end{gathered}$ | 82727868 | 81836376 | 847275 | 837273 | 847566 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina....- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Georgiu-Mississippi................ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


    ## Income in Relation to the Money Value of Home-Produced Food

    Although the varying values ascribed by the families in different farm sections to their home-produced products complicate intersectional comparisons, they do not affect comparisons by income and family type within any given analysis unit. With increasing incomes the average value of the food that was furnished directly by the farm increased in each analysis unit. Table 9 shows these figures on a food-expenditure-unit basis which eliminates as a variable differences in family size and composition.

    From one analysis unit to another there were differences in the rates of increase in the money value of food with increases in incomes. In New Jersey, the average value of food from the farm consumed by families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499$ was only 20 percent higher (on a family basis) than that of families in the class $\$ 500-\$ 749$; in the California, the Illinois-Iowa, and the GeorgiaMississippi sections, 30 to 35 percent higher; in the North DakotaKansas section, 42 percent higher; and in the Vermont, the Pennsylvania-Ohio, the Michigan-Wisconsin, the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado, and the Washington-Oregon sections, 58 to 78 percent higher. In the North Carolina-South Carolina section, the
    average value of home-produced food was more than twice as great at the higher income level as at the lower.

    ## Fomily Type in Relation to the Money Value of Home-Produced Food

    In every analysis unit, the average money value of home-produced food increased with size of family as shown by family-type groups, but not sufficiently to maintain the dietary level of harge frmilies on the same plane as the small. Simple averages of the relative values of home-produced food per food-expenditure unit are shown below for two family-type groups as compared to type 1 in the income classes $\$ 750-\$ 999, \$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, and $\$ 1,250-\$ 1,499$ :

    Relaties value of hame-prodtucad food (food-erpestititure-unit bussix),
     ilies of types-

    | Analysis unit: |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | 1 | Pand 9 | 4 md 6 |
    | Vermont. | 100 | 83 | 73 |
    | New Jersey | 100 | 97 | 82 |
    | Pennsylvania-(\%hio | 100 | 80 | 68 |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin | 100 | 81 | 66 |
    | Illinois-Iowa | 100 | 82 | 71 |
    | North Dakota-Kansas. | 100 | 92 | 90 |
    | South Dakota-Montana-Colorado | 100 | 89 | 71 |
    | Washington-Oregon | 100 | 90 | 78 |
    | Oregon part-time farn | 100 | 81 | 73 |
    | California | 100 | 85 | 83 |
    | North Carolina self-sufficing countiex | 100 | 72 | 65 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina | 100 | 78 | 65 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi | 100 | 83 | 67 |

    On a food-expenditure-unit basis, compared to type 1 families, familics of other type groups appeared to maintain their home-production programs most adequately in the comnties studied in New Jersey and in North Dakota and Kansas. In most other farm sections, families of types 2 and 3 combined had approximately four-fifths as much home-produced food as those of type 1; families of types 4 and 5 , about two-thirds to three-fourths as much.

    ## Money Value of Food Received as Gift or Pay

    Little food was received as gift or pay. In the income class $\$ 1,000-$ $\$ 1,249$, its average value among families of types 4 and 5 ranged from $\$ 3$ to $\$ 18$ per family in the different farm sections (table 42 ). The average amounts received by these families were highest in the counties of North Carolina where self-sufficing farming predominates and money incomes are low, and in the part-time farming unit in Oregon; they were next highest in the wheat-growing sections of North Dakota and Kansas where drought cut into money incomes during the year covered by the study. From about a sixth to $a$ half of these fanilies received food as gift or pay in different analysis units. The proportion was lowest in the several farm sections of the Middle Atlantic and Narth Central region.

    The percentage of families having food as gift or pay was not related to income. It was fairly constant from one income class to another in the Southeast, but fluctuated widely with income changes in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region. Families of type 1 received food as gift or pay relatively less often than those of oher types.

    ## Money Value of All Food

    ## Income in Relation to the Money Value of Food

    Within each farm section the average money value of the food supply as a whole-purchased, farm-furnished, and received as gift or pay-increased as incomes rose. In the Pennsylvania-Ohio section, for example, families of types 4 and 5 combined, in two income classes, $\$ 500-\$ 749$ and $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499$, had food with an average money value of $\$ 377$ and $\$ 657$, respectively. Corresponding averages for Vermont were $\$ 408$ and $\$ 641$; for the Illinois-Iowa section, $\$ 476$ and $\$ 638$; and for the Washington-Oregon section, $\$ 406$ and $\$ 661$. Among families of white farm operators, types 4 and 5 , in the Southeast, the averages for the North Carolina-South Carolina section in these income classes were, respectively, $\$ 417$ and $\$ 828$; for the Georgia-Mississippi section, $\$ 410$ and $\$ 666$ (table 42 ). Although there were varying rates of increase in money value of food with rise in income in the several farm sections, in none did the increase in money value of food keep pace with increase in income; in each section the proportion of income represented by food decreased as incomes rose, especially in the upper range of the income scale.

    Table 10.-All yood: Average money value of all food per family in a year, and value of all food as a percentage of the total value of family living, families of types 4 and 5 , selected income classes, 15 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1985-96
    |White nourelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-tcrn)

    | Region and analysis unit | Average money value of all food, in income class- |  |  |  |  | Value of food as a percentage of total value of family living, in income class- |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | All | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \$ 2500 \\ & \$ 498 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \$ 750- \\ & \$ 8429 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \$ 1,000 \\ \$ 1,249 \end{array}\right\|$ |  | All | $\stackrel{\$ 250-}{\$ 299}$ | ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{\text {\$750- }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,000- \\ & \$ 1,249 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \$ 1,7090 \\ \mid \end{array}$ |
    | new england | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Dol- } \\ \text { lars } \\ 516 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dol- } \\ \text { lars } \\ 357 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Dol- } \\ \text { lars } \\ 448 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Dol- } \\ \hline \text { Pror } \\ 499 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Dol- } \\ \text { Lars } \\ 618 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per-- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per. } \\ \text { cent } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ |
    | middle atlantic and north central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | New Jersey. | $\begin{aligned} & 678 \\ & 549 \\ & 541 \\ & 599 \\ & 569 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 509 \\ & 330 \\ & 341 \\ & 345 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 569 \\ & 448 \\ & 411 \\ & 495 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 642 \\ & 494 \\ & 464 \\ & 546 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 705 \\ & 578 \\ & 558 \\ & 558 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 39 \\ & 36 \\ & 41 \end{aligned}$ | 47454145 | 4949474040 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 44 \\ & 39 \\ & 43 \end{aligned}$ | 40373438 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Mlichigan-Wisconsin. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | plaing and mountain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Dakota-Kansas. | $\begin{aligned} & 577 \\ & 6221 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 480 \\ & 512 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 560 \\ & 594 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 615 \\ & 592 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 636 \\ & 753 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{5}^{43}$ | ${ }_{48}^{42}$ | 3646 |
    | pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Washington-Oregon | $\begin{aligned} & 581 \\ & 668 \\ & 668 \end{aligned}$ | 338 | $\begin{aligned} & 519 \\ & 490 \\ & 590 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 564 \\ & 558 \\ & 580 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 654 \\ & 701 \\ & 788 \\ & \hline 08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 40 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ -922 \end{gathered}$ | 494642 | 46484141 | 424031 |
    | Oregon-part-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | southeast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Carolina self-sufficing counties. | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & 671 \\ & 574 \\ & 574 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 337 \\ & 395 \\ & 306 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 609 \\ & 489 \\ & 499 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 723 \\ & 5 \times 1 \\ & 572 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 735 \\ & 788 \\ & 8488 \end{aligned}$ | 644543 | 674981 | 675455 | 68525353 | 534646 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes families in the consumption sampie. See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region; see Glossary for detmittons of terms used in this table. All averages and percentages in this table are based on the number of families in each income class.

    Figure 3 shows for two analysis units the change in the relative value of food with change in relative income for families of types 4 and 5 combined. Both the average value of food and the average income for cach income class are expressed as pereentages of the averagoes for all familics of these types in the analysis units. This method
    

    Figure 3.--Relationships between money value of food and income, families of types 4 and 5 husband, wife, one person 16 or older, and none to three others), nonrelief white farm operators' families in the North Carolina-South Carolina and the Illinois-Iowa analysis units, $193 \overline{-} 36$.
    of presentation eliminates regional differences in general levels of income and money value of food, and facilitates the comparison of consumption patterns from one farm section to another. The curve representing the Illinois-Iowa farm section illustrates the pattern that shapes itself if the total dollar value of food increases comparatively little as incomes increase. The curve based on data from the North Carolintu-South Carolina section illustrates the other extremea relatively large increase in total dollar value of food with increasing incomes. In the Southeast sections, the rate of increase was more murked at income levels above the average than was observed in other farm sections.

    With rise in incomes, a decreasing proportion of the money value of family living was represented by food, as a rule. In some farm sections, however, the proportion rose in the lower part of the income range before following the general trend of decreasing with rising income (table 10).

    ## Family Type in Relation to the Money Value of Food

    The relationships found in the several farm sections between family type and the money value of all food are similar to those already
    pointed out for the component parts; in all farm sections the relative increase in the number to be fed from one family type to another was much greater than the relative increase in the money value of the family food supply. Differences between the dietary levels of families in the several type groups were greater in some farm sections than others. The following figures (simple averages of the relative values of food of families of two type groups compared to type 1 , in three income classes, $\$ 750-\$ 999, \$ 1,000-\$ 1,249$, and $\$ 1,250-\$ 1,499$ ) indicate that differences between types tended to be least marked in the New Jersey section, and most marked in the North Carolina counties where self-sufficing farming predominates:

    | Analysis unit: | Relative money palue of food (yood-expenditure-unit basig) income range $\$ 750-$$\$ 1,499$, families of types- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | 1 | 2 and $s$ | 4 and 5 |
    | Vermont | 100 | 82 | 72 |
    | New Jersey | 100 | 94 | 78 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio | 100 | 80 | 69 |
    | Michigan-Wisconsin. | 100 | 82 | 67 |
    | Illinois-Iowa. | 100 | 84 | 75 |
    | North Dakota-Kansas | 100 | 85 | 79 |
    | South Dakota-Montana-Colorado | 100 | 85 | 73 |
    | Washington-Oregon. | 100 | 89 | 77 |
    | Oregon part-time farms | 100 | 75 | 69 |
    | California. .-. .-..-- | 100 | 84 | 78 |
    | North Carolina self-suffing counties | 100 | 74 | 66 |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina. | 100 | 79 | 65 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi | 100 | 83 | 67 |

    In round numbers, on a food-expenditure-unit basis, the tendency was for families of types 2 and 3 in income classes $\$ 750-\$ 1,499$ to have food supplies valued at 75 to 90 percent of those of type 1 families; families of types 4 and 5 , food valued at 65 to 80 percent of that of type 1 ; and families of types 6 and 7, food valued at 50 to 70 percent of that of type 1. The relationships between the money value of diets of families differing in type are not unlike those existing between the money value (per food-expenditure unit) of diets patterned after plans outlined in the 1939 Yearbook of Agriculture, Food and Life. These proposed diets were valued (on the basis of prices paid by farm families for purchased food, and values assigned by the families to their home-produced goods, adjusted to January-October 1938 price levels) as follows:

    ## Diet plan:

    Expensive good die
    Moderate-cost good diet
    Low-cost good diet
    Economical fair diet
    Estimated money value of food per expenditure unit for a week
    $\$ 2.60-\$ 2.90$
    \$2. 00-\$2. 60
    $\$ 1.60-\$ 2.00$
    \$1. 25-\$1. 60

    The relative values of these diets (midpoint of range given above) compared to that of the expensive good diet are: Expensive good diet, 100; moderate-cost good diet, 84; low-cost good diet, 65; and the economical fair diet, 52 . These figures fall within the range of relatives of money value of food shown previously for families of types 1 , 2 and 3,4 and 5 , and 6 and 7 , respectively. Hence, within the income range, $\$ 750-\$ 1,499$, if families of type 1 have food valued in the expensive good-diet class, families of types 4 and 5 might be expected to have food valued in the low-cost good-diet class.

    ## Dietary Patterns as Shown by 7-Day Schedules

    Since much of the struggle for livelihood on the farms in this country is directed toward obtaining the food supply, it is only natural that farm families are interested in the costs of home production and in food prices. But necessary also is their interest in diet from the nutritional viewpoint. Proper food is the stuff out of which sound and efficient bodies are built, and upon which their daily upkeep and activity depend. The nutritive qualities of customary diets determine to a large extent whether an individual or a nation achieves the highest possible level of vitality. For the fullest realization of the physical and mental powers of a people, much depends upon buoyant health, important to the development of well-rounded personalities, and upon sturdy bodies capable of ready response to the mind's direction and equal to the demands of a long span of life.

    This section, describing the character of farm family diets, considers them in terms of the proportion of the money value of food representing major food classes and the quantities consumed of the several important foods or groups of food; the next section (p. 52) discusses the nutritive value of the diets in terms of chemical substances.

    ## Proportion of the Money Value of Food Representing Major Food Classes

    Meat, poultry, and fish accounted for the largest share of the money valuc of food eaten at home (from a fifth to a fourth) among households of white farm operators at each income level in three broad regional groups. (See Methodology, Combinations of Farm Sections into Analysis Units.) Milk, cheese, and cream usually took second place; vegetables and fruit, third; and grain products, fourth. (Data for money value of food eaten at home are given in tables 48 to 52 .)

    Milk tends to be more prominent in farm diets than in those of urban groups. From 70 to 90 percent of the money value of all home-produced food had by families of types 4 and 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, could be attributed to products from animal sources in 17 of 20 farm sections studied (the part-time farmoperator unit omitted). In 11 farm sections, meat, poultry, and eggs contributed a somewhat larger share to the money value of farmfurnished food than did milk and cream; the reverse was true in 9 . Within each analysis unit the relative importance of these products was similar for families differing in type with incomes in the same class, $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$.

    Close comparisons of regional dietary habits cannot be made on the basis of value in dollars and cents, sither in total or proportional amounts. With total money value of food constant, some classes of food may represent a higher percentage of the total in one region than another, either because relatively large quantities are consumed or because the food is valued at relatively high prices.

    Within each region families of the several type groups did not differ markedly with respect to the proportion of the money value represented by various food groups. For example, among families of type 1 (husband and wife only) at the income level $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, the proportions representing eggs, meat, and miscellaneous items gen-
    erally were highest (or equal to the highest) as compared to the other family-type groups, and the proportions representing milk, grain products, and sugars generally were lowest (or equal to the lowest). As compared to families of type 1, there was a tendency among households of types 2 and 3 combined, and 6 and 7 combined-both groups with a larger proportion of family members under 16 yearsto distribute a larger share of the total money value of food to milk. Excepting milk, which is of special dietary importance to children, the differences occurring between proportions distributed to various food classes by type 1 families and those of types 2 and 3 or 6 and 7 , indicate that families of type 1 selected a somewhat more expensive type of diet (table 11). The preceding section brought out the point that, as a group, families of type 1 spent more per meal per foodexpenditure unit than families of other type groups.
    As incomes rose, the average dollar value of each of the major classes of food tended to remain fairly constant or to increase. Changes in the percentages of the total value of the diet representing each food class indicate, therefore, whether its money value increased at the same relative rate as that of all food, or more or less rapidly than all food. The proportions of the food dollar representing dairy products and vegetables and fruit followed different trends with rising incomes in the three broad regional groups. Between the classes $\$ 0-\$ 499$ and $\$ 3,000-\$ 4,999$, the share representing milk, cheese, and cream decreased from 19 to 14 percent among families of types 4 and 5 combined in the North (New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central regions). In the West (Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions) the share increased from 18 to 25 percent between these same classes; in the Southeast, the percentage increased from 21 in the income class $\$ 0-\$ 499$ to 24 in the class $\$ 500-\$ 999$, and then decreased with income to 19 percent in the class $\$ 3,000-\$ 4,999$. As incomes rose throughout the entire range studied, the share of the food dollar taken by vegetables and fruit increased from 16 to 20 percent among families in the North; it remained fairly constant in the Southeast; but it declined from 19 to 16 percent in the West (table 11).

    Changes with income in the proportion of the food dollar representing other classes of food were in the same direction in the three broad regional groups. The proportion of the money value representing eggs and miscellaneous items remained fairly constant in each unit. But fats, grain products, and sugars accounted for progressively smaller proportions as incomes rose between the limits indicated, and meat, poultry, and fish accounted for progressively larger proportions in each analysis unit.

    At practically every income level, the money value of eggs, milk, cheese, cream and vegetables and fruit (groups classed among the protective foods) taken together amounted to 40 percent or more of the total for all food; and of fats and meat combined, to about a third or more of the total.

    ## Quantities Consumed of Important Food Groups

    Within income classes or fomily-type groups the consumption of individual articles of food or of groups of food may be expected to differ more than the money value of the food supply as a whole.

    Many combinations of major classes of food, with hundreds of possible choices among individual foods, may be selected to provide the three dozen or so chemical substances that the body needs for its nourishment. Among families of similar economic status, food choices are influenced by family tastes and preferences, both among foods that are too dissimilar to be more than partial alternates in the diet and among foods that are similar in food value.

    Table 11.- Money value of food by class of food: Average money value of food per household in a week and percentage distribution by classes of food, by family type for income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, and by income for types 4 and 5,3 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ March-November 1986
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    

    NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE AT-
    LANTIC, AND NORTH CENTRAL
    \$0-\$499
    $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,489$

    | 49 | 8.92 | 5 | 19 | 10 | 22 | 15 | 7 | 16 | 6 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 193 | 8. 14 | 6 | 18 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 7 | 18 | 6 |
    | 264 | 10.08 | 5 | 17 | 10 | 24 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 5 |
    | 183 | 10.87 | 5 | 17 | 10 | 22 | 14 | 8 | 18 | 6 |
    | 159 | 12.27 | 5 | 16 | 9 | 25 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 6 |
    | 66 | 13.03 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 26 | 14 | 7 | 20 | 5 |
    | 55 | 7.92 | 5 | 18 | 10 | 23 | 12 | 7 | 19 | 6 |
    | 90 | 8. 46 | ó | 20 | 10 | 22 | 11 | 7 | 20 | 5 |
    | 102 | 10. 52 | 4 | 23 | 11 | 23 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 5 |
    | 71 | 10.92 | 5 | 22 | 10 | 24 | 10 | 6 | 18 | 5 |
    | (i3 | 12.06 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 8 | 17 | 5 |
    | 18 | 13.19 | 4 | 25 | 10 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 16 | 5 |
    | 71 | 6. 29 | 3 | 21 | 14 | 19 | 16 | 7 | 16 |  |
    | 359 | 8. 15 | 3 | 24 | 13 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 15 | 4 |
    | 242 | 9. 90 | 4 | 22 | 10 | 24 | 14 | 7 | 1.5 | 4 |
    | 146 | 10.64 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 26 | 12 | 6 | 15 | 4 |
    | 121 | 10.98 | 4 | 20 | 10 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 16 | 5 |
    | 55 | 13.82 | 4 | 19 | 10 | 29 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 4 |


    ## Seasonal Trends in the Consumption of Major Food Groups

    Differing periods of time were covered by schedules reporting on the varying aspects of the food supply in this study. Figures on food production for home use taken from the family-income schedule, and those on money value of food and food-canning programs taken from the expenditure schedule cover a 12 -month period in 1935-36. On the other hand, the information on quantities of food consumed, derived from food check lists and food records, cover only a 7 -day period sometime in 1936 or early 1937.

    Most of the 7 -day estimates of consumption (check lists) were obtained from March to November inclusive; those collected in this period have been pooled for study within regions of the relationships between income and family type and the consumption of food. But because schedule collection did not proceed uniformly in the several local offices, the months within this period of time were not equally represented everywhere, and the resulting averages cannot be used in making interregional comparisons of the consumption of any item that is seasonal. Only in the summer months-June, July, and August-were enough schedules collected in each region to obtain averages that may be used for such regional comparisons.

    Modern methods and facilities for storing, preserving, shipping, and marketing food products have greatly reduced the influence of season on the availability of foods in cities. But on farms, families purchase only a portion of their food supply, more especially the staple articles as grain products, sugar, and flavorings, that are not seasonal. Hence the techmological developments tending to reduce seasonal differences in food consumption are less significant for farm than for city diets. Of several major groups of foods there are distinct seasonal trends in farm family consumption.

    To show something of these seasonal trends and to make possible an estimate of consumption on a year-round basis, figures on consumption in a week (check list data) obtained in each of four 3-month periods have been averaged separately for two broad analysis units (one, New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central States; the other, the Southeast region). The months combined were:

    | Month: | Season |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | March-April-May | Spring |
    | June-July-August | Summe |
    | September-October |  |
    | December-January | Winter |

    As would be expected from the seasonal cycle of production and farm prices, more eggs were consumed on farms in the spring and early summer months than in other seasons. This was true in both analysis units, as is shown in table 12 for families of types 4 and 5 with incomes in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$. For dairy and meat products, the figures do not show any consistent seasonal trend; the difference in averages from season to season was greater in the Southeast than in the North. For grain products, spring appears to be the season of highest consumption; and for sugars, summer.

    Potato-sweetpotato consumption in the Southeast was markedly seasonal; a much larger proportion in this region than in the North was represented by sweetpotatoes, a product less well adapted to storage than potatoes. Potatoes are a year-round food on farms in the northern sections of the country, where conditions are favorable
    to home storage throughout the winter and early spring，and where markets，thanks to commercial storage plants and carly crops from the South，can supply farm demand between the time when home stores are exhausted and the new crop is harvested locally．

    Table 12．－Consumption of specified food groups，by season：Average household consumption of specified food groups in a week，by season，families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499,2$ analysis units，white farm operators in 12 States， 1 1936－37
    ［Housebolds of white nonteliel families that include a husband and wife，botb native－born］

    | Analysis unit and season |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 僉 } \\ & \text { 空 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other vegetables |  |  | Fruit |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 豆 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { 年 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { き } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ |  | 吻 | 茄 |
    | NEW ENGLAND，MIDDIE <br> ATLANTIC， <br> CENTRAL <br> AND <br> NORTM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | No． | Doz． | Qt． | Ib． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Ib． |
    | Spring 1936 | 60 | 2． 6 | 20.0 | 4．2 | 12.7 | 15.2 | 8.4 | 28．11 | 4.4 | 5． 2 | 1.0 | 6.9 | 3.3 | 0.7 |
    | Suminer 1836 | 155 | 2.6 | 19．6 | 4．1： | ： 10.9 | 14．8 | 9.7 | 24.0 | 9.6 | 2．8． | ． 7 | 11.0 | 2.0 | ． 4 |
    | Fall 1936 | 43 | 2.2 | 23， 0 | 4． $6:$ | 11.4 | 14．9 | 7.8 | 25.7 | 12.3 | 2． 5. | 1.0 | 12.9 | ． 8 | ． 5 |
    | Winter 1936－37 | 27 | 2.0 | 20.5 | 3． 7 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 7.2 | 12． 5 | 2.5 | 7.1 | 1.0 | 9.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
    | SOUTHEAST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Spring 1036． | $48^{\circ}$ | 3.0 | 28.5 | 5． 5 | 11.5 | 35.3 | 8.6 | 11.1 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 4． 2 | ． 6 |
    | Summer 1936 | 130 | 1． 9 | 26.6 | 5．9． | 13.8 | 33.4 | 3.3 | 9.9 | 18．9 | 1． 5 | ． 4 | 17.4 | 1．0） | ． 2 |
    | Fall 1936 | 64 | 1.3 | 25.4 | 5.1 | 12． 7 | 28.8 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 13.8 | ． 9. | ． 5 | 6.5 | 1．2 | ． 3 |
    | Winter 1986－37． | 16 | 2.0 | 18.8 | 6． 1 | 18.4 | 33.0 | 7．9： | ！16．4 | 8． 1 | 1.5 | ． 9 | 9.1 | 2.1 | ． 8 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food eheck lists furnished by families in the constmption sample．See Meth－ odology for the states and counties studied in earh region；see Clossary for definitlors of terms used in this table．A！averages are based on the number of households in each seasonal group．
    ${ }^{2}$ Approximately the quantity of Guid milk to which the various dairy products（except butter）are equiv－ alent so far as proteins and minerals are concerned．
    8 Does not include bacon and salt side．
    1 Includes bacon and salt side．
    Two－thirds of the weight of baked goods has been added to that of flour，meals，and cereals．
    Farm family consumption of the more perishable of the fresh vegetables and fruit tends to follow the marked seasonal trends of garden and orchard productivity，and usually is highest in summer and fall．Inversely related to the quantities of these foods consumed in fresh state are the quantities of processed（canned or dried）products． These processed foods are consumed in largest average quantity，as a rule，in the winter and early spring months when home stores of fresh farm－furnished products are low，and when retail prices of many of the fresh vegetables and fruit are relatively high．

    ## Consumption of Major Food Groups as Related to Income and Family Type

    Consumption of the various foods or groups of food is related in differing degrees to income and family type．${ }^{4}$ Among families living


    in the North (New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central regions), there were steady increases in household consumption of each major food group as incomes rose. Because the number of persons fed from household supplies also increased, it is easier to interpret consumption figures on a per capita than on a household basis. The relative quantities provided for each household member are shown in table 13. The rate of increase with rising income was greatest for fresh fruit among families of types 4 and 5 in farm sections in the North; next for meat, fresh vegetables, and eggs; and least for milk, fats, grain products, sugars, and potatoes. The trend toward increase in the consumption of fresh vegetables and fruit with rising income is significant; these foods are important sources of vitamin C and, in general, farm diets were not well fortified in this nutrient.
    In the West (Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions), the rate of increase with rising income was greatest for fresh vegetables. Upward trends were found also for eggs, milk, sugars, and fresh fruit, while the per capita consumption of meat, grain products, and potatoes changed but little. In the Southeast the most marked incrases in per capita consumption were in eggs and meat.

    The figures in appendix tables from families in income classes at the extremes of the income distribution should not be given undue weight in the interpretation of trends in consumption. There were relatively few families in the highest income classes. In the lowest classes there were two groups of families-those whose incomes chanced to be low in the year of the study, but whose assets enabled them to maintain during the relatively brief period the higher living levels to which they were accustomed; and those whose incomes usually were low and who had adjusted their levels of living accordingly.

    Within the food groups, income affected the consumption of some food items more than others-purchased foods more than farm-furnished. For example, as income rose, there were marked increases in the consumption of commercially baked goods. In the North, the increase in these products was more than onc-third between the income classes $\$ 500-\$ 999$ and $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$; average consumption for familics of types 4 and 5 was 6.2 and 8.5 pounds per household, respectively, at these levels. In the Southeast, the increase was fourfold; quantities averaged 0.5 and 2.2 pounds, respectively, for the corresponding familytype group and income classes. The proportion of these families buying the prepared foods mentioncd increased but little between the two income classes, from 79 to 87 percent in the North, and from 58 to 65 percent in the Wcst; but in the Southeast, the proportion rose from 26 to 74 percent. At no income level, however, did families in the Southeast buy so large a share of their grain products in the form of baked goods as was common among families of the North and West.

    Twenty-nine percent of the weight of grain products (flour equivalent.) was bought in the form of baked goods by households of family types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$ in the North, and 35 percent in the income class $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$. Corresponding figures for the West were 16 and 24 percent; and for the Southeast, 1 and 5 percent (table 50).

    The quantities of important foods consumed by families in the different type groups increased with family size; but the increases were not proportional to the increase in numbers to be fed. The
    rates of increase differed for the various kinds of food. Thus, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, families of other type groups most nearly approximated families of type 1 , with respect to the per capita supplies of milk, grain products, and potatoes; they approximated them least closely with respect to eggs, meat, and (except in the Southeast) fresh fruit.

    Table 13.-helative constmption of specified food groops: Relative per capila consumption of specified food groups, by family type for income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, and by income for family types 4 and 5,9 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ March-November 1936
    [Howseholls of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, bott native-borr]

    | Analysis unit, family type, and incowe | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \text { 號 } \\ & \text { D } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  | 篤 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | INCOME CLASS $\$ 1,000-81,490$ (fanily type $1=100$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | new enoland, middle atlantic, and Nobth central | No. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. |
    | Type 1...- | 135 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | Types 4 and 5 | 218 | 76 | 89 | 83 | 74 | 83 | 84 | 94 | 83 | 88 |
    | TYpes 0 and 7 | 140 | 51 | 67 | 58 | 56 | 78 | ${ }_{63} 8$ | 103 85 | 83 62 | 80 40 |
    | plains, molntain, asd pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Type 1. | 18 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | Types 2 and 3 | 22 | 68 | 80 | 78 | 79 | 85 | 84 | 92 | 78 | 73 |
    | Types 4 and 5. | 102 | 63 | 86 | 81. | 72 | 96 | 87 | 100 | 69 | 58 |
    | souttreas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Type 1. | 74 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | Types 2 and 3. | 82 | 68 | 90 | 89 | 70 | 82 | 88 | 93 | 97 | 85 |
    | Types 4 and 5 | 242 | 63 | 88 | is | 68 | 88 | 84 | 91 | 88 | 69 |
    | Types 6 and 7 . | 115 | 37 | 78 | 61 | 34 | 79 | 69 | 106 | 80 | 90 |

    FAMEILY TYPES 4 AND 5 (income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499=100$ )
    
    1,000-1,499

    | 193 | 93 | 88 | 91 | 79 | 103 | 97 | 83 | 91 | 74 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 264 | 1061 | 100 | 100 | 109 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | 183 | 109 | 107 | 104 | 104 | 108 | 102 | 88 | 100 | 109 |
    | 159 | 123 | 104 | 110 | $12 \overline{0}$ | 104 | 110 | 103 | 137 | 140 |
    | 95 | 100 | 83 | 82 | 85 | 84 | 94 | 93 | 82 | 93 |
    | 102 | 100 | 100 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | 71 | 134 | 95 | 98 | 104 | 91 | 105 | 101 | 134 | 105 |
    | 63 | 125 | 114 | 101 | 102 | 98 | 119 | 89 | 141 | 134 |
    | 359 | 81 | 103 | 103 | 72 | 98 | 90 | 71 | 93 | 104 |
    | 242 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
    | 146 | 123 | 106 | 113 | 118 | 101 | 94 | 94 | 117 | 103 |
    | 121 | 130 | 97 | 110 | 121 | 87 | 89 | 84 | 125 | 116 |

    As a rule, families of type 1 and types 4 and 5 combined--groups that include in their membership a large proportion of persons 16 years or older-consumed more potatoes and grain products on a per capita basis than families of types 2 and 3 or 6 and 7 -groups with proportionally fewer persons in the older age group. This probably reflects the greater need for inexpensive energy-yielding food by the older family members, called upon to perform heavy farm tasks.

    ## Interregional Comparison of Quantities Consumed of Major Food Groups

    Food choices probably are as divergent between the analysis unit of the North and West (Ncw England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions) on the one hand, and the Southeast on the other, as between any two parts of the country. (Comparisons in this section are bascd on data from white operators' families only; had all tenure-color groups in the Southeast been combined, different conclusions would have been reached.) There were characteristic differences within similar totals when the food of white operators' families is considered under three broad classes: (1) selected food groups that include many of the so-called protective foods; (2) other groups of foods of plant origin; (3) other groups of foods chiefly of animal origin.

    The food groups included in each class, and average consumption per person in a week in summer months are shown below for white operators' families of types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-$ $\$ 1,499$, in cach of two analysis units:

    | , | Pounds consumed per person in a week in summet on farms in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Classes and groups of food: Class A. | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { North } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Whest } \\ 19.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { South- } \\ \text { eunst } \\ \text { 21. } 6 \end{gathered}$ |
    | Eggs. | 1. 0 | 0.6 |
    | Milk, fluid, or its equivalent in other forms | S-- 11.1 | 12. 0 |
    | Butter---------------------------- | - 5 | 5 |
    | Succulent vegetables, fresh and canned. | - 3. 0 | 4. 0 |
    | Fruit, fresh ${ }^{1}$ and canned ------------- | - 3.7 | 4. 5 |
    | Class B. | 10.6 | 11.1 |
    | Grain products (flour equivalent) | 3.5 | 7.1 |
    | Sugars, sirups, preserves... | - 2.2 | 2. 0 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes. | - 4.8 | 1. 9 |
    | Dry mature beans, peas------------- | - . 1 | 1 |
    | Class C | 3. 4 | 3. 9 |
    | Fats, oils ${ }^{2}$ | . 7 | 1. 6 |
    |  | --- 2.7 | 2. 3 |
    | Includes also the fresh equivalent of dried fruits. Excludes butter, but includes bacon and salt side. |  |  |

    Because the food groups included in class A tend to provide farm families with most of the calcium, the vitamin A value, the ascorbic acid, and the riboflavin of their diets, as well as a large share of the high-quality protein, they play an important role in determining dietary adequacy. It is in these nutrients that farm diets often are relatively deficient; the foods supplying them are sometimes called protective foods.

    Class B is comprised of four food groups, each of which is a relatively inexpensive source of food encrgy. Combined, the four groups are about equally prominent in the diets of both regions; this reflects common experience that carbohydrate-rich foods of plant origin-the grains, tubers, and sugars-generally are cheap means of staving off hunger. In the unit from the North and West, each of three types of foodgrain products, sugars, and potatoes--entered into diets in substantial quantities; in the Southeast, the quantity of grain products greatly outweighed that of other products.

    Foods in class C give to the diet a "staying" quality and a flavor that has appetite appeal to most persons. Fats and meat are by no means interchangeable so far as nutritive values are concerned; both groups supply food energy, but the leaner cuts of meat, poultry, and fish are important also for high-quality protein, and for certain minerals and vitamins. In a given income class, families of the same type groups in the Southeast consume considerably more fats than do families in the North and West, but somewhat less of meat, poultry, and fish.

    ## Foods of Class A (Groups Including Many of the Protective Foods)

    Among farm families, the level of consumption of most of the foods in class A is closely related to programs of food production for household use. This is especially true of eggs and milk, and to a lesser decree, of succulent vegetables and fruits, also. (For data on quantities of home-produced food consumed during the 7-day periods in 1936 covered by the special food study, see tables 55 and 55 a; for figures on the number of families producing different types of products for home use in 1935-36, see table 56).

    Eggs.
    Some farm-furnished eggs for household use were had in 1935-36 by more than 75 percent of the white operators' families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ in every farm section studied. In 15 of 21 sections, the proportion was 95 percent or more. Almost all families consumed some eggs during the week covered by the 7-day estimate of food consumption. In the North and West the proportion was 95 percent or more at all income levels. In the Southeast, 92 percent or more of the families with incomes of at least $\$ 1,000$ used some eggs during the week; but when incomes were in the classes $\$ 0-\$ 499$ and $\$ 500-\$ 999$, the proportions were 79 and 86 , respectively.

    Of families having eggs during the week of the consumption study, 95 percent had most if not all of them directly from the farm. In three broad regional groups, the average consumption of eggs in a week in June, July, or August ranged from 2.6 dozen to 1.8 dozen per houschold among white operators' families of types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, as shown below:

    Eggs consumed in a week

    |  | Aprjrozimat e <br> Dozen per <br> number per <br> household <br> person |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | -2.5 | 8 |
    | -2.6 | 9 |
    | -1.8 | 5 |

    As might be expected from the seasonal cycle of production, these figures are higher than would be found in winter.

    Milk.
    In 15 of the 21 analysis units included in the survey (white farm operators), 90 percent or more of the families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ produced some milk for home consumption in 1935-36. In southern California only 34 percent of these families reported production of milk for home use and in the other five sec-tions-New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Oregon (part-time operators), central California, and North Carolina-from 55 to 88 percent produced some milk for home use.

    Fresh milk from the farm was had by almost all ( 97 percent or more) of the families of white operators in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ consuming this food during the week of the special food study. The fluid milk to which the checse, cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and ice cream were equivalent (in milk solids other than fat), when added to the fluid milk, gave the following averages per week for the summer of 1936 among households of families of types 1 to 5 combined, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ :
    

    Of the total quantity of milk or its equivalent consumed by these families during the week, 85 percent represented milk produced on the farm in the North, 87 percent in the West, and 91 percent in the Southeast.

    At this income level, milk consumption was fairly generous during the summer in all three regions. On a per capita basis, it was lowest in the North and highest in the West. The proportions of the total quantities that were consumed as fluid milk were 81,83 , and 93 percent, respectively, for the North, West, and Southeast. Most of the fluid milk consumed was produced on the farm. In the North and West a small proportion (a fourth or less) of the cheese consumed during the week studied was home-produced, but in the Southeast practically none. Little seasonal difference was found in the proportion of families having fresh milk in the North, but in the Southeast fewer familics (especially among the larger families in the lower income classes) consumed fresh milk in the winter than during the other three seasons.
    Vegetables other than potatoes.
    Garden vegetables (potatoes not included) were produced in 193536 by a large proportion of the families included in most farm sections. Among those of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499,92$ percent or more had such food from their gardens in farm sections of the New England and Middle Atlantic and North Central States. In the Plains and Mountain region, food from home gardens was less common. In the South Dakota-Montana-Colorado section, about three-fourths of the families had home gardens; and in Kansas, only about half. The comparatively arid climate and frequent droughts tend to make gardening less profitable in these latter sections than in many others. In the Southeast and in the Pacific Northwest practically every family had a garden, but in the two sections of California only about half or fewer had garden food from their own farms. In
    sections characterized by a low percentage of families having food from gardens, there was a tendency for the proportion to decrease as incomes rose (table 56).

    In many farm sections, 90 percent or more of all families in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ had gardens regardless of family type. In the farm sections where gardens were less common, families of type 1 were less likely to have food from home gardens than were the larger families with greater food needs and more potential helpers.

    Among families of white operators, types 1 to 5 combined, in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, household consumption of vegetables other than potatoes during a week in the summer of 1936 was as follows:

    | Fresh | Canned | Dried |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 8. 6 | 2. 8 | 0.6 |
    | 8. 5 | 2. 9 | . 2 |
    | 15. 4 | 1. 2 | . 3 |

    These figures show the quantity and forms used in the two analysis units of the North and West to be fairly similar. There were, however, wide sectional differences within these broad regional groups; the high consumption by families in Pacific farm sections is counterbalanced in these averages by low consumption in the Plains and Mountain sections (table 63). In the Southeast, summer is the season of highest consumption of fresh vegetables whereas in the North, the peak is in the fall. However, regardless of season, families in the Southeast consumed greater quantitics of fresh vegetables than the averages found for families in the North and West combined as one unit.

    Most of the fresh vegetables consumed during a week in summer were obtained from the garden. In the North, the proportion was 86 percent; in the West, 71 percent; and in the Southeast, 93 percent for families in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$. In the analysis unit of the North and West, the vegetables used by the largest percentage of families and in the largest average quantitics were tomatoes, cabbage, lettuce, onions, peas, and snap beans. In the Southeast, a combination of southern greens tended to replace lettuce; otherwise the list was the same.

    Some of the canned vegetables used by these groups of families were also farm-furnished although in summer, when last year's supplies were depleted, the proportion was somewhat less than at other times. In the North, the consumption of canned vegetables both in winter and spring was about twice as high as in cither summer or fall. The longer growing season in the Southeast postponed until spring any great need for canned vegetables.

    ## Fruit.

    Pcrhaps because it requires a greater investment and more planning ahead, fewer families raised fruit than garden produce for home use, except in the fruit-growing sections of California. In the farm sections studied in the North (New England and Middle Atlantic and North Central States) the proportion of white operators' families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ having home-produced fruit in 1935-36 ranged from 33 percent in Vermont to 85 percent in Pennsylvania; in the West, from 6 percent in Kansas to 92 percent
    in Oregon; in the Southeast, from 52 percent in Mississippi to 88 percent in Georgia.

    In each region farm families consumed but moderate quantities of fresh fruit even in the summer months. The average quantities of fruit used in a week in the summer by households of family types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ were as follows:

    | is |  | Pounds of fruit consumed per household in a week |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | New England, Middle Atlantic and | North | Fresh | Canned | ied |
    | Central |  | 9. 8 | 1. 9 | 0.4 |
    | Plains and Mountain, Pacif |  | 10.5 | 2. 0 | . 4 |
    | Southeast. |  | 16.9 | 9 | 2 |

    These figures for white operators' families indicate a higher consumption of fruit in the Southeast than elsewhere. This difference is due partly to the fact that the peak of consumption of fresh fruit is in the summer in the Southeast and in the summer and fall in the New England and Middle Atlantic and North Central States. Furthermore in the Southeast the consumption of locally produced melons with their high proportion of refuse greatly adds to the weight of fresh fruit consumed in the summer. There appears to be a similarity in the consumption of fruit between the North and the West; but sectional and seasonal differences, as in the case of vegetable consumption, are very great. Undoubtedly the quantitics of fruit consumed on farms of the Pacific States greatly exceed those in the Plains and Mountain region.

    Of the quantities of fresh fruit consumed by these families in summer, 34 percent was home-produced in the North, 25 percent in the West, and 83 percent in the Southeast. The kinds of fresh fruit used in different parts of the country differ considerably. In the unit from the North and West the five fruits consumed in largest quantity, from March-November 1936, were apples, oranges, bananas, melons, and berries; in the Southeast only three were consumed in similar quantities-melons, apples, and peaches.

    Canned fruit was used most freely in the spring, when farm stores of fresh fruit tend to be less plentiful, and retail prices of many kinds higher than in the summer or fall. Although more dried fruit was used in the winter and spring, the quantities were too small to be of much consequence in counterbalancing seasonal differences in the consumption of fresh fruit.
    Home canning of vegetables and fruit.
    Home canning of vegetables paralleled the trends in home gardens. In 6 of 11 analysis units (New Jersey and the Oregon part-time units omitted), 90 percent or more of families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ that canned vegetables reported that half or more of the vegetables they canned were home grown. In farm sections where home gardens were less common, fewer families produced half or more of the vegetables that they canned; in the two Plains and Mountain sections, the proportions were 69 and 64 percent; and in the highly specialized farm sections of California, only a third. The sections which led in the average number of quarts canned were those in Washington and Oregon, North Carolina self-sufficing counties, and in Pennsylvania and Ohio (tables 14 and 57).

    Table 14.-vegetables and fruit produced and canned for home use: Percentage of households reporting production and canning of vegetables and fruit for home use, average value home-produced, and average quantity canned at home per household in a year, families of types 4 and 5 in income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, 19 analysis units, white farm operators in 19 States, $1995-36$
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    
    ${ }^{1}$ See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table.
    ${ }^{2}$ Data in these columns are from tbe income schedules. Percentages and averages are based on the number of bouseholds in each analysis unit.
    ${ }^{2}$ Data in these columns are from the expenditure schedules.
    ${ }^{4}$ Does not include saderkraut, pickles, relishes. Percentages and averages are based on the number of households in each analysis unit.
    ${ }^{2}$ Includes sauerkraut, pickles, relishes. Percentages are based on the number of households reporting on this item.
    ${ }^{6}$ Does not include jellies, jams, preserves. Percentages and averages are based on the number of house-
    bolds in each analysis unit.
    ${ }^{7}$ Includes jellies, jams, preserves. Percentages are based on the number of households reporting on this item.

    Home canning of vegetables and fruit tends to accompany increasing value of farm-furnished food. Among families of type 2 in Penusyl-
    vania and Ohio, for example, the average quantities canned by those with farm-furnished food in the money-value class $\$ 150-\$ 249$ included 91 quarts of vegetables and 92 quarts of fruit. The quantity canned by those with farm-furnished food valued in the class $\$ 250-\$ 349$ included 117 quarts of vegetables and 127 quarts of fruit (table 15).
    Table 15.-vegetables and fruit canned at home: Number of households canning vegetables and fruit at home and average number of quarts canned during a year, by value of home-produced food, families with one child under 16 and no others (type 2), Pennsylvania-Ohio analysis unit, ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ 1935-36
    [Households of white nonrelief [amilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Value of home-produced food (dollars) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { House- } \\ & \text { holds } \end{aligned}$ | Vegetables ${ }^{2}$ |  | Fruit ${ }^{1}$ |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Households eanning | Average quantity canneds | Honseholids canning | A verage quantity canned ${ }^{3}$ |
    | 50-149. | Number 22 | Numbat ${ }^{22}$ | Quarta ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ | Number 19 | Quarts 80 |
    | 150-349- | 95 | 82 | 91 | ${ }_{77}^{93}$ | 92 |
    | 250-349. | 78 | 75 | 117 | 77 | 127 |
    | 350 or over. | 54 | 54 | 111 | 53 | 132 |

    As incomes rose, the quantitics of vegetables canned did not increase markedly in any of the farm sections studied except in Vermont and in the Southeast. In the North Carolina-South Carolina section, the average quantity of vegetables canned by families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ that canned any food at home was 41 quarts in contrast to 63 quarts for families in the class $\$ 1,750-$ \$1,999.

    The kinds of canned vegetables consumed in largest average quantity and by the largest percentage of white operators' families in the unit from the North and West during some week in the period MarchNovember 1936 were tomatoes, corn, snap beans, and peas. In the Southeast only canned tomatoes were consumed in equally substantial quantities (table 53). Families in the North and West produced about 80 percent of the canned tomatoes consumed during this period, 60 percent of the canned corn, 85 percent of the snap beans, and 50 percent of the canned peas. In the Southeast, about 80 percent of the canned tomatoes consumed were farm-furnished.
    Home canning of fruit was not entirely dependent on the production of fruit for home use; many more families canned fruit than raised it. For example, among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, only 6 and 19 percent, respectively, of the families in Kansas and North Dakota produced any fruit for home use, but as many as 82 percent canned some fruit. In Pennsylvania and Ohio with 85 and 81 percent raising fruit for home use, 98 percent canned fruit. Not only did more families can fruit than raise it in most farm sections but in 6 of 11 sections (New Jersey and Oregon part-time omitted) half or more of the families produced less than half of what they canned. Apparently the markets afford farm families opportunities to purchase for canning at prices within their reach.

    The quantity of fruit canned at home varied with income in most analysis units. In Washington and Oregon where a very high proportion of families raised fruit, the average quantity canned by families of types 4 and 5 with incomes in the class $\$ 250-\$ 499$ was 152 quarts as compared with 236 quarts canned by families in the income class $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,999$. In the North Dakota-Kansas unit where comparatively few of the families raised fruit for home use, the average quantities canned by families of the same types and income classes were 49 and 116 quarts, respectively.

    The percentage of families canning fruit did not increase much with family size. In farm sections where a large percentage of families raised fruit, as in the Pacific Northwest, in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and in the self-sufficing counties of North Carolina, there was a stronger tendency than elsewhere for the larger families to can relatively more than the smaller families.

    More fruits than vegetables were canned by families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, in 6 of il analysis units (New Jersey and Oregon part-time omitted). The three highest averages (exclusive of jams and jellies) were 183 quarts of fruit per family in the Washington-Oregon unit; 149 quarts in the Pemesylvania-Ohio unit; and 137 quarts in the North Carolina self-sufficing unit. In five farm sections families canned an average of 100 or more quarts of fruit; in only three sections were there comparable records for vegetables. The greater ease with which acceptable products can be obtained in the canning of fruit may explain part of the preference for home canning of fruit over home canning of vegetables. Furthermore, there is a longer period during which many vegetables can be obtained fresh in the markets than for many fruits.

    ## Foods of Class B (Other Foods of Plant Origin)

    Grain products, sugars, potatoes, and mature dry beans or peas are among the cheapest energy-yielding foods. They play a prominent role in farm-family dicts. In one form or another, grain products and sugars appeared on the food lists of every family during the week for which food estimates were obtained in the season, March-November 1936, and generally these foods were on the table at every meal. In the North and West at least 95 percent of the white operators' families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ had potatoes or sweetpotatoes during the week covered by the consumption study; in the Southeast, only 82 percent (tables 50 and 51 ).

    ## Grain products.

    Of the plant foods grouped in class B, grain products made up almost one-third of the total consumed in summer months in the North and somewhat more than a third in the West. In the Southeast, they constituted about two-thirds. In the three regional analysis units, the quantities of grain products (flour equivalent) consumed in the summer months by white operators' families of types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ were as follows:

    |  | Pounds of arain products consumed in a week |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Analysis unit: | Per household | Per person |
    | New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central | 13. 3 | 3. 4 |
    | Plains and Mountain, Pacific | 12.9 | 3. 6 |
    | Southeast. | 29.5 | 7. 1 |

    Sixty-eight percent of the total number of pounds of grain products consumed came into the kitchen as flours, meals, and breakfast cereals in the North, and 82 percent in the West; the remainder was bought in the form of baked goods, according to estimates referring to the period March-November 1936 for families of types 4 and 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$. In the Southeast, the proportion was quite different- 97 per cent was in the form of flours, meals, or cereals, and only 3 percent as baked goods. Ranked in order of importance, after flours came rolled oats in the North and West, and corn meal, hominy, and rice in the Southeast.
    Sugars.
    Average consumption of refined sugars, molasses, sirups, preserves, jams, jellies, and candy, combined, was higher among households of white operators in the North than in the two other regional analysis units. The figures given in this report do not, however, take into account the quantities of sugar included in commercial baked goods and canned fruit, both of which were consumed in comparatively large quantities in the North. In each unit, families of types 4 and 5 in the ineome class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ used between 1 and 2 pounds of refincd sugar per person in a week. Other sweets (sirups, jellies, candies) amount to about a third as much in the North and the West and half as much in the Southeast. Almost three-fourths of the families of this type and income group had jellies, jams, and preserves during the week of the food-consumption study. The average quantities of jellies and preserves made at home by these families in $1935-36$ ranged from 6 quarts per household in the North Carolina-South Carolina farm section to 29 in the Pennsylvania-Ohio section. The making of jellies or preserves was less common in the former unit than in the latter; 56 and 96 percent of the familics, respectively, reported this activity (tables 50 and 57).

    ## Potatoes, sweetpotatoes.

    In 17 of 21 units (white farm operators) some potatocs or sweetpotatoes were produced for home use by three-fourths or more of the families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$. Much lower figures were found in Kansas and the two sections of California where the proportion of families raising potatoes was less than 25 percent.

    Average consumption of potatoes and sweetpotatoes in the summer months by white operators' families of types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ was highest in the North and lowest in the Southeast, as is shown by the following figures:

    |  | Pounds of potatoes consumed in a week |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Analysis unit: | Per kousehold | Per person |
    | New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central_ | 20.9 | 5. 4 |
    | Plains and Mountain, Pacific. | 11. 9 | 3. 4 |
    | Southeast. | 8.0 | 1. 9 |

    Families in the North produced about 85 percent of the average quantities consumed in a week during the summer; in the West, 66 percent; in the Southeast the proportion was 94 percent.

    Sweetpotatoes were much more prominent in diets of families in the Southeast than in those of families in the North and West. Dur-
    ing the period March through November, this food constituted over a third of the total quantity of potatoes and sweetpotatoes consumed by families in the Southeast in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, but for only 3 percent of the total in the North and West.

    ## Foods of Class C (Other Foods Chiefly of Animal Origin)

    The kinds and quantities of meats and fats used by farm families depend in part upon home-production practices-cream and butter on milk production; and lard, bacon, and salt side on pork production. The proportion of families included in the study that raised pork for home consumption in 1935-36 ranged from 4 percent in southern California to 100 percent in Georgia, among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$. Over 90 percent of white operators' farnilies of these types and incomes reported raising pork for household use in farm sections of the Southeast and in Ohio, Illinois, and North Dakota.

    Since the quantities of meats and fats in meal preparation are somewhat interrelated, it is useful to consider the consumption of these two groups of products as a whole. The average quantities of all fats, meat, poultry, and fish consumed by households of families of types 1 to 5 combined in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ in a week during the summer of 1936 were as follows:

    |  | Pounds of fats, meat, poultry and fish consumed in a week |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Analysis unit: | Pet housetold | Per person |
    | New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central. | 14.2 | 3.7 |
    | Plains and Mountain, Pacific. | 16.8 | 4. 7 |
    | Southeast | 18.3 | 4.4 |

    Thus it appears that consumption of white operators' families in the North was somewhat lower than that in the other broad regional groups.
    Fats.
    Fat consumption was much higher in the Southeast than in the North and West. In a given income class, $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, fully as much butter, more than three times as much bacon and salt side, and almost twice as much lard and cooking fats were used. The lesser use of fats in the North and West is balanced in part, however, by larger purchases of commercial baked goods which add some fat to the diet.
    Meat, poultry, fish.
    Not all the varieties or forms of meat, poultry, and fish are used by a single family in any one week, and the emphasis on a particular product may shift not only from week to week, but from season to season. Since pork animals are most frequently slaughtered in the late fall and early winter when temperatures are favorable to curing, the consumption of home-produced fresh pork tends to be highest in the winter. Fresh pork was consumed in the 7 -day period covered by food check lists by almost two-thirds, 63 percent, of the families (types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ ) interviewed in winter months, but only by one-fifth, 21 percent, of those interviewed in the summer in farm sections in New England and in the Middle

    Atlantic and North Central States. Corresponding figures for the analysis unit of the Southeast (white operators) were 75 and 18 percent.

    Table 16.--meat and poultry produced and canned for home use: Percentage of households reporting production and canning of meat and poultry for home use, average quantity canned per houschold in a year, and percentage of households owning pressure cookers, families of types 4 and 5 in income class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, 19 analysis units, white farm operators in 19 States, $1935-96$
    [Houselolds of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-borm]

    | Region and analysis unit | Housebolis having home-produced- |  |  | House-holds can-ning anymeat orpoultryfor homeuse | Households producing more 1han half of home. camned meat or voultry |  | Households owning pressure cookers |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Pork | Poultry | Other meat 2 |  |  |  |  |
    | Vermont NEW ENGLAND | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | Percent 65 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ 42 \end{gathered}$ | Percent 56 | Percent 67 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quarts } \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | Percent 3 |
    | MIDDLE ATLANTIC AND NORTH CENTRAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Pennsylvaria | 73 | 95 | 25 | 74 | 73 | 39 | 4 |
    | Ohio.-- | 92 | 98 | 60 |  | 73 | 49 | 4 |
    | Wichigan- | 71 | 81 | 38 | ) 57 | 52 | 32 | 11 |
    | Wisconsin | 86 | 94 | 43 | \} 57 |  | 32 | 11 |
    | llinois. | 95 | 99 | 44 | \} 59 | 59 | 32 | 18 |
    | Iowa | 89 | 25 | 51 | S | 5 | 32 | 18 |
    | FLAINS AND MOUNTAIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Dakota | 95 | 97 | 66 | ) 51 | 47 | 34 | 19 |
    |  | 77 | 87 | 51 |  | 4 | 34 | 19 |
    | South Dukota-Montana-Colorado..-. | 72 | 93 | 6.5 | 42 | 45 | 24 | 27 |
    | PACIFIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Washington...------ | 51 | 70 | 46 | \} 56 | 55 | 27 | 23 |
    | Oregon | 61 | 86 | 46 | 06 | 5 | 27 | 23 |
    |  | 24 | 82 | 35 | \} 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
    | California, southern---------------------- | 4 | 59 | 6 | 2 | 2 |  | 5 |
    | SOI: THEAST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North Carolina self-sufficing counties. | $9]$ | 96 | 16 | 71 | 71 | 16 | 0 |
    | North Carolina.....--------------------- | 94 | 94 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 4 | 7 |
    | South Carolina. | 98 | 99 | 16 | 18 | 17 | 4 | 7 |
    |  | 100 | 98 | 20 | \} 24 | 25 | 10 |  |
    |  | 98 | 93 | 9 | 24 | 20 | 10 | 3 |

    1 Data in columns 2-4 are from the income schedules, those in columns $5-8$ are from the expenditure schedules. Perepntages and averages in columns 2-5,7. and 8 are based on all households in the corresponding analysis unit. Percentages in columin are based on the number of households reporting on this item. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table.

    1 Ineludes beef, veal, lamb, mutton, rabbit, game killed for food.
    Meat canning-both the proportion of families canning meat and the quantities canned-was related to the value of home-furnished food as shown below for families of type 2 (all income classes combined) in the Pennsylvania-Ohio unit:

    | Value of farm-furnished food: | Percentage of families canning meat | Average num ber of guarts canned |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | \$50-\$149 | - 45 | 39 |
    | \$150-\$249 | - 65 | 40 |
    | \$250-\$349 | - 85 | 58 |
    | \$350 or over | - 78 | 65 |

    It might be expected that lack of facilities for the home camning of meat would be the factor limiting the percentage of households under-
    taking this phase of food preservation. However, the proportion of families canning meat was not related to the proportion having pressure cookers in the different sections. Thus, among families of types 4 and 5 combined in the class $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$, only 4 percent of the families in the Pennsylvania-Ohio farm section had pressure cookers and 7 percent in the North Carolina-South Carolina section; however, meat was canned by 74 percent of the families in the former section and by 18 percent in the latter. In most sections the prevalence of pressure cookers was too low to insure the safe canning of meat, unless families had access to community facilities (table 16).

    ## Intersectional Comparison of Home-Production Programs

    In view of the close association between home-production programs, expenditures for food, and dietary adequacy, especially among lowincome groups, it is of interest to compare food-production programs of families of similar economic status living in different sections of the country. For this purpose a special tabulation was made with respect to farm-furnished milk, pork, and garden food reported on familyincome schedules by white operators' families of types 2 and 3 in farm sections in California, North Dakota and Kansas, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and Georgia and Mississippi. Only those families were included in the tabulation whose net family income (money and nonmoney) was under $\$ 750$, and the value of whose living (exclusive of farmfurnished housing) was also under $\$ 750$.

    Omitting the value of farm-furnished housing in describing the level of living eliminates as a variable the regional differences in housing that are imposed by climatic conditions and other factors. Fixing an upper limit for value of family living (exclusive of farm-furnished housing) as well as for family income excludes from the group those well-to-do families whose 1935-36 incomes chanced to be low, but whose credit or assets permitted them to continue to live on a comparatively high scale. Among families of white operators with incomes under $\$ 750$, the following proportions had a living (exclusive of farmfurnished housing) valued at less than $\$ 750$ :

    ## Farm section:

    Percentage of families with incomes under \$750 whose value of living (other than farmfurnished housing) was also under \#750)
    
    
    
    
    Thus, among families with $1935-36$ incomes under $\$ 750$, a living valued at less than $\$ 750$ for the year (exclusive of farm-furnished housing) was maintained by only 39 percent of those studied in California as compared with 92 percent in the Georgia-Mississippi section.

    Differing climate, soil, market value of land, general level of income, and custom result in widely varying practices with respect to production for home use in different parts of the country. There are also wide differences within each farm section in the kind of home-production program planned by families of similar economic status. Thus, about half of this lower income group of families studied in California kept a cow, and half did not; 3 in 10 had gardens, while 7 did not.

    In Pennsylvania and Ohio all had gardens, about 8 out of 10 kept a cow and about 7 in 10 raised pork. The proportion of families having the kind of farm-furnished food specified, and the average quantities of each are showis in table 17 and figure 4.
    
    
    Figure 4.-Home-produced milk, pork, and garden fond: Percentage of families having home-produced milk, pork, and garden food, and average quantities home-produced by families of types 2 and 3 (husband, wife, and one or two ehildren under 16) with incomes and value of living, (except farm-furnished housing) under $\$ 750$, nonrelief white farm operators' families in 4 analysis units, 1935-36.

    In the counties studied in California the average quantity of homeproduced milk was low, scarcely more than a cup a day for each person. The average value of garden products was also relatively low, amounting to only one-fifth of a cent per person a day. Nevertheless, the money value of farm-furnished food from cow, garden, poultry flock, and meat animals averaged 28 percent of the value of the whole food supply. At the other extreme, among the lower income families of white farm operators studied in Georgia and Mississippi, almost all ( 96 percent) produced a variety of foods for home use and generous quantities of milk, pork, and garden food. Farm-furnished products were found to average 75 percent of the value of their whole food supply.

    In areas of highly specialized farming such as truck-vegetable or fruit growing, where farms are small and land values high, farm families tend to produce comparatively little of the expensive animal products. In livestock and grain-producing sections, such as in Illinois, Lowa, Kansas, the Dakotas, and the Mountain States, supplies of meat and eggs retained or produced for family consumption tend
    to be considerably above the average for most other farm sections, though gardens and orchards appear to be small or rather unproductive. Families in general farming areas usually arrange for a fairly well-balanced program of food production for family use. Among low-income groups, food for household use is extensively produced where conditions are favorable, as in the Southeast.
    
    

    Figure 5.-Proportion of money value of food represented by farm-furnished and by purchased food: Families of types 2 and 3 (husband, wife, and one or two children under 16) with incomes and value of living (except farm-furnished housing) under $\$ 750$, nonrelief white farm operators' families in 4 analysis units, 1935-36.
    Money expenditures for food were inversely proportional to the value of farm-furnished food, among the families included in the special tabulation on food-production programs as is shown in table 17 and figure 5. With home production geared to nutritional needs, food expenditures can be cut while maintaining or improving the quality of the family's dict. But merely increasing the quantity of home-grown foods without reference to family needs may not be advantageous. Careful planning is essential to avoid an unbalanced food supply and unnecessary overproduction of some items.

    Table 17.-home-produced milk, pork, and garden food: Percentage of families having specified foods farm-furnished, average quantity or value furnished per person per day, and money value per person per meal of home-produced and purchased food, families with one or two children under 16 (types 2 and 8) and family income and value of living ${ }^{1}$ under $\$ 750,4$ selected analysis units, ${ }^{2}$ white farm operators in 7 States, 1935-36
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit | Families having home-produced- |  |  | A verage quantity or value per person per day |  |  | A verage value of food per person per meal |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Milk | Pork | Garden foad | Milk | Pork | Garden food | Homeproduced | Purchased |
    | California | Percent | Percent | Percent | Cups | Ounces | Cents | Cents ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }_{6.6}^{\text {Cents }}$ |
    | North Dakota-Kansas | 100 | 76 | 72 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 3.8 |
    | Pennsylvania-Ohio... | 84 | 72 | 100 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 1.8 | 5.7 | 3. 5 |
    | Qeorgit-Mississippi | 98 | 98 | 96 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 2.0 | 7.7 | 2.5 |


    ## Nutritive Value of Diets

    ## Nutritive Value in Relation to Money Value of Food

    One way of describing the character of diets is to discuss them in terms of the quantities of the various nutrients they provide. A large number of chemical substances are recognized as essential to human nutrition. In this section the nutritive value of diets is presented with respect to food energy, protein, calcium, phosphorus, total iron, vitamin A value, thiamin, ascorbic acid, and riboflavin. There are other nutrients equally important but not included, as potassium, sodium, chlorine, iodine, nicotinic acid, and vitamin D. For some there is little danger of shortage in present-day diets; for others, too few data are as yet available on their distribution in common food materials to make possible an estimate of their concentration in diets; for still others, as in the case of vitamin D or sodium chloride, common foods are not the chief source.

    Even for the nutrients included in this analysis, the figures are considered but tentative. The computations have been based on average figures for food composition compiled from many sources and probably of unequal validity. They were applied to the quantities of food brought into the house and available for consumption, with adjustments made to correct for average quantities of refuse, but with no deductions for kitchen or plate waste, and without adequate deductions for the frequent and sometimes large losses of nutritive value during storage of food, food preparation, and service. These include losses of minerals and vitamins through the discarding of cooking water; through destruction due to heat or oxidation; and also losses of all nutrients through waste of edible materials, especially of fats and carbohydrates, in the preparing and serving of meals. As a result, the nutritive value of the food as reported is probably above the value of the diets as eaten, and the dietary picture presented probably is optimistic.

    The estimates of nutritive value of diets are based on information obtained from actual records of the kinds and quantities of food had by each household during 1 week. (See Glossary, Supplementary Schedule.) The food records were classified for analysis according to the money value of food per food-expenditure unit. This method of classification involves fewer categories and can therefore be used with smaller numbers of cases than would be required for a complete classification by family type and income. It has the added advantage of showing up most strikingly the relation between money value of food, consumption of major food groups, and the nutritive value of diets.

    In order that the relative importance of averages presented by level of money value of food may be appreciated, there is given in table 18 the distribution of families by money value of food. In each analysis unit ${ }^{5}$ nearly two-thirds of the cases fell into two money-value-of-food classes. In the units in the North and West, these were the classes $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ and $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$ per week per food-expenditure


    unit; in the Southeast, the classes $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ and $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$. One of these classes ( $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per food-expenditure unit- 30 to 40 cents per day) was common to all analysis units of white operators; hence this level of money value has been selected for more detailed discussion than some of the others.

    Table 18.-distribution of households by money valte of food: Percentage distribution of households by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 5 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, 1986-97
    [\#ouseholds of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit | Households | Households having food with monoy value ${ }^{2}$ per week per foodexpenditure unit of - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 0.69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 0.69 \\ & \$ 1.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1.38 \\ \$ 2.07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2.08- \\ \$ 2.76 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2.77- \\ & \$ 3.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3.4 \mathrm{~B}- \\ & \$ 4.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 4.15-$ | $\$ 4.84$ or over |
    | New England | Number 104 | Percent 0 | Percent 1 | Percent 7 | Percent 29 | Percent 30 | Per. cent 17 | Percent 10 | Per- <br> cent |
    | Middle Atlantic and North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Central - | 270 | 0 | (8) | 14 | 33 | 30 | 14 | 6 |  |
    | Plains and Mountain------- | 36 | ${ }_{0}^{0}$ | 0 | 11 | 41 | 28 | 14 | 6 |  |
    | Pacific-..----------------- | 142 | (3) 0 | 1 | 10 | 31 | 37 | 15 | 4 |  |
    | Southeast...-...-............- | 439 | ${ }^{(3)}$ | 5 | 30 | 35 | 15 | 9 | 3 |  |

    The nutritive values of diets at the several levels of money value are given as averages per person and per nutrition unit per day. (See Methodology, Measurement of Houschold Size in Dietary Analyses.) In this section the nutrients are discussed one by one, with some consideration given to nutritional requirements and the extent to which they probably are met by the available food supply. In addition, the tables also show the distribution of houscholds according to the content of their diets with respect to each of the nutrients.

    ## Food Energy

    Food energy is needed to carry on the internal work of the body and to provide fuel for all external activity. Fats, carbohydrates. and proteins all contribute to the energy value of the diet. In addition to yielding calories, fats supply the unsaturated fatty acids that are essential to normal nutrition. Fats also promote the utilization of certain other nutrients needed by the body.

    The energy requirements of normal adults doing approximately the same kind of work vary with body size and build. Because of larger surface area and the greater ratio of active protoplasm to body fat, the fuel needs of the tall, thin person are relatively higher than those of the short, stocky person of the same age and body weight. Requirements are also affected to a great extent by the severity of muscular work. Thus, a man doing heavy farm labor may require nearly twice as much food energy as his brother who spends his day in an office. In old age, requirements tend to lessen because muscular activity declines and because internal processes are somewhat slower.

    Children need more energy in proportion to their size than adults. Not only does the internal work of their bodies proceed at a higher rate of speed than with adults, but there must be an extra supply of food to provide for the growth of new tissue. The relatively great physical activity of children contributes still further to their energy needs.

    Dietary allowances of calories for normal adults are usually planned at a level at which intake will just about balance the probable energy output. Studies of food consumption and energy expenditure indicate that a man weighing 70 kilograms ( 154 pounds) doing moderately active work is likely to require from 2,700 to 3,300 calories a day. Table 73 shows the relative allowances in calories that have been suggested in this study for persons of different age, sex, and activity. Taking 3,000 calories as the value of unity or one, the relative allowances for individuals range from 0.4 for a child under 4 years of age to 1.5 for a man performing severe muscular work. In assigning an energy factor for an adult, account was taken of age, height, and daily activity as reported in the food record. Consequently, the calorie content of the diets of farm families, when expressed on a food-energy-unit basis, should be directly comparable to that of other occupational groups; the great energy needs of the adults on farms have already been allowed for in the scale of relatives.

    The average number of food-energy units to which each group of families was equivalent, estimated both in terms of the Bureau of Home Economics scale and of the International scale, is presented in table 19. (See Methodology, Measurement of Household Size in Dietary Analyses.) Although the latter scale is believed to represent the relative food needs of American families the less accurately, averages for household size in units based on the International scale have been included in order that comparisons may be made between this study and those made in other countries.

    Because each young child counts as one person but as less than one food-energy unit, household size expressed in persons is usually greater than when expressed in food-energy units. Hence the average calorie value of the diets, also shown in table 19, is less on a per capita than on an energy-unit basis.

    The food supplies of the farm families studied provided generously for their energy needs in most cases. None of the group averages was as much as 5 percent below the suggested allowance of 3,000 calories for a moderately active man. The men performing the strenuous tasks of the farm were generally considered as equivalent to $1.2,1.3$, or 1.5 food-cnergy units, depending on size, age, and the tasks being performed, so that an allowance of 3,000 calories per unit means from 3,600 to 4,500 calories for the farm operator.

    With money value of food less than $\$ 2.08$ per food-expenditure unit a week-less than 10 cents per meal-there were, in most of the analysis units, a few families whose diets furnished less than 2,700 calorics per energy unit. With rising levels of money value of food there was an increase in the average energy value of diets and in the proportion of families whose food supplies were high in available calories.

    These high averages for food-energy value should be interpreted in the light of the earlier discussion (p. 52) of the reasons why the nutritive values presented may be higher than those of the food actually eaten. Food waste was suggested as a possible cause. Little is known
    about the amount of edible food that is wasted in farm homes. It is probably negligible in households where strict economy must be practiced and where at best there is scarcely enough to eat. On the other hand, families with access to plentiful food supplies may be more wasteful. No record was kept in this study of the amount of waste of edible food. In many households a share of the food that came into the house for human consumption undoubtedly found its way to the cats, dogs, chickens, or pigs. There is also the possibility of great waste in the preparation of those foods that are abundant on the farm at any particular season.

    Table 19.-Food energy: Average household size, average food-energy value of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantifies of food energy, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1986-97
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    

    Each food eaten makes some contribution to the energy value of the diet．Pound for pound on a dry－weight basis，fats contribute more than twice as many calories as sugars，starches，and proteins．But the relative importance of various food groups as sources of calories de－ pends not only upon the composition of the foods，but upon the quan－ tities in which each is eaten．

    Table 20－average consumption of specified groups of food：Average pet capita consumption of specified groups of food in a week，by money value of food per week per food－expenditure unit， 4 analysis units，white farm operators in 16 States，${ }^{1}$ 1936－37
    ［Households of white nonrelief farnilies that include a husband and wife，both native－boral

    | Analysis unit and money value ？of food per week per food－expenditure unit（dollars） |  |  |  | $\frac{\infty}{\infty}$ | Meat, poultry, |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{sinn} \text { "solq } \\ -87880 \Delta \text { pold } \end{gathered}$ |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | NEW ENGLAND | No． | Doz． | Ot． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lb． | Lh． | Lb． | L．b． | Lh． |
    | 2．08－2．76 | 26 | 0.47 | 5.42 | 1． 41 | 1． 36 | 4． 17 | 1.69 | 5． 41 | 0.52 | 1.43 | 0.25 | 3． 62 |
    | 2．77－3．45 | 25 | ． 84 | 6． 48 | 1.18 | 2． 16 | 4． 13 | 1．99 | 6． 58 | 1．25 | 2． 29 | ． 16 | 5． 62 |
    | 3．46－4．14 | 18 | ． 62 | 6.23 | 1． 48 | 3． 03 | 4． 50 | 2． 21 | 5． 81 | 2.32 | 3.87 | ． 37 | 6． 48 |
    | MIDDLE ATLANTIC AND NORTH CENTRAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1．38－2．07 | 38 | 43 | 4．18 | ． 84 | I． 61 | 3． 40 | 1． 76 | 4．95 | ． 99 | 1．05 | .15 | 3.98 |
    | 2．08－2．76 | 88 | ． 57 | 5． 31 | 1． 23 | 2． 03 | 3． 62 | 2． 14 | 4． 60 | 1． 12 | 1.29 | ． 23 | 4． 55 |
    | 2．77－3．45 | 80 | ． 63 | 4． 48 | 1．5］ | 3． 08 | 4． 26 | 2.18 | 5． 62 | 1.46 | 1． 81 | － 22 | 6． 06 |
    | $3.46-4.14$ | 39 | ． 65 | 6． 15 | 2.04 | 3． 35 | 4.85 | 2． 91 | 6.03 | 1.87 | 2． 19 | 30 | 7.15 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1．35－2．07 | 10 | ． 48 | 2.89 | 1． 02 | 1． 70 | 3． 18 | 1． 46 | 3． 85 | 1.43 | 2.45 | ． 13 | 6.44 |
    | 2．08－2．76 | 44 | ． 83 | 4.81 | 1.77 | 2.37 | 3.41 | 2.13 | 3.76 | 1． 66 | 1． 91 | ． 19 | 6.75 |
    | 2．77－3．45 | 53 | ． 79 | 5．9n | 1.90 | 3.10 | 3.81 | 1． 83 | 3.47 | 2.77 | 2． 27 | ． 22 | 9.01 |
    | 3．46－4．14 | 17 | 1.01 | 7.80 | 2． 25 | 3． 74 | 4.47 | 2． 09 | 4.74 | 2． 05 | 2.21 | ． 15 | 8.75 |
    | SOUTHEAST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 0．69－1．37 | 19 | ． 10 | 2.14 | 1． 00 | 1． 03 | 5． 46 | ． 83 | 2． 31 | ． 38 | 1． 80 | ． 07 | 1．31 |
    | 1．38－2．07 | 133 | ． 22 | 4.97 | 1.31 | 1． 51 | 5． 97 | 1． 29 | 2． 13 | ． 56 | 2.25 | ． 12 | 2． 06 |
    | $2.08-2.76$ | 1.50 | .37 | 8． 67 | 1． 65 | 2． 033 | 6． 40 | 1.61 | 2． 19 | ． 89 | 2． 56 | ． 17 | 3． 22 |
    | 2．77－3．45 | 64 | ． 47 | 7.38 | 2.27 | 2． 67 | 7，41 | 2.11 | 2． 21 | 1． 50 | 2.73 | ． 41 | 3.38 |

    Grain products are one of the most important sources of calories． At a usual level of money value of food（ $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food－expendi－ ture unit per week）these foods furnished 27 percent of the total cal－ ories in the diets of families in the North and West and 38 percent in the diets in the Southeast．These proportions represent average quantities of grain products amounting to 3.8 pounds and 6.4 pounds， respectively，per person in a week．As the money value of the food increased，the proportion of calories from grain products decreased even though the quantities brought into the house for family con－ sumption increased．This is illustrated by figures taken from records
    kept by families of Southeast white operators in the fall and winter, as follows:

    | Money value of food per food-expenditure unit in a week: | Poundis ofgrain products per person in a week | Percentage <br> of calories <br> products |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | \$0.69-\$1.37 | 5. 5 | 50 |
    | \$2.08-82.76 | 6. 0 | 37 |
    | \$3,46-\$4.14 | 7. 0 | 32 |

    Among the other important sources of food energy in these diets are fats, milk, and sugars. The proportions of the total calories furnished by each of these and by certain other food groups in dicts with a money value in the range $\$ 2.08$ - $\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit per week were as follows:

    |  | Percentage of calories from specified food groups in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeast |
    | Grain products | 27 | 38 |
    | Butter and other fats | 17 | 21 |
    | Milk or its equivalent | - 15 | 15 |
    | Sugars----..- | 15 | 9 |
    | Meat, poultry, fish. | 8 | 6 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes_ | - 6 | 4 |
    | Total accounted for | - 88 | 93 |

    The weekly per capita consumption of the foods shown above is given in table 20 for the groups of families at the same money-value levels as were listed in table 19.

    ## Protein

    Proteins are essential to the structure of various tissues, particularly muscle, and to many of the regulatory mechanisms of the body. In studies of protein requirement, balance experiments on normal subjects have shown that nitrogen equilibrium can be established on very low levels of intake, but that there is considerable variation in the minimum amount needed by different individuals. The results indicate that the adult's average minimum requirement is probably a little over two-thirds of a gram of protein per kilogram of body weight ( 44 to 55 grams per adult per day). To allow for individual variations in need and for differences in the biological value of food proteins, dietary allowances for adults are usually set about 50 percent above average maintenance requirements. For protein, then, the adult allowance would be about 1 gram per kilogram of body weight, averaging 65 to 75 grams per adult per day. Since grood nutrition seems to be associated with diets containing a liberal supply of protein, some investigators believe that an optimal protein intake may be somewhat above the level of 1 gram per kilogram.

    Growing children need more protein per unit of body weight than do adults. The requirement varies with the rate of growth, being as high as 2.5 to 3 grams per kilogram for very young children and gradually falling as age increases.
    By expressing the adult allowance of 65 to 75 grams daily as unity and the allowances for persons of different sex and age as proportions of unity, a scale was developed for use in computing the number of
    protein units to which the households were equivalent. (See Methodology, p. 374.) For any group of families, average household size was much the same whether expressed in persons or in protein units; hence, the protein averages expressed on the two bases are similar (table 21).

    Table 21.-protein: Average household size, average protein content of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantities of protein, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1} 1936-87$
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a busband and wife, both native-born]
    

    Among families of white farm operators, the average protein content of the diet was at least as high as 75 grams per nutrition unit per day, except for 2 groups of families at low levels of money value of food. At higher levels some of the averages were nearly twice this figure. Of the 676 families of white operators studied individually, only 3 were found that had less than 44 grams of protein per nutrition unit per day. These three were in the group from the Southeast, whose diets were in the money-value class $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per expenditure unit per week ( 10 to 20 cents per day).
    When food supplics had a money value in the range \$1.38-\$2.07 per food-expenditure unit per week ( 20 to 30 cents per day), all families of white operators obtained at least 44 grams of protein per unit per day. Having food that provided an average within the range 44-66 grams of protein per unit a day, were 16 percent of the farm families studied in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region, 43 percent of those in the Pacific region, and 4 percent of the white farm operators'
    families in the Southeast. At still higher levels of money value of food most families enjoyed ample supplies of protein. These figures, and others in table 21, bear out the findings of other studies of American diets to the effect that protein generally is supplied in fairly adequate quantities.

    Many kinds of foods contain proteins, but not all are equally effective in meeting the physiological needs of the body. The proteins of milk, eggs, meat, and fish are of high quality and can supplement those of poorer quality found in grains and other vegetable products. When families rely upon grain products and mature beans or peas as the chicf source of their protein supply, it is usually a matter of economic necessity; as money for food increases, the consumpion of meat, eggs, and milk tends to rise markedly.

    The proportion of protein from animal sources varied directly with the level of money value of food. In diets valued in the range $\$ 2.08-$ $\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week, one of the most usual levels of money value, animal products furnished more than half of the total protcin- 56 percent in the case of families in the North and West, and 51 percent among white operators in the Southeast.

    At every level of money value of food for each regional group, grain products ranked among the first two food groups in the share of the total protein they contributed. The proportions were 28 and 37 percent, respectively, in diets in the money-value class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per unit of white operators' families in the North and West and in the Southeast, as shown below;

    |  | Percentage of protein from speeified foodgroups infarm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeust |
    | Grain products_ | 28 | 37 |
    | Milk or its equivalent | 25 | 28 |
    | Meat, poultry, fish.- | 24 | 19 |
    | Eggs------------- | 7 | 4 |
    | Total accounted for | 84 | 88 |

    For the two groups of farm families shown above, milk was the second most important food in its contribution of protein. Milk is an extremely valuable source of dietary protein, especially in households with young children. For the farm families furnishing food records, the average consumption of fluid milk, or its equivalent in other forms, was 5.1 quarts a week or about 3 cups a day for each person. This quantity would furnish 25 grams of protein or about one-third of a generous allowance for an adult. Actually, however, not all families fared as well as this. When the money value of food was low, milk consumption was likely to be low also. For example, families of white operators in farm sections of the Southeast with diets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per person per week had an average of only about 2 quarts of milk a week, or a little over a cup a day for each family member.

    Meat, poultry, and fish accounted for 24 percent of the total protein in the diets in the money-value class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per unit in the North and West, and for 19 percent in the Southeast. These
    foods occupy an important position in the diets of most Americans, not only because of their nutritive value but because of the flavor and "staying-quality" they impart to a meal. City families spend a fourth to a third of their food dollar to procure them. On farms, the quantity of meat consumed depends both on the supply of meat animals or poultry raised for home use and on the amount of available cash. In farm sections studied in the North and West and also in the Southeast, the average consumption of meat, poultry, and fish varied from 1.5 pounds per person per week in the cheapest diets to about twice this quantity in the more costly ones (table 22). At any one level of money value of food, the consumption of meat also varied greatly from family to family. Thus, with total food supplies at the money-value level $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$ per unit per week, 4 percent of the families in the North and West consumed less than 1 pound per person during the week of the study; 11 percent had quantities in the range 1.0-1.9 pounds; 67 percent, $2.0-3.9 ; 16$ percent, $4.0-5.9$; and 2 percent, 6 pounds or more.

    These three groups of foods--ccreal grains, milk, and meat-provided more than three-fourths of the total quantity of protein in the diets of the farm families studied; the remainder was derived unequally from the other groups of foods. Since even the families most dependent upon grain products for their subsistence were able to secure at least a fair share of their total protein from animal sources, it appears that the quality as well as the quantity of protein in the diets of the farm population studied usually was adequate.

    Table 22.-meat, poultay, and fish: Average consumption of meat, poultry, and fish per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantities, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1986-37
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    


    ## Calcium and Phosphorus

    Of the several minerals required for normal nutrition, calcium and phosphorus are needed in relatively large quantities. They are the chief constituents of bone and teeth and for this reason it is essential
    that there be an abundant supply during the period of growth. About 99 percent of the body calcium is in the skeletal structure, but the other 1 percent fulfills an extremely important role in the fluids and soft tissues of the body. Phosphorus is an essential constituent of all living cells. It participates in many of the chemical reactions that control metabolism.

    The problem of determining the calcium and phosphorus requirements of normal adults has been approached by means of balance experiments. Two decades ago a study of the evidence available indicated that 0.45 gram of calcium and 0.88 gram of phosphorus were the average intakes necessary for maintenance for a 70 -kilogram person. In setting up dietary allowances, it has been customary to add to these basic figures a 50 -percent margin of safety to allow for individual variations in requirement and for fluctuation in the mineral content of foods. On this basis 0.68 gram of calcium and 1.32 grams of phosphorus have been widely recommended as daily allowances for normal adults.

    There is now reason to believe that to be generous, the allowances of calcium for adults should be higher than 0.68 gram a day. How much should be considered an optimal amount is not clearly established as yet. It must be high enough to provide liberally for those individuals whose requirements are higher than the average and to allow for differences in the availability of the calcium in various foods.

    The requirement of calcium is greatly increased during pregnancy and lactation. The Health Organisation of the League of Nations recommends a daily allowance of 1.5 grams to provide for the normal and extra demands on the maternal organism.

    Children need relatively large amounts of calcium to provide for skeletal development. An allowance of 1 gram per child per day has for some time been considered adequate. Recent studies of calcium retention in children furnish additional evidence that this is sufficient, at least until the period of rapid growth at puberty. It should always be kept in mind, however, that efficient use of dietary calcium can be made only when there is at the same time an ample supply of phosphorus and of vitamin D. A daily intake of 1 gram of phosphorus has been found to give good retention and this has been generally used as a suggested allowance for children. Since the phosphorus requirement for maintenance increases with body weight, the allowance for children probably should be increased during adolescence until the adult level is reached.

    The scales of relative allowances used for computing the number of calcium units and phosphorus units to which the persons in each household were equivalent are shown in the Methodology, page 374. Because children need more calcium than do adults, household size in terms of calcium units is always larger than the number of persons when the family includes children (table 23). For this reason the averages per capita are higher than averages per nutrition unit. This is not true in the case of phosphorus, however.

    The average calcium content of the diets of farm families furnishing food records was at least as high as 0.68 gram per nutrition unit per day for every group of families except those in the Southeast whose diets were in the money-value class $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per food-expenditure unit per week. The average for this group was only 0.58 gram per nutrition unit per day. The food of about a fifth of these families
    furnished less than 0.34 gram of calcium per unit per day; of 17 percent, 0.34 but less than 0.45 gram ; and of 29 percent, 0.45 but less than 0.68 gram. These figures depict a widespread calcium deficiency in this low-income group. Fortunately, only a small proportion of the white farm operators studied were subsisting on food supplies of such low money value. Although in each group there were a few families receiving subminimal amounts of calcium, more and more of the families were found to have relatively liberal quantitics of calcium as the money value of diets increased.

    At one of the most usual levels of money value of food (\$2.08$\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit a week), diets furnishing less than 0.68 gram of calcium per nutrition unit were obtained by 13 percent of the families in the Ncw England farm section, and by 29 percent in sections of the Middle Atlantic and North Central region. At the other extreme, diets supplying 0.90 gram or more of calcium per nutrition unit per day were obtained by 37 to 60 percent of the families in farm sections of the North and West, and by 81 percent of those in the Southeast.

    Calcium occurs in many foods, yet the fact that the diets of numerous familics were relatively deficient in this nutrient indicates that calcium-rich foods were not selected in sufficient quantity. Milk in its various forms is the best single source of calcium, one glassful supplying nearly half of the daily requirement of an adult. Green, leafy vegetables as a group probably would rate next in order of importance as a source of calcium from the standpoint of chemical composition, but it is now known that the calcium in some of these foods is only partially, if at all, available for utilization by the body.

    In the diets of the farm families studied, milk furnished a large part of the total calcium. It accounted for nearly three-fourths of the total in the case of families of white farm operators when food supplies were valued in the range $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week. The direct relation between milk consumption and the level of calcium in diets is clearly shown by the following data based on food records of white operators in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region:

    | Money value of food per food-expenditure unit per week: | Quarts of milk рет persan in a week | Grams of calcium per per. son per day |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | \$1.38-\$2.07 | 4. 2 | 0. 68 |
    | \$2.08-\$2.76 | 5. 3 | . 87 |
    | \$2.77-\$3.45 | 4. 5 | . 82 |
    | \$3.46-\$4.14 | 6. 2 | 1. 12 |

    In the case of no other nutrient is it possible to demonstrate such a close relation between the consumption of a single food and the provision of that nutrient.

    Even when the averages for a group were fairly high, there were always some families in each group that used but little milk. The average quantity of milk consumed by the 175 farm families in the North and West whose diets were in the money-value class $\$ 2.77-$ $\$ 3.45$ per person per week was 10.5 pints a week (table 24). But in about a fifth of the households, the consumption was less than 7.0 pints a week, or less than a pint per person per day.

    TABLE 23.--CALCICM AND PHOAPHOHUS: Average householil size, average calcium and phosphorus content of diets, and percentage of households with diels furnishing specified quantities of calcium and phosphorus, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, 1 1996-97
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a busband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit and money valuc ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per food-expenditure unit (dollars) | Households ${ }^{3}$ | Calcium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Phosphorus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | A verage household size 1 |  | A verage content of diets per day- |  | Diets furnishing specified quantities of caicium (in frams per unit per day) |  |  |  |  | Average household size ${ }^{\text { }}$ |  | A vergge content of diets per day- |  | Diets furnishing specified quantities of phosphorus (in grams per unit per day) |  |  |  |
    |  |  | Per: sons | Calcium units | Per person | Per calcium unit | Under 0.34 | $\begin{gathered} 0.34- \\ 0.44 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45- \\ & 0.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.68 \\ & 0.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.90 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}$ | Persons | Phos: phorus units | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { person } \end{gathered}$ | Per phosphoris unit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Un- } \\ & \text { der } \\ & 0.88 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 0.88- \\ 1.31 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.32- \\ 1.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1.76 \\ o r \\ \text { more } \end{array}$ |
    | 2.08-2.76 NEW ENGLAND | Number | Number | Number | Grams | Grams | Per- | Per- cent | Per- cent | Per. <br> cent | Per- <br> cent | Nuinber | Number | Grams | Grams | I'ercent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    | 2.73-3.45 | 36 30 | 4. 30 | 5.31 | 1. 15 | 0.93 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 27 | 60 | 4.30 | 4.17 | 1.70 | 1.75 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 47 |
    | 3.49-4.14. | 16 | 4.84 4.34 | 6.09 5.29 | 1.36 1.44 | 1.08 1.15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 81 | 4.84 4.34 | 4.70 <br> 4.24 | 1.99 2.29 | 2. 05 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 84 |
    | Middle AtLantic and nortif crintral |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.38-2.07. | 38 | 5.71 | 7.48 | 89 | 68 | 0 | 16 | 42 | 21 | 21 | 5. 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 2.08-2.76. | 88 | 4.88 | 6. 29 | 1. 12 | . 87 | 3 | 16 2 | 24 | 34 | 37 | 5. 71 4.88 | 5. 40 | 1.42 1.71 | 1.48 1.80 | 0 0 | 32 7 | 44 | 24 46 |
    | 2.77-3.45. | 80 | 4. 17 | 5.33 | 1. 05 | . 82 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 36 | 43 | 4.17 | 3. 95 | 1. 83 | 1.93 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 76 |
    | 3.40-4.14 | 39 | 3.47 | 4.33 | 1.39 | I. 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.47 | 3.31 | 2.21 | 2.30 |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.38-2.07..........-.-. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 2.08-2.76 | 44 | 3. 70 | 4.35 4.63 | 1.07 | . 84 | 0 | ${ }_{9}^{7}$ | 50 | 29 | 7 | 3.47 | 3. 36 | 1. 23 | 1. 30 | 0 | 57 | 29 | 14 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 58 | 3.56 | 4.63 4.43 | 1.07 1.29 | -.84 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 34 26 | 43 | 3. 70 | 3. 57 | 1. 66 | 1. 71 | 0 | 11 | 43 | 48 |
    | 3.46-4.14. | 17 | 2. 90 | 3.54 | 1.64 | 1.35 |  |  |  | 26 | 66 | 2. 260 | 3. 42 2.82 | 2. 08 | 2. 210 2.50 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 81 |
    | Southeast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
    | 9.68-1.37. | 24 | 5. 76 | 7.78 | . 78 | . 58 | 20 | 17 | 29 | 17 | 17 | 5.76 | 5.35 | 1. 54 | 1.66 | 4 | 21 | 29 | 46 |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 133 | 5. 47 | 7.16 | 1. 26 | . 96 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 55 | 5. 47 | 5. 16 | 2. 02 | 2. 14 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 82 |
    | 2.08-2.76 | ${ }^{5} 150$ | 4. 60 | 5. 98 | 1. 58 | 1. 22 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 81 | 4. 60 | 4. 36 | 2. 43 | 2.56 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 97 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 64 | 3. 79 | 4.78 | 1.87 | 1. 48 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 88 | 3. 79 | 3.63 | 2.92 | 3. 05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

    Grain products were usually the next most important source of calcium because of the large quantity in which these foods were eaten. In the Southeast, the use of self-rising flour not only increased the total intake of calcium considerably, but also the proportion of the total calcium furnished by grain products. In diets at the moneyvalue level $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit a week, the proportion of the total calcium furnished to white operators' families by specified groups of foods was as follows:

    |  | Percentage of catcium from specifed food groups in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeast |
    | Milk or its equivalent. | - 73 | 69 |
    | Grain products | 8 | 19 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetahle | 3 | 6 |
    | Total accounted for | 84 | 94 |

    Table 24.-milk equivalent: Average consumption of milk equivalent per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantities, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-97
    [Households of white nonrelief fariaics that include a busband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit and money value 2 of tood per week per food-expenditure unit (dollars) | Households | A verage quantity以er person in a week | Housebolds consuming specified quantities of milk or its equivalent ${ }^{\prime}$ (in pints per person in a week) |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  | 0.0-3.4 | 3.5-6.9 | 7.0-13.9 | 14.0-20.9 | 21.0 or more |
    | NORTH AND WEST ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Number | Pints | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 53 | 8.4 | 8 | 35 | Prat 51 | Percen ${ }_{6}$ | $\mathrm{Percent}_{0}$ |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 175 | 10.5 | 4 | 14 | 59 | 20 | 8 |
    | 4,15-4.83. | 33 | 14.6 | 0 | 3 | 55 | 24 | 18 |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 133 | 9.1 | 16 | 24 | 39 | 17 |  |
    | 2.77-3.45. | 64 | 14.7 | 5 | 11 | 36 | 31 | 17 |

    Phosphorus usually was well supplied by the food of the farm families studied. The lowest average for any group was 1.30 grams per nutrition unit per day, and this was found for the group from the Pacific region having food valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per week per food-expenditure unit. At this level of money value of food none of the diets in any of the farm sections studied furnished less than 0.88 gram of phosphorus per nutrition unit per day. When food supplies had a money value in the range $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit per week, approximately 90 percent of the families studied in the North and West, and all of those in the Southeast received at least 1.32 grams of phosphorus per nutrition unit per day.

    Phosphorus is widely distributed in foods, and among families having ordinary mixed diets, a serious deficiency is seldom encountered. For the farm groups studied, grain products, milk, and meat were the most important sources of phosphorus. In the Southeast, where self-rising flour is used to a large extent, this food in itself contributed
    an important share. The proportion of the total furnished to white operators' families by specified groups of foods in diets in the moneyvalue class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit in a week was as follows:

    |  | Percentage of phosphorus from specified food groups in farm dists in the-- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeast |
    | Milk or its equivalent | - 38 | 36 |
    | Grain products. | - 20 | 40 |
    | Mest, poultry, fish. | - 15 | 9 |
    | Potatocs, sweetpotatoes | - 8 | 2 |
    | Total accounted for | . 81 | 87 |

    ## Iron

    Iron is needed for the formation of hemoglobin, the oxygen-carrying pigment of the blood. It also functions as an activator of certain chemical processes in body tissues. From some of the earlier balance experiments on normal individuals, it appeared that the minimum daily iron requirement of adults averaged about 10 milligrams. The addition of a 50 percent margin of sufety brought this figure to 15 milligrams, an allowance that has been used for a number of years in planning and evaluating diets. The accumulation of more recent experimental data indicates that this allowance may have been unnecessarily high. Some investigators consider that an allowance of 12 milligrams is adequate for both men and women; others have suggested that women should receive larger amounts to provide for increased needs during the reproductive period of life. Conclusions regarding human requirements may undergo still further change as more becomes known of the factors affecting the utilization of iron in different foods.

    Children should be liberally supplied with iron, although the experimental evidence showing requirements at different ages is comparatively meager. Balance studies on a small number of infants indicate a minimum requirement of about 0.5 milligram per kilogram of body weight. In studies with preschool children, intakes of 0.6 milligram per kilogram have been shown to provide good retention. Few data are available concerning the iron requirements of older children, and it is usually assumed that their needs are similar to those of adults.

    The allowances for different individuals expressed in terms of the allowance for men in the scale of relatives used for computing the number of iron units to which families were equivalent are shown in the Methodology, page 374.

    On the whole, liberal quantities of iron were available in the food supply of the farm families giving food records (table 25). For only three groups of families was the average iron content of the diets below 15 milligrams per iron unit per day. $\Lambda s$ the money value of the food increased, the average iron content of the diets increased also, a tendency that has been observed in the case of each of the nutrients.

    When food supplies were valued at an amount in the range \$1.38$\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week, all households of white operators included in the study had diets furnishing 8 milligrams or more of iron per nutrition unit per day. In the Middle Atlantic and

    North Central region, 10 percent of the families with food valued at this level had diets furnishing as much as 8 but less than 12 milligrams of iron: and 66 percent, diets furnishing 12 but less than 16 milligrams of iron per nutrition unit per day. At this same level of money value of food, only about a third of the white farm operators studied in the Southeast had diets furnishing less than 16 milligrams of iron per nutrition unit daily.

    The liberal supply of iron in the diets of these farm families may be attributed in part to their use of iron-rich foods, and in part to foods which, though less rich in iron, were consumed in large quantities. From the standpoint of chemical analysis, good sources of iron are meat, eggs, whole grains, dried beans and peas, and the green, leafy vegetables. The proportion of the total iron furnished to white operators' families by these and other selected food groups at one of the most usual levels of money value of food ( $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per unit per week) was as follows:

    | Percentroe of total iron from specified foods in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | North and West | Southeast |
    | 21 | 15 |
    | 21 | 41 |
    | 14 | 5 |
    | 10 | 11 |
    | 8 | 5 |
    | 7 | 3 |
    | 6 | 2 |
    | 4 | 10 |
    | 91 | 92 |

    ## Food group:

    North and West Southeast

    | Meat, poultry, fish | 21.15 |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | Grain products... | 2141 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes | 145 |
    | Milk or its equivalent. | 1011 |
    | Eggs | 85 |
    | Other vegetables and fruit ${ }^{1}$ | 7 |
    | Dried vegetables | 6 2 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables_ | $4 \quad 10$ |
    |  | $91 \quad 92$ |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes all vezetables except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, tomstoes, dried regetables, snd leafy, green, and yellow vegetables; all fruit except citrus.

    The figures just given are for families with food valued at an amount in the range $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit per week. Among groups of families in this class in the North and West the consumption of meat, poultry, and fish, contributing 21 percent of the total iron, averaged about 2 pounds a week per person. About the same proportion of iron came from grain products, the consumption of which averaged 3.8 pounds per person per week. Although most of these cercal foods were eaten in a highly milled form, thereby losing as much as four-fifths of their original store of iron, they are used in such quantity as to constitute one of the most important dietary sources of iron. In the diets of white operators in the Southeast with food valued within the range mentioned, grain products accounted for 41 percent of the total iron. This figure represents a consumption averaging 6.4 pounds per person per week.

    Potatoes and sweetpotatoes furnished 14 percent of the iron in the diets of these families in the North and West, but only about 5 percent in the case of white operators in the Southeast. Average consumption of these foods by the two groups was, respectively, 4.5 and 2.2 pounds per person per week. Milk consumed at the rate of 4.9 and 6.7 quarts per person per week by these two groups of families accounted for 10 and 11 percent of the total iron, although milk itself is very low in iron content.

    Eggs are rich in iron in easily available form. They also contain significant amounts of vitamin A and thiamin as well as protein of good quality. Because eggs are so valuable nutritionally and are one
    of the foods which can be produced on farms in practically all parts of the country, a study was made of the distribution of families by their consumption of eggs.

    Egg consumption was found to be fairly liberal on farms in the North and West. Families with food supplies of a value in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per expenditure unit per week consumed an average of 5 eggs per week for each person (table 26). In half of the households 4 but fewer than 8 eggs were eaten per person a week; but in a little over a fourth, fower than 4 eggs. On the other hand, in about a fifth of the households, consumption amounted to 8 or more eggs per person per week. As the money value of the diet rose, average consumption increased, and there was a larger proportion of the families in the group consuming 8 or more per week, or more than 1 egg per person per day.

    Table 25.-Iron: Average household size, average iron content of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantities of iron, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-37
    [Households of white nonrelief familles that fuclude a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit and money value ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per food-expenditure unit (doilars) | House holds ${ }^{3}$ | A veragehousehold size ${ }^{4}$ |  | A verage content of diets per day- |  | Diets furnishtng specifled quantities of iron (in milligrams per unit per day) |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Per- sons | $\begin{gathered} \text { Iron } \\ \text { units } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { per- } \\ & \text { sor- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { iron } \\ & \text { unit } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Cn} \text { - } \\ & \text { der } \\ & 8.0 \end{aligned}$ | 8.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.0 .0 \\ & 15.8 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{23.9}^{16.0}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.0 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}$ |
    |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Num. } \\ \text { ber- } \\ 30 \\ 32 \\ 16 \end{array}$ | Num - ber 4. 30 4.84 4.34 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Num-} \\ \text { be } \\ 4.04 \\ 4.04 \\ 4.55 \\ 4.17 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Milli- } \\ \text { grams } \\ 15.9 \\ 18.1 \\ 22.5 \end{gathered}$ | Milli- <br> oram, <br> 16.9 <br> 19.2 <br> 23.2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cen } \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 37 \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ 47 \\ 47 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cen } \\ \begin{array}{l} 13 \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
    | midDLE $\underset{\text { CTLANTIC }}{\text { CENTRAL }}$ AND NORTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.38-2.07. | 3888808939 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 5. } 71 \\ \text { 4. } 88 \\ \text { 4. } 17 \\ \text { 3. } 47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.09 .09 \\ & 4.39 \\ & 3.73 \\ & 3.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.0 \\ & 35.8 \\ & 18.8 \\ & 22.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.5 \\ & 17.6 \\ & 21.6 \\ & 21.1 \end{aligned}$ | 0000 | 1030 | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ 31 \\ 61 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 60 \\ & 76 \end{aligned}$ | 18 |
    | 2.77-3.45. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 3.46-4.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 54 \\ & 53 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.47 \\ & 3.70 \\ & 3.70 \\ & \text { 3. } 56 \\ & 2.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3. } 24 \\ & \text { 3. } \\ & \text { 3. } 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \\ & 15.8 \\ & 19.1 \\ & 19.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.2 .2 \\ & 17.1 \\ & 20.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 29110 | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 37 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 43 \\ & 65 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{24}^{4}$ |
    | 2.08-2.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | - $2.777-3.45$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | southeast | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 133 \\ 150 \\ 6154 \\ 64 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | 8000 | $\stackrel{21}{4}$ | $\begin{array}{r}37 \\ 29 \\ 8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 17223757 |
    | 0.69-1.37 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.77 \\ & 5.47 \\ & 4.40 \\ & 4.169 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 4.92 \\ 4.82 \\ 4.09 \\ 3.49 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 12.717.230.024.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.9 \\ & 14.5 \\ & 20 \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 17455438 |  |
    | 1.38-2.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 2.77-3.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

    A considerable number of families of the white farm-operator group in the Southeast used no eggs at all during the week covered by the food record. Of those whose food was valued in the range $\$ 1.38-$ $\$ 2.07$ per expenditure unit in a week, 22 percent used no eggs, 49 percent had up to 3 eggs a person a week, 20 percent 4 but fewer than 8 , and only 9 percent had 8 or more eggs per person per week. The average for the group was 3 eggs a person in a week. At the next higher level of money value ( $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week), the average consumption was 4 eggs per person a week
    among familics of farm operators studied in the Southeast, and 7 eggs per person among families in the North and West. Used in these quantities, eggs furnished, respectively, about 5 and 8 percent of the total iron in the diets.

    Table 26.-eggs: Average consumption of eggs per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantities, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1986-97
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both aative-born]

    | Analysis unit and money vulue ? of food per week yer food-expenditure anit (dollars) | Households | Average quantity per person in a week | Housebolds consuming specified number of eggs (per person in a week) |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  | None | 1-3 | 4-7 | 8-11 | 12 or more |
    | NORTH AND WEST ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{array}{r} N u m b e r \\ 63 \\ 175 \\ 33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Number } \\ 5 \\ 8 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | Percent ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Percent251615 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ 51 \\ 34 \\ 21 \end{array}$ | Percent 16 26 21 | Percent$\begin{array}{r} \text { K } \\ 22 \end{array}$$40$ |
    | 2.77-3.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 4.15-4.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | SOUTHEAST | 13364 | ${ }_{6}^{3}$ | 22 | 4927 | 2031 | 823 | $\stackrel{1}{8}$ |
    | 2.77-3.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

    1 Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Glossary for deflnitions of terms used in this table. See alse table 19, footnote i.
    ${ }^{2}$ See table 19, footnote 2.
    3 New Eugland, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacife regions.
    In interpreting the apparent abundance of iron in the diets of these farm families, one should consider at the same time the high calorie values yielded by the quantities recorded of some foods. (See p. 52.) That these figures do not represent the physiologic intake, especially at the higher levels of money value of food, is obvious. It seems reasonable to suppose that much of the food waste would be in the cheaper forms of food-fats and grain products. Since grain foods have been shown to be one of the most important sources of iron, it follows that the figures showing the iron content of the diet are correspondingly higher than the actual iron intake. However, the average iron figures for the diets exceptionally high in calories were so far above the suggested allowance that they would provide a considerable margin for reduction due to waste.

    ## Vitamin A Value

    Vitamins are organic substances necessary in small quantities for growth and for the maintenance of a normal state of nutrition. One by one their chemical nature is being identified, and their specific functions in the body are becoming more clearly understood.

    Vitamin A is needed for growth and reproduction and for the maintenance of health and vigor at all ages. One of the early signs of a deficiency is night blindness, or the impaired ability of the eye to adapt to dim light. Changes in the structure of epithelial tissues also occur which greatly interfere with normal functioning. A serious deficiency leads to an eye disease, xerophthalmia.

    Knowledge of requirements for vitamin $A$ is based chiefly on studies to determine the minimum intake of the vitamin that will prevent nutritional night blindness. These studies have shown that the vitamin A need of adults is related to body weight. However, there
    are great individual differences in requirement, perhaps because some persons assimilate and utilize vitamin A (and the provitamins, as beta-carotene) to better advantage than others. Several investigators have reported that carotene is less efficient than vitamin $\mathbf{A}$ in cod-liver oil for maintaining normal visual adaptation. There is some indication, however, that the utilization of carotene may be somewhat more complete when it is supplied in the form of cooked vegetables than as pure beta-carotene dissolved in cottonseed oil.

    The daily minimum vitamin A requirements of humans can be stated only approximately, with an indication of the range of such requirements as estimated from studies of small numbers of human subjects. According to laboratory studies in the Bureau of Home Economics. adults need from 25 to 60 International Units of vitamin A per kilogram per day to support normal visual adaptation when the vitamin A is supplied almost entirely by fish liver oil. The average minimum requirement fell between 40 and 45 International Units per kilogram, which for a 70 -kilogram man would mean approximately 3,000 International Units per day. Since there are wide variations in the requirement or utilization of vitamin $A$ as well as its precursors, and since a margin for storage is advisable, it would seem well to set the goal for diet planning at a level at least twice the minimum established for vitamin A from fish oil.

    Farm family diets tend to provide a liberal supply of vitamin A, usually increasing as the money value of food rises, according to averages for groups of familics at several levels of money value of food (table 27). However, there were a number of individual families faring less well than the averages might suggest. When diets were in the money-value class $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week, 21 percent of the families in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region obtained from their food supply amounts of vitamin A in the range 1,500-2,999 International Units per nutrition unit per day; 29 percent, $3,000-4,499$ International Units; and 24 percent, 4,500-5,999 International Units. In other words, almost 80 percent of these families were receiving 3,000 International Units or more per nutrition unit per day, and one-fourth were receiving 6,000 International Units or more per nutrition unit.

    In the Southeast, many families of white operators recorded diets that were poor in vitamin A. At the lowest level of money value of food (\$0.69-\$1.37 per week per food-expenditure unit), which included 5 percent of the families studied, about a third were receiving less than 3,000 International Units of vitamin A per nutrition unit per day, and about the same proportion 3,000 but less than 6,000 International Units. Even at the money-value level $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per expenditure unit there were 8 percent of the diets that yielded less than 3,000 International Units, although more than 60 percent had 6,000 International Units or more per nutrition unit per day.

    In each farm section there was a wide variation in the averages for individual families at every level of money value. This tendency was especially marked in the data from the Southeast. At each of the three lowest money-value levels, which included almost threefourths of the total number of amilies studied, the food of individual families provided amounts ranging all the way from less than 1,500 International Units to 24,000 or more International Units of vitamin A per nutrition unit per day.

    Table 27.-vitamin a value: Average household size, average vitamin $A$ value of diets, and percentage of househclds with diets furnishing specified quantities of vitamin A value, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-37
    [Households of white nonrelief families that inciude a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit and money value ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per food-expenditure anit (dollars) | Honseholds ${ }^{3}$ | A verage household size ' |  | A verage content of diets per day- |  |  | Diets furnishing specifled quantities of vitamin A value (in International Units) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  | Per nutrition unit per day | Per kilogram per day |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  | Persons | Nutrition units |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { person } \end{aligned}$ | Per nutrition unit | Per kito- grama | Un der 1,500 | $\stackrel{\text { 1,500- }}{2,999}$ | 3,000 4,498 | $\begin{gathered} 4,500- \\ 5,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6,0010- \\ 11,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,400- \\ & 23,909 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24,000 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Un- } \\ & \text { der } \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $30-$ 59 | ${ }_{16}^{66}$ | $\begin{gathered} 120- \\ 239 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 240 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}$ |
    | 2.08-2.76_........-.......- | Numbrr 30 | Number 4.30 | Number 4.20 | Infer- national Units 8,400 | Internotional Units 8,600 | Inter. nationa Units 140 | Per- cent 0 | Per cent 10 | Per- cent 13 13 | Per- cent 30 | Per- cent 34 | Ier- cent 10 | Per. cent 3 | Percent 0 | Per- cent 13 | Per- <br> cent <br> 63 <br> 8 | Per. cent 17 | Percent 7 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 32 | 4. 84 | 4.73 | 7, 600 | 7,800 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 69 | $B$ | 0 | 0 | 3 | 47 | 50 |  |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 38 | 5.71 | 5. 47 | 5, 400 | 5, 600 | 95 | ) | 21 | 29 | 24 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 43 | 18 | 5 |
    | $2.08-2.76$ | 88 | 4. 88 | 4. 69 | 6. 400 | 6, 800 | 115 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 30 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 59 | 33 | 5 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 81 | 4. 17 | 3. 99 | 8,000 | 8, 400 | 140 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 57 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 33 | 46 | 11 |
    | 3.40-4.14 | 39 | 3.47 | 3.35 | 10,300 | 10,700 | 165 |  |  |  | - .-- | --- --- |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.38-2.07-.............. | 14 | 3.47 | 3.38 | 9, 200 | 9,409 | 165 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 43 | 29 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 43 | 29 |
    | 2.08-2.76 | 44 | 3. 70 | 3. 60 | 9,200 | 9,400 | 145 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 62 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 37 | 57 | 4 |
    | 2.77-3.45. | 53 | 3.56 | 3.45 | 13, 100 | 33,503 | 215 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 43 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 57 | 30 |
    | 3.46-4.14. | 17 | 2. 90 | 2.82 | 13,400 | 13, $8(6)$ | 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 0.69-1.37-.....--------- | 24 | 5. 76 | 5. 42 | 6,600 | 7,000 | 140 | 8 | 25 | 25 | 4 | 17 | 17 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 33 | 17 | 21 |
    | $1.38 \cdot 2.67$ | 133 | 5.47 | 6. 21 | 9, 200 | 9,600 | 180 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 14 | 26 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 14 | 29 | 28 | 26 |
    | 2.08-2.76 | ${ }^{s} 150$ | 4.60 | 4.39 | 11, 400 | 12,000 | 215 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 15 | 31 | 18 | 14 | 1 | 12 | 32 | 22 39 | 33 33 |
    | 2.77-3.45. | 64 | 3.79 | 3.66 | 12,240 | 12,700 | 215 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 35 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 39 | 33 |

    It is easy to understand how such variation could occur when one considers the difference in the vitamin A value of common foods. For example, if for a dinner, a family of five used 3 pounds of turnip greens (found by assay to contain about 75,000 International Units per pound), this one meal alone would add enough vitamin A to raise the entire week's average by 6,400 International Units per person per day. If in another household, the food supply during the week of the record included no green, leafy vegetable, but instead, only vegetables of much lower vitamin A value, as beets, celery, or onions, the two diets might be similar in every respect except for the choice of a single food (turnip greens rather than beets, for example) and yet the final average vitamin A values for the week would be very different.

    Green-colored vegetables, including peas, green beans, and broccoli, as well as green leaves of all kinds, are among the richest sources of carotene or, as it is sometimes called, provitamin A. Large yields are also obtained from yellow vegetables, such as carrots and sweetpotatoes.

    The relative importance of different food groups as sources of vitamin A value for white operators' families whose diets were in the money-value class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week is shown below:

    | W below: | Percentage of pitamin A value from specified food groups in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeast |
    | Butter and other fats | 25 | 10 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables_ | 23 | 28 |
    | Milk or its equivalent. | 15 | 11 |
    | Other vegetables and fruit ${ }^{1}$ | - 10 | 4 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes. | - 9 | 36 |
    | Eggs. | 7 | 3 |
    | Total accounted for | -. 89 | 92 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes all vegetables except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, tomatocs, dricd vegetables, and leafy, green and yellow vegetables; all fruit except citrus.

    A significant source of vitamin A value in the diets from the Southeast was sweetpotatoes. The week's food supplies during the period studied included an average of about 1.4 pounds of sweetpotatoes per person. Sweetpotatoes are somewhat seasonal in their availability; consumption is much greater in fall and winter than in spring and summer when home-stored supplies are exhausted. Sweetpotators and potatoes together furnished more than one-third of the total vitamin A value. In the North and West where sweetpotatoes constituted a small part, only 4 percent, of potato-sweetpotato consumption, the contribution of vitamin A from these foods was only 9 percent of the total.

    Vitamin A, as such, occurs abundantly in fish-liver oils Other excellent sources are fish roe, liver, egg yclk, butter, and cheese. Because of the quantitics in which they are used on farms, milk and cream are important in the proportion of the total vitamin A they furnish. For example, for the group of families from the North and West represented above, milk and cream supplied 15 percent of the total vitamin A value. Eggs accounted for 7 percent, and fats, chiefly because of butter, 25 percent. In the diets of the Southeast,
    these foods from animal sources supplied a relatively smaller proportion of the total vitamin A, not only because of lower consumption of butter and eggs, but because of relatively greater contributions from foods of plant origin.

    According to food records, the average consumption of butter was higher in the North and West than in the Southeast in diets of the same money value. In the money-value class $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per foodexpenditure unit per week, average consumption in a week by families in the North and West was 0.33 pound per capita (table 28). Thirteen percent of the families used no butter at all during the week; 22 percent used less than a fourth of a pound per person; 38 percent used a fourth but less than a half pound; and 27 percent, a half pound but ess than a pound per person in a week.

    Table 28.-butter: Average consumption of butter per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantities, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-37
    [Households of white nonrelief familles that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit and money value ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per food-expenditure unit (dollars) | House holds | Average quantity per person in 8 week | Households consuming specified quantities of butter (In pounds per person in a week) |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  | None | 0.01-0.24 | 0.25-0.49 | 0.50-0.90 | 1.00 or more |
    | NORTH AND WEST ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Number | Pounds |  | Percent |  |  |  |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 63 | 0.33 | P13 | Percent 22 | 38 | 187 | Percent 0 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 175 | . 52 | 12 | 8 | 33 | 40 | 7 |
    | 4.15-4.83. | 33 | . 66 | 6 | 9 | 21 | 40 | 24 |
    | 1.38-2.07 | 133 | . 26 | 37 |  | 18 | 11 | 8 |
    | 2.77-3.45 | 64 | . 41 | 24 | 19 | 20 | 25 | 12 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Clossary for deffitions of terms used in this table. See also table 19, footnote 1 .
    ${ }_{2}^{2}$ see table 19 , footnote 2.
    ${ }^{3}$ New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.
    In the Southeast at the money-value level $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per week per food-expenditure unit, the consumption of butter averaged 0.26 pound per person in a week. Of the total number of families, 37 percent used no butter; 26 percent used less than a fourth of a pound per person; 18 percent used a fourth but less than a half pound; 11 percent, a half of a pound but less than a pound; and 8 percent used a pound or more a person in a week. As the money value of the food supply increased, there was an increase in the average consumption for the group and also in the proportion of families at the higher levels of consumption.

    ## Thiamin (Vitamin $B_{1}$ )

    Thiamin (vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ ) plays an essential role in the metabolism of carbohydrate and therefore in the normal processes of all body cells. It is required for growth, for the maintenance of appetite, and for the normal functioning of the gastrointestinal tract. A severe and prolonged shortage of vitamin $B_{1}$ results in a disease called beriberi.

    One of the first estimates of the human requirements of vitamin $B_{1}$ was based on studies of the thiamin content of diets known to be associated with the presence or absence of beriberi. Additional informa-
    tion has come through research with experimental animals. From studies of the relationship of the vitamin requirement of several species to body weight and to energy metabolism, a formula has been proposed for estimating human requirements. With pure vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ (as thiamin hydrochloride) recently made available, new fields of research are opening for studying human requirements.

    So far as investigated, the results of the several types of studies, together with clinical observations of cases of thiamin deficiency, indicate that in a mixed diet, the minimum intake required to prevent beriberi is from 200 to 250 International Units per 70-kilogram adult doing moderately active muscular work. That the requirement is related to energy metabolism is well established. It now appears that the vitamin may play a specific role in the intermediary breakdown of carbohydrate. This theory would seem consistent with the findings that the requirement for thiamin (vitamin $B_{1}$ ) is less when diets contain considerable fat than when most of the calories are derived from carbohydrate and protein. This "vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$-sparing" action of fat has led to the suggestion that the vitamin requirement is more closely related to the nonfat calories than to total calories.

    In planning diets for adults, allowances may well be set two or three times as high as the minimum required to prevent beriberi. This would mean a level of intake of from 1.5 to 2.0 milligrams of thiamin ( 500 to 666 International Units) for a 70 -kilogram adult or about 20 International Units per 100 calorics. Whether or not this intake could be considered optimal is unknown. In the scale of relatives used in this study for determining the number of nutrition units (for thiamin) to which each household was equivalent, the allowances used for different individuals bear the same relation to that for the moderately active man as do the energy allowances. (Sce Methodology, p. 374.)

    Most of the farm families studied had access to a fairly liberal supply of thiamin in their food. This is reflected in the averages per nutr:tion unit which ranged from somewhat more than 1.5 milligrams ( 500 International Units) to more than 3 milligrams ( 1,000 International Units). In cach analysis unit the averages increased as the money value of food increased. For example, among families in the Middle Atlantic and North Central farm sections at the money-value level $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week, diets furnished an average of 1.88 milligrams per nutrition unit per day; at successively higher levels of money value the averages were 2.28, 2.75 , and 3.28 milligrams of thiamin per nutrition unit per day (table 29).

    Much less variation in averages was found when the thiamin content of the diet was expressed as International Units per 100 calories. For the groups of families just used for illustration (Middle Atlantic and North Central), the averages per 100 calories were 21, 21, 23, and 22 International Units at the four levels of money value of food. The extreme range in averages for all levels of money value of food in four analysis units was from 18 to 23 International Units per 100 calories, or the equivalent of 540 to 690 International Units for a 3,000 -calorie dietary.
    Very few of the diets in the New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, or the Pacific farm sections furnished less than 1.0 milligram of thiamin per nutrition unit per day. However, there were many diets supplying as much as 1.0 but less than 1.5 milligrams
    per nutrition unit. These were most frequently found at the lower levels of money value of food. Of Middle Atlantic and North Central families at the money-value level $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per expenditure unit per week, 34 percent were receiving 1.0 but less than 1.5 milligrams of thiamin per nutrition unit per day. About the same proportion of families in the Pacific farm sections were obtaining less than 1.5 milligrams per nutrition unit per day, some of these families having even less than 1.0.

    In the Southeast, food supplies valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week furnished to individual families very different amounts of thiamin. Four percent obtained less than 1.00 milligram of thiamin per nutrition unit per day; the averages for 13 percent were in the interval 1.00-1.49 milligrams; 39 percent, $1.50-1.99 ; 30$ percent, $2.00-2.99$; and 14 percent, 3.00 milligrams or more of thiamin per unit per day.
    In all farm sections, the proportion of families receiving at least 2 milligrams of thiamin per nutrition unit a day increased as the money value of food rose. This relationship between money value of food and the thiamin content of the diet was, however, not found when average values were computed on a 100 -calorie basis; with increasing money value of food, the total energy value of the diet kept pace with the consumption of those foods furnishing the largest share of the total thiamin.

    Thiamin is found to be rather widespread, although in small quantities, in both plant and animal foods. Among the richest sources are seeds such as peas, beans, and the whole grains. Lean pork is exceptionally rich in thiamin, while kidney and liver are likewise excellent sources.

    In diets of white operators' families with a money value in the range $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week, the food groups contributing the largest proportions of the total thiamin were as follows:

    |  | Percentage of thiamin from specified food groups in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | Northand West | Southeas? |
    | Meat, poultry, fish | 24 | 26 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes | 22 | 6 |
    | Milk or its equivalent. | 15 | 17 |
    | Grain products.- | 14 | 27 |
    | Other vegetables and fruit : | - 9 | 2 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables | 4 | 9 |
    | Total accounted for. | - 88 | 87 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes all vegetables except potatoes and sweetpotatoes tomatoes, dried vexetables, and leafy, green, and yellow vegetables; all fruit except citrus.

    Meat, poultry, and fish supplied about a fourth of the total thiamin in the diets of families studied both in the North and West and in the Southeast. This proportion represented an average consumption of about 2 pounds of meat, poultry, and fish per person in a week. In the diets of families included in the analysis unit of the North and West, potatoes and sweetpotatoes furnished almost as much thiamin as did meat. But in the diets of the Southeast, potatoes and sweetpotatoes accounted for only 6 percent of the total. This was partly because the consumption of these foods was only half as great and partly because pound for pound potatoes contain larger quantities of thiamin than do sweetpotatoes.

    Table 29.-mimamin: Average household size, average thiamin content of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantities of thiamin, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States. ${ }^{1}$ 1936- 37
    

    Although milk is not one of the richest sources of thiamin, it was consumed in such quantities by the two groups of farm families discussed above as to provide 15 and 17 percent of the dietary supply of thiamin. Grain products, most of which were used in a highly milled form by families studied in the North and West, accounted for only 14 percent of the total thiamin in these diets. In the Southeast this proportion was about twice as great, both because the diets included larger quantities of grain products and because a considerable amount of corn meal was made from the whole kernel.

    ## Ascorbic Acid (Vitamin C)

    Ascorbic acid (vitamin C) was first known as a substance necessary for the prevention or cure of scurvy. Its most clearly established function is that concerned with the physical state of intercellular substances. In this capacity ascorbic acid is closely related to the development and maintenance of the structure of teeth, bones, and various connective tissues in the body. The relatively high concentration of vitamin $\mathbf{C}$ in tissues characterized by a high metabolic activity suggests that the vitamin is essential to growth in animals and plants. There is evidence also that ascorbic acid is necessary for the normal functioning of the blood-serum complement, a substance concerned with resistance to bacterial invasion.

    Table 30.-ascorbic acid: Average household size, average ascorbic acid content of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantities of ascorbic acid, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unil, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-87
    [Households o white nonrelief farnilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    

    The three methods most commonly used in the study of human requirements for ascorbic acid involve measurement of capillary resistance or fragility, the amount of ascorbic acid excreted in the urine, and the ascorbic acid content in blood. Investigations with these methods indicate that there is a wide range between the physiologic minimum requirement and the level of intake required for tissue saturation. The average minimum requirement of adults appears to be between 25 and 30 milligrams per day. There is less agreement as to what shall be considered an optimal intake, but diets probably should furnish at least twice and possibly three times the minimum intake needed to protect against specific symptoms of deficiency. Per unit of body weight, requirements appear to be several times greater for young children than for adults. Pregnancy and lactation also increase the need for vitamin C. The scale of relative allowances used for computing the number of ascorbic acid units to which the persons in each household were equivalent is shown in the Methodology, page 374.
    Estimates of the ascorbic acid content of the farm diets studied suggest that the supply of this nutrient was relatively less generous than that of some of the others. This was particularly true in the Southeast, where at each money-value level the average content per nutrition unit was lower than for a corresponding group in other analysis units.
    In all regions the diets most likely to be deficient in this nutrient were those at the lower end of the money-value scale. Families of white farm operators in the Southeast, at the money-value level \$0.69-\$1.37 per food-expenditure unit per week, had diets providing an average of only 42 milligrams of ascorbic acid per nutrition unit per day. In a third of these households, the average ascorbic acid content of the diet was below 25 milligrams per nutrition unit per day; and in another third, as high as 25 but less than 50 milligrams per nutrition unit per day. At the next higher money-value-of-food level, where the average ascorbic acid of the diets was 55 milligrams per nutrition unit per day, 9 percent of the diets furnished less than $25 ; 39$ percent furnished amounts in the range $25-49$; and 31 percent, $50-74$ milligrams of ascorbic acid per nutrition unit per day. This means that the majority of this group of 133 farm families had diets supplying less than a liberal allowance (table 30).

    About the same situation was found among the families in farm sections in the Middle Atlantic and North Central region at this latter level of money value of food (\$1.38-\$2.07 per food-expenditure unit per week). An increase in the value of the food supply to the level $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$ per unit per week meant that a larger proportion of families had a liberal provision of ascorbic acid; however, 42 percent were receiving less than 75 milligrams per nutrition unit per day.

    Because ascorbic acid is water soluble and unstable to heat and oxidation and therefore readily lost or destroyed, the actual intake of this vitamin is somewhat less than figures computed on the basis of fresh, uncooked food materials would imply. The estimate of the ascorbic acid content of diets as indicated by the figures in table 30 may be considered somewhat optimistic.

    Among the richest sources of ascorbic acid are citrus fruit, tomatoes (raw or canned), and raw cabbage. Green, leafy vegetables are also good sources, although there may be relatively large losses in rooking.

    Most other fruit and vegetables contain some ascorbic acid; their importance in the diet as a source of this vitamin depends on the quantitics in which they are consumed and whether they are eaten cooked or raw. Potatocs are a good example. In the quantities eaten by white operators' families in the North and West with diets in the money-value class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week, potatoes contributed as much as 27 percent of the total ascorbic acid value of the food supply. The consumption of potatoes by this group of families averaged 4.5 pounds per person a week. In the Southeast, where the average consumption of potatoes and sweetpotatoes was only 2.2 pounds per person in a week, these foods furnished 14 percent of the total ascorbic acid as shown below:

    |  | Percentage of ascorbic acid from specipied food groups in farm diets in the |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and West | Southeast |
    | Other vegetables and fruit ${ }^{1}$ | 28 | 18 |
    | Potatoes, swectpotatoes | 27 | 14 |
    | Tomatoes, citrus fruit. | 18 | 14 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables. | 16 | 40 |
    | Milk or its equivalent. | - 9 | 12 |
    | Total accounted for. | - 98 | 98 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Inciudes all vegetables except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, tomatoes, dried vegetables and lealy, green, and yellow vegetables; all fruit except citrus.

    Tomatoes and citrus fruit, foods in which ascorbic acid is very concentrated, furnished only 18 and 14 percent of the total in the diets of the two groups of families mentioned above. In general, the consumption of citrus fruit among the households studied was very low (table 31). At thrce levels of money value of food, the average consumption by families in the North and West was $0.24,0.52$, and 0.61 pound per person per week. In these three groups, 57,42 , and 40 percent of the families used no citrus fruit at all during the week of the study. In the Southeast (Florida was not included in the sample), both the average consumption and the proportion of households consuming some citrus fruit was lower than in the North and West. The relatively infrequent use of citrus fruit on farms is not unexpected since they are foods which in most sections of the country would require a cash outlay.

    The consumption of fruit other than citrus was much more liberal, especially in the analysis unit from the North and West. At one of the most usual levels of money value of food ( $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$ per foodexpenditure unit per week), the average quantity used was 4.1 pounds per person in a week (table 31). Only 5 percent of the families had none at all; 47 percent used up to 3 pounds a person a week; and about the same proportion used 3 pounds or more per person during the week of the food record. In the Southeast, at the same level of money value of food, about a fourth of the families consumed none of this fruit; 59 percent used less than 3 pounds a person a week; and only 16 percent, 3 pounds or more.

    ## Riboflavin

    Riboflavin is a constituent of an oxidative enzyme involved in cell respiration. Although the need of experimental animals for riboflavin
    has long been clearly demonstrated, it is only recently that a riboflavin deficiency in human beings has been recognized. Among the several characteristic symptoms that may develop in a severe deficiency are a cheilosis (lesions of the lips) and keratitis (ocular changes). These conditions have been found to appear in patients on diets low in riboflavin and have been cured by the administration of the crystalline vitamin.

    Less is known of the minimum human requirement for riboflavin than for vitamin A, thiamin, or ascorbic acid. Until recently there had been no physiologic condition in human beings that was recognized as resulting from a specific deficiency of riboflavin, and consequently, no criterion for determining minimum needs. In the absence of actual measurements of requirement, dietary allowances have sometimes been based on the quantities of riboflavin furnished by mixed diets belicved to be adequate in other respects. On this basis, an adult allowance of 1.5 to 2.0 milligrams has been suggested as a reasonable level to use in planning diets. How far above average maintenance requirements such an intake would be is not known, but it probably represents a fair margin of safety. An optimal allowance may prove to be higher.

    Table 31.- citros and other fruit: Average consumption of citrus and other jruit per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantilies, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-87
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-bora]

    | Alalysis unit and font per week per frod pxpanditure unit (dollars) | Households | Citrus fruit |  |  |  |  | Other fruit |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Aver-agequantityperpersoninweekweek | Households consuming speritied quantities of citrus fruit (in poundsper person in a week) per person in a week |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { age } \\ & \text { quan- } \\ & \text { quity } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { picrison } \\ & \text { ing } \\ & \text { week } \end{aligned}$ | Households consuming specified guantities of other fruit (in pounds per person in aweek) |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { citrus } \\ \text { fruit } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01- \\ 0.49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.99 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 1.00 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}\right.$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { other } \\ \text { fruit } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1-1- \\ & { }_{2.9} \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{3.0-9}$ | 8.0. | 9.0 or more |
    | Northand west ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} L b \\ 0.24 \\ .52 \\ .52 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} P c t, \\ 57 \\ 42 \\ 40 \\ 40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} P_{c t t} . \\ 32 \\ 22 \\ 18 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct. } \\ 57 \\ 57 \\ 47 \\ 48 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Petr}_{2}^{21} \\ 288 \\ 28 \\ 45 \end{gathered}$ | Pct.101021 |  |
    | 1.38-2.07. | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ 63 \\ 173 \\ 173 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct. } \\ 19 \\ 19 \\ 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct. } \\ 17 \\ { }_{27}^{77} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lb. } \\ & 2.4 \\ & 4.1 \\ & 5.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} P c t . \\ 11 \\ 5 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | Pct.01016 |
    | 2. $717-3.45-\cdots-\cdots$ - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 4.15-4, 83-............ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | southenst |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1. 388 -9. 07 | ${ }_{64}^{133}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .08 \\ & .13 \end{aligned}$ | 8577 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 1.0 | 29 | 63 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
    | 2.73-3.45.. |  |  |  |  | 6 | 5 | 1.7 | 25 | 59 | 9 | 3 | 4 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. See also table 19, footnote 1 .
    : Spe tahle 19, footnote 2.
    New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.
    Among families of white farm operators in three analysis units, the average riboflavin content of the diet per nutrition unit was at least as high as 1.8 milligrams per day at the money-value level \$1.38-\$2.07 per food-expenditure unit per week. The proportion of families in this money-value class receiving less than 1.8 milligrams, however, was 47 percent in the Middle $\Lambda$ tlantic and North Central region; 43 percent in the Pacific; and 38 percent of white farm operators in the Southeast. The figure for the latter group includes 11 percent of the
    families whose diets furnished less than 1.2 milligrams per nutrition unit per day (table 32).

    At the most usual levels of money value, riboflavin apparently was well supplied. It was only among those families in the Southeast with diets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per food-expenditure unit per week that the intake may have been dangerously low. The diets of over half of this group supplied less than 1.2 milligrams per day per nutrition unit; and of a third, 1.2 but less than 1.8 milligrams per nutrition unit per day.

    Riboflavin is widely distributed among plant and animal foods. All meat contains some riboflavin but organs, such as liver, kidney, and heart, contain larger quantities than muscle meat. Among plant foods, leafy, green vegetables are especially good sources. From a practical standpoint, milk is an important source, because of the quantities in which it can be consumed. When food supplies had a money value in the range $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per week per foodexpenditure unit, milk furnished 50 percent of the total riboflavin in the diets of families in the North and West, and 60 percent in diets of families in the Southeast. This higher proportion for the latter group was due partly to a higher average consumption of milk (table 24) and partly, of course, to relatively smaller contributions from other foods. Meat, poultry, and fish combined were the next most important group of foods in the proportion of riboflavin they supplied to white operators' families with diets in the money-value class \$2.08-\$2.76 per week per tood-expenditure unit, as shown below:

    |  | Percentage of ribofavin from specifed food groups in farm diets in the- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Food group: | North and Weest | Southeast |
    | Milk or its equivalent | - 50 | 60 |
    | Meat, poultry, fish. | 18 | 16 |
    | Potatoes, sweetpotatoes | 8 | 4 |
    | Eggs...-------- | 6 | 4 |
    | Other vegetables and fruit 1 | 6 | 3 |
    | Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables. | 4 | 7 |
    | Total accounted for. | 92 | 94 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Includes all vegetables except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, tomatoes, dried vegetables, and leaty, green, and yellow vegetables; all (ruit except citrus.
    In third place as contributors of riboflavin were potatoes in the North and West, and leafy, green, and yellow vegetables in the Southeast.

    Canned or fresh vegetables other than potatoes were consumed in very different amounts by individual families. At the money-value level $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per unit per week, 25 percent of the families surveyed in the North and West used less than 1.5 pounds per person in a week; 33 percent used amounts in the range $1.5-2.9$ pounds; 32 percent, $3.0-5.9$; and 10 percent, 6 pounds or more. Even when the money value of the diets was as high as the level $\$ 4.15-\$ 4.83$ per food-expenditure unit per week, there were some families ( 21 percent) consuming less than 3 pounds of vegetables per person in a week. At the other extreme were a few families using over 12 pounds of vegetables per person during the period of the food record (table 33).

    Table 33 and similar ones for eggs, milk, meat, butter, and fruit show clearly why there is such diversity in the nutritive values of diets of individual families living at the same level of money value of food.

    Table 32.-riboflavin: Average household size, average ribofavin content of diets, and percentage of households with diets furnishing specified quantities of riboflavin, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 4 analysis units, white farm operators in 16 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-57
    [ Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    
     i $\rightarrow$ See table 19 for footnotes $2-5$.

    ## Classification of Diets by Grade

    Nutritional well-being demands that the diet provide adequate amounts and suitable proportions of each of the required nutrients in wholesome, digestible, and attractive form. Liberal quantities of one nutrient do not compensate for less than minimal quantities of another, although there are well-known interrelationships in function.

    From data supplied by their food records, families have been classified according to the richness of their diets in respect to each nutrient, as described in the preceding pages. In addition, an attempt has been made to grade diets so as to take several nutrients into account at one time, and thus to provide an over-all picture of the quality of the diet. Any such grading must, of course, be regarded as provisional and highly tentative. Scientific knowledge is still too fragmentary to make possible a thorough-going appraisal of the nutritive adequacy of diets. To do so would necessitate more information than is now available regarding both human requirements for food and the nutritive values of food as commonly eaten. Since relatively little is known either of minimal or optimal requirements, specifications for diet-grading are somewhat arbitrary.

    In this publication, diets of families have been classified into four groups-poor, fair, good, and excellent. To escape classification as poor, and to merit classification as fair, good, or excellent, a diet had to meet or exceed the following specifications per nutrition unit per day:

    | Nutrient: | Guantity per nutrition unit per duy |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | Protein. | ams. |
    | Calcium. | 0.45 gram. |
    | Phosphorus | 0.88 gram. |
    | Iron... | 10 milligrams. |
    | Vitamin A | 3,000 International Units. |
    | Thiamin (vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 1.0 milligram or 333 International Units. |
    | Ascorbie acid (vitamin | 30 miligrams or 600 International Enits. |
    | Riboflavin | 0.9 milligram. |

    A diet was classed as poor if it failed to meet the above specifications with respect to one or more nutrients; as fair, if it met or exceeded the quantities of each nutrient specified above, but by less than a $50-$ percent margin with respect to one or more nutrient; as good, if it provided at least a 50 -percent margin beyond the specifications listed for each nutrient, but less than 100 -percent margin in the case of the vitamins. A diet was classed as excellent if it provided per nutrition unit per day, the following nutrients in at least the quantities listed:

    | Nutrient: | Quantity per nutrition unit per day |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | Protein. | 75 grams. |
    | Calcium | 0.68 gram. |
    | Phosphorus | 1.32 grams. |
    | Iron | 15 milligrams. |
    | Vitamin A value | 6,000 International Units. |
    | Thiamin (vitamin $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 2.0 milligrams or 666 International Units. |
    | Ascorbic acid (vitamin | 60 milligrams or 1,200 International Units. |
    | ibof | 1.8 milligrams. |

    Table 33-vegetables other than potatoes: Average consumption of vegetables other than potatoes per person in a week and percentage of households consuming specified quantities, by money value of food per week per jood-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{\text { }}$ 1936-37
    [Mouseholds of white nonrelief fanilies that include s husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Analyses unit and | Households | Average quantity per per$\operatorname{son}$ in $a$ week | Households consuming specified quantities of vegetablos ${ }^{3}$ other than potatoes (in poinds per parson in a week) |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | food-expenditure unit (doliars) |  |  | 0.0-1.4 | 1.5-2.9 | 3.0-5.9 | 6.0-8.9 | 9.0-11.9 | 12.0 or mote |
    | Nontr And wre | Numbrr | Poundr | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    | 27T-3. | 175 | 5. 2 | 10 | 23 | 34 | 18 | 9 | b |
    | 4.15-4.83. | 33 | 7. 6 | 3 | 18 | 24 | 25 | 12 | 18 |
    | 1.38-2.07.....--...--- | 133 | 3.5 | 23 | 22 | 38 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
    | 2.77 3.45. | 64 | 5.4 | 12 | 21 | 33 | 11 | 17 | 6 |

    1 Datn in this table are from food records furaished by tamilies in the consumption sample. See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. See also table 19, footnote 1.

    - See table 19, footnote 2.

    2 Does not include dried vegetables.

    - New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.

    Criteria other than those listed above might have been selected that would impose higher or lower standards for each grade of diet, and thus classify relatively more or fewer families in each category. Probably, however, most scientists working in the field would agree that any diet classed as poor by the specifications listed above could be improved to the advantage of human welfare, and that the lower limits of the definition for an excellent diet are very modest with respect to a number of nutrients.

    ## Grade of Diet in Relation to Money Value of Food

    A clear-cut association between money value of food and grade of diet, as defined in preceding paragraphs, can be observed in the data from food records obtained both in the North and West and in the Southeast. The percentage of diets graded excellent increased markedly as money value of food per expenditure unit increased, while the percentage graded poor decreased. In the North and West, for example, 8 percent of the diets were graded excellent and 30 percent were graded poor in the money-value-of-food class $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week, whereas 50 percent were graded excellent and only 3 percent graded poor in the class $\$ 2.77-\$ 3.45$ (table 34).

    Along with the recognition of this association between money value of food and grade of diet should go an appreciation of the fact that at all levels of money value of food some families were more successful than others in obtaining satisfactory diets. Thus, in the North and West among families with food valued in the class $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per expenditure unit per week, about one-fifth succeeded in obtaining excellent diets, whereas one-tenth had diets that were graded poor. Greater knowledge and skill in the wise selection of purchased food, together with home-production programs more adapted to family needs, undoubtedly were factors in the situation.

    Diets that did not provide enough of one or more nutrients to be classified in the fair grade were reported by about one-tenth of the families that furnished food records in the North and West unit. Diets equally poor were reported by about one-fourth of the families of white operators in the Southeast. On the other hand, food supplies that could be classed as excellent were reported by about one-third of the families furnishing food records from the North and West unit and by about one-fourth of those from the Southeast. These facts are shown graphically in figure 6 for families living in the North and West.
    

    MONEY VALUE OF FOOD PER WEEK PER FOOD-EXPENDITURE UNIT (DOLLARS)
    Figure 6.-Grade of diet by money value of food: Distribution of families by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, and proportion having dicts graded poor, fair, good, and excellent, nonrelief white farm operators' families in the analysis unit of the North and West, 1936-37.

    Of the food records from the North and West that were graded poor, well over a third fell short of the specifications for a fair diet with respect to vitamin $A$ and calcium; and about one-fifth, with respect to vitamin C. When diets were deficient in but one factor, it was about as likely to be calcium as vitamin A. Less frequently vita$\min \mathrm{C}$ was the only limiting factor. Other nutrients were the sole deficiencies but seldom.

    Of the food records from white operators in the Southeast that were graded poor, about half failed to meet the specifications listed for a fair diet with respect to vitamin A and ascorbic acid, and about a fourth with respect to calcium. Only infrequently were thiamin or riboflavin the sole limiting factors.

    Of the diet records classed as fair in the North and West, about half failed to meet the specifications for a good diet with respect to calcium and total iron; about a fourth failed to meet the specifications
    with respect to thiamin, vitamin $A$ value, and ascorbic acid. When a single deficiency prevented classification as good, it was most likely to be calcium. Of diet records from the Southeast white farm operators' families, between a third and a half of those that failed to meet the specifications for a good diet were relatively deficient in ascorbic acid and vitamin A.
    The chief dietary sources of each of these nutrients have been discussed in the preceding pages. Diets graded good or excellent included much more milk, eggs, green, leafy vegetables, and fresh fruit than diets graded poor.

    Table 34.- Grade of diet by money value of food: Percentage of households having diets of specified grades, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1} 1936-37$
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Money value ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per food-expenditure unit (dollars) | North and West ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ |  |  |  |  | Southeast (white operators) |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Households | Households with diets graded- |  |  |  | Housebolds | Households with diets graded- |  |  |  |
    |  |  | Excel. lent | Good | Fair | Poor |  | Excellent | Grood | Fair | Poar |
    | $0.68-1.37$ | Number | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Number | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    | 1.38-2.07.------------ | 63 | 8 | 6 | 56 | 30 | 133 | 10 | 16 | 41 | 75 33 |
    | 2.08-2.76 | 162 | 18 | 25 | 47 | 10 | 76 | 37 | 21 | 25 | 17 |
    | 2.77-3.45-.--------- | 175 | 50 | 26 | 21 | 3 | 64 | 46 | 23 | 22 | 9 |
    | 4.15-4.83_........... | 33 | 88 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food records furnished by farnilies in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the States and counties studied in ench region; see Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. For specifteations used in grading diets, see p. 82. All percentages are based on the number of bouseholds to each money-value class.
    Adjusted to June-August 1936 price level by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index of retsil food costs.
    ${ }^{1}$ New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacifer regions.
    Had criteria other than those adopted in this study been used in classifying diets by grade, somewhat differing proportions would have been judged to be poor, fair, good, and excellent. For example, had a lower standard for thiamin been the dividing line between diets classed as poor or fair- 0.75 milligram per nutrition unit per day rather than 1.0 of thiamin-and had 1.5 milligrams of thiamin per unit per day rather than 2.0 been the dividing line between diets classed as good or as excellent (all other factors kept constant), the grading would have placed a somewhat larger proportion of food records in the higher dietary classes, especially of records showing relatively high money value of food. On the other hand, had the standards for ascorbic acid and riboflavin been higher, proportionally more would have been placed in the poorer diet classes in every money-value-of-food class.

    Table 35 compares for selected money-value-of-food groups the proportions of diets in each grade using the criteria adopted for this study with the proportion that would have been in each (1) had the lower standards for thiamin described above been imposed; (2) had the ascorbic acid standards been raised by one-fourth; and (3) had the riboflavin standards been doubled. The figures in the table indicate the need for care in interpreting an appraisal of the nutritive quality of diets based on any single set of figures.

    Table 35--diets graded by four sets of criterta: Percentage of households having diets of specified grades, as judged by four sets of criteria, by money valuc of food per week per food-expenditure unit, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-87
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Money value ${ }^{2}$ of food per week per foodexpenditure unit and criteria ${ }^{3}$ for grading diets | North and West ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  | Soutbeast |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Excel- lent | Good | Fair | Foor |
    | \$0.69 \$1.37: <br> Specifications adopted for thls publication. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. 0 | Pct. | $\begin{array}{r} P_{2} \mathrm{t} . \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} P c t \\ 7 \overline{\mathrm{j}} \end{aligned}$ |
    | Specifications modified to allow: ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 25 |  |
    | Lower standard for thiamin.---------- |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 25 | 75 |
    | Higher standard for ascorbic acid |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21 4 | 79 |
    | Higher standard for ribaflavin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$1.38-\$2.07: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Specifleations adopted for this publication Specitications modified to allow:" | 8 | 6 | 56 | 30 | 10 | 16 | 41 | 33 |
    | Specicawer standard for thiamin....... | 10 | 5 | 55 | 30 | 12 | 13 | 43 | 32 |
    | Higher standard for ascorbic aci | 5 | , | 50 | 37 | 7 | 11 | 38 | 44 |
    | Higher standard for riboflavin. | 2 | 10 | 39 | 49 | 2 | 5 | 42 | 51 |
    | \$2.08-\$2.76: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Specificationsadopted for this publication.- | 18 | 25 | 47 | 10 | 37 | 21 | 25 | 17 |
    | Speciflcations modifled to sllow: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Lower standard for thiamin...- | 29 15 | 19 23 | 43 45 | 9 17 | 41 25 | 17 25 | 25 26 | 17 24 |
    | Higher standard for ribollavin.........- | 1 | 17 | 63 | 18 | 12 | 29 | 35 | 24 |
    | \$2.77-\$3.45: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Specificationsadopted for this publication. | 50 | 26 | 21 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
    | Specifications modifed to allow: ${ }^{\circ}$ | 63 |  | 21 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
    | Higher standard for ascorbic acid. | 41 | 30 | 26 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
    | Higher standard for riboflavin.. | 12 | 42 | 42 | 4 |  |  |  |  |

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region; see Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. All percentages in this table are based on the number of households in each money-value class.
    ${ }_{2}$ Adjusted to June-August 1936 level by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index of retail food costs.
    ${ }^{3}$ See description in text.
    ; New England, Mid̈dle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.
    ${ }^{8}$ Modification made in the specifled nutrient only.

    ## Grade of Diet in Relation to Family Type and Income

    Within a given income class, $\$ 500-\$ 999$ for example, there was a tendency for the smaller families (type 1) to have a larger proportion of diets graded good or excellent and a smaller proportion graded poor or fair than the very large families (types 6 and 7). This was in line with average money value of food per food-expenditure unitmeal for white operators' families furnishing food records at this income level, as shown below:

    | Analysis unit and family-type group: North and West: | Average money palue of food per loodmeal (cente) | Percentage of diets graded- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | ${\underset{\text { fair }}{\text { Por or }}}^{\text {for }}$ | Good or excellent |
    | Type 1. | 14, 0 | 37 | 63 |
    | Types 2 and 3 | - 13.3 | 65 | 35 |
    | Types 4 and 5. | - 13. 6 | 50 | 50 |
    | Types 6 and 7 | - 10.5 | 87 | 13 |
    | Southeast: |  |  |  |
    | Type 1- | -14.4 | 50 | 50 |
    | Types 2 and 3 | - 12.5 | 41 | 59 |
    | Types 4 and 5- | . 10.8 | 57 | 43 |
    | Types 6 and 7-- | - 9.4 | 69 | 31 |

    Contributing to the differences in money value of diets are, of course, the differences in the quantities had of the relatively expensive protective foods.
    As incomes rose, families of each type generally had an increasing proportion of diets graded excellent or good. This would be expected from the increasing quantities of milk, butter, succulent vegetables, and fresh fruit usually found in diets of higher money value associated with higher incomes. (See Quantities Consumed of Important Food Groups, p. 32 ; and Nutritive Value of Diets, p. 52.) Among farm families, however, there are wide differences in dietary patterns. Through home-production programs many families with low incomes (money and nonmoney) are able to maintain high dietary levels (table 36 ).

    Table 36.-Grade of diet and money valee of food by family type and income: Average money value of food per food-expenditure unit-meal and percentage of diels graded excellent or good and fair or poor, by family type and income, 2 anal$y s i s$ units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1986-37
    [Housebolds of white nonrelief families that include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Family type and income class (doliars) | North and West |  |  |  | Southeast |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Households | Average money value of food per expenditure unit-meal | Proportion of diets graded- |  | Households | Average money value of food per expenditura unit-mea | Proportion of diets graded- |  |
    |  |  |  | Exceilent or good | Fair or poor |  |  | Excellent or good | Fair or pror |
    | TFPE 1 | Number | Cents | Percent | Percent | Number | Cents |  |  |
    | 500-999. | 49 | 14.0 | 63 |  | 19 | 14.4 | 50 | Per 50 |
    | 1,000-1, 199 | 31 | 15.8 | 71 | 29 | 10 | 17.9 | 80 | 20 |
    | 800-999 - | 37 | 13.3 | 35 | 65 | 40 | 12.5 | 59 |  |
    | 1,000-I, 499. | 53 | 14.7 | 62 | 38 | 25 | 12.4 | 45 | 5 |
    | 1,500-1, 099 | 28 | 14.9 | 58 | 44 | 12 | 14.9 | 76 | 24 |
    | 500-999 | 49 | 13.6 | 50 | 50 | 67 | 10.8 | 43 |  |
    | 1,000-1, 490 | 52 | 14.1 | 68 | 32 | 51 | 12.0 | 33 | 67 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 47 | 13.2 | 44 | 56 | 22 | 11.4 | 31 | 69 |

    1 Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region; see Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. For specifications used in grading the diets. see page 82.
    ${ }^{2}$ New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.
    Differences in grade of diet from one income class to another are not always clear-cut however; in part because of the wide variations in the home-production of the protective foods within each income class, and in part because the lower income classes include two groups of familics in any given year-those that fall in these groups year after year, and those that are in lower income classes for a single year because of temporary reverses. The latter generally have resources that enable them to maintain higher dietary levels than would be expected of families accustomed to living within correspondingly low incomes (see p. 369).

    To the circumstances noted above which bring about exceptions to the general rule that each family-type group tended to have better
    

    Figure 7.-Grade of diet by income: Distribution of families by income, and proportion having diets graded poor, fair, good, and excellent, nonrelief white farm operators' families in the analysis unit of the North and West, 1936-37.
    

    Figure 8.-Grade of diet by income: Distribution of families by income, and proportion having diets graded poor, fair, good, and excellent, nonrelief whito farm operators' families in the Southeast analysis unit, 1936-37.
    diets as incomes rose, should be added another in considering the relationships shown by this study between grade of diet and income (all family types combined). The reader should recall that the eligibility requirements for the study excluded families on relief, thus eliminating from the lower income classes of the study many more families of larger size (types 3,5,6, and 7) than smaller (types 1, 2, and 4); smaller families can remain independent of public assistance on lower incomes than can the larger families. (See Methodology, The Consumption Sample in Relation to the Total Population.) As shown earlier, at any given income level smaller families tend to have relatively more of the protective foods for each person than do the larger, and hence food of higher money value per food-expenditure unit.

    Table 37.-grade of diet, by family type and income; Percentage of households having diets of specified grades, by family type and income, 2 analysis units, white farm operators in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1996-97
    [Households of white nonrelief families that include a hasband and wite, both native-born]

    | Analysis unit, family type, and income class | $\begin{aligned} & \text { House- } \\ & \text { holds } \end{aligned}$ | Percentage of diets graded-- |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Excel- } \\ \text { lent } \end{gathered}$ | Good | Fair | Poor |
    | North and West: ALL TXPES | Number221131128890 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ 41 \\ 27 \\ 41 \\ 31 \\ 41 \\ 41 \end{array}$ | Percent920221828 | Percert1444324027 | Percent 3695114 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$500-\$809. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$1,000-\$1, 499 |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$1,500-\$1,999. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$2,000 or over. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Southeast: |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$0-\$4999.0. | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 124 \\ 78 \\ 64 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 31 \\ & 19 \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | 1414141919 | 3825363131 | 31302419 |
    | \$1, $200-\$ 1,499$ |  |  |  |  |  |
    | \$1, 5000 or over. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | family-type groups in incoue class \$560-\$998 |  |  |  |  |  |
    | North and West: | 35262448 | 371212340 | 26231813 | 31844175 | 61199 |
    | Type 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Types 2 and 3 - |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Types 4 and 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Southeast: |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Type 1. | 10295629 | 50382724 | 021167 | 10173028 | 40242441 |
    | Types 2 and 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Types 6 and 7. |  |  |  |  |  |

    'Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for the States and counties studied in each region; see Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. For specifications used in grading diets see page 82 . All percentages are based on the number of bouseholds in each elass.

    As a result of the unequal distribution of families by type in the different income classes, there is great similarity in average money value of food per food-expenditure unit (all family types combined) from one income class to another. This was particularly true of average value of food per expenditure unit in the farm sections of the North (New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central regions), as is shown by the following data from food records:
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    |  | Morey anlue (in cetts) of food per expenditure unit-meal in- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Family-income class: | North | West | Southeast |
    | \$0-\$499. | 14. 1 | 13.5 | 10.8 |
    | \$500-\$999 | 13.7 | 13. 3 | 11. 3 |
    | \$1,000-\$1,499 | -14.8 | 13.9 | 12. 1 |
    | \$1,500-\$1,999 | -13.9 | 14.0 | 13. 0 |
    | \$2,000-\$2,999 | 14.3 | 14.9 | 14.0 |

    Because a larger proportion of the families in the North and West meeting the eligibility requirements of the study were in the higher income classes than in the Southeast, and because within each income class families in the North and West had food of higher money value per food-expenditure unit, there was a distinct difference in the nutritive quality of diets of farm operators' families included in the consumption sample in the North and West on the one hand, and those of the Southeast on the other. This is true whether each unit is considered by income classes or as a whole. A larger proportion of the former group than of the latter had diets that could be classed as excellent, and fewer that had to be classed as poor (table 37 and figs. 7 and 8).

    ## SECTION 3. FOOD OF WHITE SHARECROPPERS' FAMILIES IN THE SOUTHEAST

    Families of sharecroppers supply labor and some part of the expenditures for the operation of the farm, and receive in return a specified proportion of the crop. They do not furnish work animals, nor do they make major decisions as to policies of farm operation (Glossary, Sharecropper).

    ## Money Value of Food of White Sharecroppers' Families

    More than four-fifths ( 84 percent) of the nonrelief families of white sharecroppers in the Georgia-Mississippi section had incomes (money and nonmoney) below $\$ 750$ in 1935-36. In the counties of the Carolinas the proportion was smaller, 39 percent. However, even in the latter section, the median income was under $\$ 900$. These figures indicate that many families must devote a high proportion of their income to food, subsist on a low dietary level, or both.

    The average money value of food at a given income level was higher in the Georgia-Mississippi section than in the Carolinas. For example, the average for types 4 and 5 combined in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 749$ amounted to $\$ 419$ in the former section and $\$ 387$ in the latter. These sums were 63 and 56 percent, respectively, of the money value of family living. Although products furnished by the farm were valued at approximately 70 and 60 percent of the total for the food of these groups in the two sections, average expenditures for food were slightly more than 40 percent of money expenditures for living in each of the two analysis units. This is a relatively high proportion to devote to the purchase of so small a share of the food supply; it reflects the fact that the amount of money available for family living was relatively low.

    With rising income, the average moncy value of food per foodexpenditure unit increased, and in each income class the money value of the sharecroppers' food was usually lower than that of operators in each farm section, as is shown by the following figures for families of types 4 and 5 combined in selected income classes:

    | Farm section, family-income class, and tenure: North Carolina-South Carolina: $\$ 250-\$ 499:$ | Average money value of food per experditure unit-meal (in cents) | Percentage <br> of food <br> that was <br> home produced |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Sharecroppers | - 5. 3 | 53 |
    | Operators...- | -5. 9 | 60 |
    | \$500-\$749: |  |  |
    | Sharecroppers. | -7.0 | 59 |
    | Operators | -8.2 | 69 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi: |  |  |
    | \$250-\$499: |  |  |
    | Sharecroppers | --5.7 | 60 |
    | Operators. | . 6. 3 | 75 |
    | \$500-\$749: |  |  |
    | Sharecroppers | - 7.8 | 71 |
    | Operators.--- | -.-7.6 | 75 |
    |  | 91 |  |
    | $81287^{\circ}-41-7$ |  |  |

    Practically all of the money spent for food by families of sharecroppers was for meals to be prepared and served at home. Most of the money for food purchased and eaten away from home was spent for between-meal food and drink, such as soft drinks, sandwiches, candy, ice cream; only small amounts went for school lunches and for meals at work. In the income class $\$ 500-\$ 749$, for example, average expenditures for meals amounted to about $\$ 2$ or less for any family-type group; the highest average for between-meal food was almost $\$ 5$.

    Milk and fats accounted for almost equal shares of the money value of the home food supply-about one-fifth each-in the diets of families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$. Meats (exclusive of bacon and salt side), grain products, and vegetables and fruits combined accounted for somewhat less, about 15 percent each. As incomes rose, the shift was in the direction of a smaller share to grain products, sugars, and fats, and a larger share to meat and to vegetables and fruit. The differences between the patterns of the various family-type groups might be anticipated from a comparison of average values of food per unit-meal-at comparable incomes, the larger families, with relatively less for the food of each person, had dietary patterns in which meat accounted for a smaller share of the total money value than in diets of small families; but with milk and grain products taking a larger share. These shifts are in the direction followed if the income of families of any given size decreases.

    ## Dietary Patterns of White Sharecroppers' Families as Shown by 7-Day Schedules

    Something of the nature of the diets of families of sharecroppers may be seen from figures on average consumption in a week during the season March-November 1936, the two farm sections of the Southeast combined. Among families of types 4 and 5 , in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$, the food supply of families of sharecroppers included smaller quantities of the relatively expensive protective foods than did diets of families of operators, as the following figures show:

    | Classes and groups of food:Class A (groups including many of the protective | Pounds cansumed per house.hold in a ueek |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | arecroppers | Opertatars |
    |  | 81.4 | 91.4 |
    | Eggs | 2.0 | 4 |
    | Milk, fluid, or its equivalent in other forns, | 51. 6 | 58.3 |
    | Butter- | 2.4 | 2. 6 |
    | Succulent vegetables, fresh and camed | 14.6 | 14.9 |
    | Fruit, fresh ${ }^{1}$ and canned | 10.8 | 14.2 |
    | Class B (other foods of plant origin) | 49.2 | 47.0 |
    | Grain products (flour equi | 33. 9 | 31. 5 |
    | Sugar, sirups, preserves | 7.0 | 7.8 |
    | Potatoes, swectpotatoes. | 7. 7 | 7. 2 |
    | Dry mature beans, peas | . 6 |  |
    | Class C (other foods chiefly of animal origin) -.- | 13.7 | 12.3 |
    |  | 6. 8 | 5. 8 |
    | Meat, ${ }^{3}$ poultry, fish. | 6.9 | 6.5 |
    | 1 Includes also the rresh rruit equivalent of dried frait. <br> Excludes butter, but includes bacon and salt side. |  |  |

    The houscholds fed from the food supplies listed above included an average of 4.76 persons among the sharecroppers and 4.57 among operators; the value of the food per expenditure unit-meal was 8.1 cents and 8.6 cents, respectively.
    Over three-fourths of the families of white sharecroppers giving estimates of their food consumption had incomes (money and nonmoney) below $\$ 1,000$ for the year. As incomes rose to this point, average consumption of most major groups of foods increased among families of each type group. Average consumption of grain products decreased on a per capita, but not always on a household basis; there was an apparent (though not a real) decrease in the per capita consumption of dairy products. ${ }^{1}$

    In comparable income classes there were increases in the consumption of most food groups from one family type to another, with increasing family size. The increases were not in proportion to the number of persons to be fed, however. There was less difference in per capita consumption from one family type to another with respect to grain products than most other food groups.

    Inasmuch as the nutritive quality of diets of low-income families living on farms is closely related to programs of food production for home use, it is of interest to examine the extent of this practice among families of sharecroppers. The proportion of families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$ having farm-furnished milk sometime during the year differed markedly from one State to another. In North Carolina, the percentage was 31; in South Carolina, 67; in Mississippi, 96 percent; and in Georgia, 100. This does not mean that all of these sharecroppers' families owned cows but that at some time during the year they may have shared in the milk supply (chiefly buttermilk) of the families of the operators for whom they worked. In each group of farm counties the percentage having some farmfurnished milk increased appreciably with income, and with increasing size of family.

    It is not easy to replace milk by other foods in achieving adequate diets; hence, the proportion of families having no fresh milk is of particular interest. Among white sharecroppers interviewed at some time during the period March-November 1936, 26 percent had no fresh fluid milk in the preceding week as compared with 11 percent of the white operators. As was found to be the case among families of white operators, there was no income level at which all families had fresh fluid milk.

    Some eggs furnished by the farm in 1935-36 were used by practically all of the families of white sharecroppers included in the study. Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$, all farm sections combined, 79 percent used eggs during the week for which the family gave an estimate of food consumption in the period March-November; the percentage of families of this type group and income class in each farm section that produced some cggs for home


    consumption in 1935-36 was: North Carolina, 88; South Carolina, 89; Mississippi, 91 ; and Georgia, 100.

    Ninety-five percent or more of the sharecroppers' families had home gardens. Almost all families having vegetables during the week of the special food consumption study (season, March-November) reported that a large proportion was farm-furnished. Tomatoes, cabbage, snap beans, peas, and the typical southern greens were the kinds used in largest quantities. Practically all families had some food from the garden, and more than three-fourths canned some vegetables. Almost all of the families that canned food, moreover, raised more than half of what they canned.

    The proportion of sharecroppers producing pork usually was somewhat lower than of operators comparable with respect to family type and income class; and the average quantities produced for household use were, as a rule, considerably smaller. The farm-furnished pork consumed by sharecroppers may have included a large proportion of the less salable cuts; families in straitened circumstances may have disposed of the choice leaner cuts, as ham, for needed cash and retained for home consumption the salt side and other fat cuts that are less valuable nutritionally. Relatively more fat meat was consumed by families of sharecroppers than by families of operators, as shown by consumption estimates.

    ## Nutritive Value of Diets of White Sharecroppers' Families

    ## Nutritive Value as Related to Money Value of Food

    Classified by level of money value of food, there was no consistent trend in the differences in nutritive value between diets of families of sharecroppers and operators. Of food energy and some nutrientsprotein, phosphorus, iron, and vitamin A-diets of sharecroppers furnished slightly larger average quantities; of one other, ascorbic acid, slightly smaller quantities than were found for operators. With respect to other nutrients, the direction of the differences was not consistent at the three comparable levels of money value for which there are data (table 38).

    With food supplies valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per foodexpenditure unit per week-and nearly a fourth of the families of sharecroppers that kept food records were in this class-some of the diets were very restricted. The average ascorbic acid content of the raw food was only 38 milligrams per nutrition unit per day, a level that will be still further reduced by cooking. The average value of riboflavin, 1.2 milligrams, was also low. The calcium content of these diets, averaging 0.66 gram per unit, was higher than might be expected in vicw of the low milk consumption, but self-rising flour supplied significant quantities of both calcium and phosphorus.

    Diets valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week supplied somewhat larger average quantities of each of the nutrients considered. Only in ascorbic acid and riboflavin were the average values per nutrition unit below what could be considered a fairly liberal intake. This does not mean, of course, that every family with food valued within this range obtained desirable quantities of all other nutrients. For example, about one-fifth of the families obtained
    loss then 1.5 milligrams of thiamin (50) International (nits), and the same proportion, less than 4,000 inferatimad Gints of vitamin A per autrition unit per day.

    The arerage quantity of ascorbic acid furnished by the food of this group of fanilies (i. e., those with diets in the money-value range 81.38-\$2.07 per expenditure unit per week) was 50 milligranis per nutrition unit per day. Average values ior individual families were distributed as follows:

    Milligrams:
    Under 25
    Percentage of fumities haning specified fttht tities of ascorbic acid per yutriton anit per dal

    25-49 13
    50.74 43

    75-99 28

    100 or over 13 3
    These figures show the variation around the average, and indicate the extent of the ascorbic acid deprivation that probably existed when over half of the families had in their food supplies less than 50 milligrams per nutrition unit per day.

    Table 38.-ntetritive value of diets by money valee of food: Average nutritive value of diets per nuthilion unit per day and average houschold size, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, Southeast white operator and white shavecropper analysis units, ${ }^{1}$ 1906-3?
    [Husubolds of white nourelief families that incluse a busband and wife, both native-boin]
    

    The average riboflavin content of these diets (in the money-value range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per unit per week) was 1.7 milligrams per nutrition unit per day, but 29 percent of the families reccived less than 1.2 and another 26 percent, as much as 1.2 but less than 1.8 milligrams. Until more is known of human requirements for this nutrient, the significance of these levels of consumption cannot be appreciated.

    At the next higher level of money value of food, $\$ 2.08-\$ 2.76$ per food-expenditure unit per week, the average values for each of the nutrients were all above suggested dietary allowances. However, with an average energy value of 4,770 calories per food-energy unit, there was doubtless considerable food waste and consequently the nutritive value averages may exaggerate the actual intake.

    ## Classification of Diets by Grade

    At comparable levels of money value of food per food-expenditure unit, the diets of families of white sharecroppers in the Southeast tended to be less satisfactory with respect to the proportion of diets graded excellent or good and fair or poor than diets of families of farm operators. This is shown by the following figures:

    |  | Percentage of diets graded |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Money valuc of food per week per expenditure unit, and tenure: \$1.38-82.07: | Excellent or jood | Fair or poor |
    | Sharecroppers | 21 | 79 |
    | Operators. | 26 | 74 |
    | \$2.08-\$2.76: |  |  |
    | Sharecroppers. | 45 | 55 |
    | Operators. | 58 | 42 |

    At cach money-value level, the diets of sharecroppers included less of the protective foods than those of operators.

    Too few records were obtained from sharecroppers to classify their diets by grade within family-type and income categories. For all family types combined, the difference in grade of diet among familics in the two tenure groups is shown below for selected income levels:

    | Family-income class and tenure: Under 5500 : | Percentaye of diets graded |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Fucelle at }} \\ & \text { or gnoort } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Fair or } \\ \text { poor }}}{ }$ |
    | Sharecroppers. | 25 | 75 |
    | Operators. | 31 | 69 |
    | \$500-\$999: |  |  |
    | Sharecroppers | 41 | 59 |
    | Operators | 45 | 55 |

    A larger proportion of sharecroppers than operators lived at the lower income levels. Families of sharecroppers tended to be larger; their programs of production for home use were less adequate; their diets usually included less of the protective foods.

    # SECTION 4. FOOD OF NEGRO FARM FAMILIES IN THE SOUTHEAST 

    ## Money Value of Food of Negro Farm Operators' and Sharecroppers' Families

    Most of the nonrelief Negro families living on farms in the counties studied in the Southeast had incomes (moucy and nonmoney) under $\$ 750$ in 1935-36. Included in this group were 57 percent of the families of farm operators in the Carolinas, 70 percent of those in Georgia and Mississippi; 70 percent of the families of sharecroppers in the former section, and 92 percent of those in the latter. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the average money value of the food of Negro farm families relatively low. More than 40 percent of the operators' families included in this study and more than 60 percent of the sharecroppers' families had food valued at less than 20 cents per food-expenditure unit per day (table 44).

    Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 250-\$ 499$, for example, the average money value of a year's food supply in the North Carolina-South Carolina farm section was $\$ 267$ for Negro operators and $\$ 237$ for Negro sharecroppers. These figures are similar to those for corresponding family-type, income, and tenure groups in the Georgia-Mississippi section. Home-produced food accounted for almost two-thirds of the total value of food of the farm operators ( 61 and 65 percent in the two analysis units) but for only about half that of the sharecroppers (43 and 54 percent). Despite the fact that farms furnished so large a share of food, average expenditures for food took almost half of the total money expenditures for living of families of operators and more than half of those of sharecroppers' families.

    As incomes rose, threre was an accompanying increase in the average money value of food, whether expressed on a family or on a food-expenditure-mit basis. The latter is the more satisfactory basis of comparison because it eliminates the effect of differences from one analysis unit to another in average family size which exist even within the family-type groups. For families of types 4 and 5 combined, the average money value of food per expenditure unit-meal is shown below:

    | Family-income class and farm section: S250-\$499: | per experditiure unit-meal |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Operators | Sharecroppers |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina | -5. 1 | 4. 4 |
    | Georgia-Mississippi | - 5. 5 | 4.6 |
    | \$500. \$749: |  |  |
    | North Carolina-South Carolina | -6. 4 | 6. 4 |
    | Gcorgia-Mississippi | - 7.2 | 6. 4 |

    This increase in money value of food per food-expenditure unitmeal with rising income was found for both tenure groups in both farm sections. However, within the same income class families of operators usually had food of higher money value than sharecroppers.

    The average money value of food per food-expenditure unit decreased as family size increased at practically every income level. This is illustrated by the following figures for families in the Carolinas, in the income class $\$ 250-\$ 499$ :

    |  | Average value (in cents) of food per expenditure unil-meal |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Family-type group: | Operators | Sharecroppers |
    | 1. | - 7.5 | 8. 1 |
    | 2 and 3 | - 5.9 | 5. 7 |
    | 4 and 5 | - 5. 1 | 4. 4 |
    | 6 and 7 | - 3. 9 | 3.9 |

    While some of the decrease in money value of food per unit-meal with increasing family size may reflect economies possible through reduction in household waste or through purchasing on a large scale, the quality of diet from a nutritional standpoint generally was less satisfactory among large families than among small. (See p. 107.)

    Expenditures for food were chiefly for supplies for meals at home. Average expenditures for food away from home were always small, seldom averaging as much as $\$ 5$ a year in the income classes below $\$ 750$. Among families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 250-$ $\$ 499$, average expenditures for food away from home amounted to less than $\$ 3$ during the year. Most of this sum was spent for betweenmeal refreshment.

    ## Dietary Patterns of Negro Farm Families as Shown by 7-Day Schedules

    In the analysis, by income and family type, of the quantity and money value of food consumed in a 7 -day period, all Negro farm families were combined-operators' and sharecroppers' families from the counties studied in the four States. Grain products and fats (including bacon and salt side), each accounted for more than onefifth, 22 and 21 percent, of the money value of the home food supply of Negro families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 0-\$ 499$, according to estimates of consumption covering some week in the period Mnrch-November 1936. Meat, milk and cheese, and vegetables and fruit ranked next; each was 14 or 15 percent of the total valuc. As incomes rose, the shift was generally in the direction of less prominence to grain products and more to meat. But at each income level below $\$ 1,500$ more of the money value of food represented grain products, meat, and fats among Negro than among white families in these farm counties in the Southeast; less represented milk and cheese, and veqgetables and fruit.

    Diets were rather restricted among families in the lower income classes. Even for the class $\$ 500-\$ 999$-and almost half of the Negro families included in the consumption sample had incomes under $\$ 500$--the quantities of major groups of food estimated as consumed in a week sometime during the period March-November 1936 by families of types 4 and 5 combined were as follows:
    Pounds consumedper householdClasses and groups of food:in a wit
    Class A (groups including many of the protective foods)in a week
    Eggs ..... 1. 5
    Mik, fluid or its equivalent in other forms ..... 31. 0
    Butter ..... 1. 4
    Succulent vegetables, fresh and canned ..... 12. 1
    Fruit, fresh ${ }^{1}$ and canned ..... 10. 0
    Class B (other foods of plant origin) ..... 43. 6
    Grain products (flour equivalent) ..... 30.2
    Sugar, sirups, preserves ..... 7. 0
    Potatoes, sweetpotatoes ..... 5. 7
    Dry mature beans, peas ..... 7
    Class C (other foods chiefly of animal origin) ..... 13. 8
    Fats, oils ${ }^{2}$ ..... 7. 0
    Meat, ${ }^{3}$ poultry, fish ..... 6. 8
    1 Includes aiso the fresh equivalent of dried fruit.
    2 Excludes butter, but includes bacon and salt side.
    ${ }^{2}$ Excludes bacon and salt side.

    These quantities of eggs and milk are a third less than those generally recommended for low-cost adequate diets. The average for milk is definitely lower than that reported by white farm families of the same family type and income class living in the Southeast.

    Relatively few of these Negro families (of operators and sharecroppers) had incomes of $\$ 1,500$ or over in the year of the study. In successive income classes up to this level, there usually were marked increases in the consumption of eggs, fluid milk (or its equivalent in other forms), of meat, poultry, and fish, and of potatoes; and relatively smaller increases in the consumption of vegetables other than potatoes.

    Most Negro families included in the 7-day study of quantities consumed obtained their milk, butter, eggs, poultry, and ham dircetly from their farms, or as gift or pay. Beef, veal, or lamb usually were purchased, but were used infrequently if at all; less than one family in three had beef during the week covered by estimates of food consumption, and veal, lamb, or mutton were rarely eaten. More than three-fourths of the families purchased some salt side and lard, showing that insufficient quantities were home-produced. About onefifth of the families purchased some bread, crackers, or other baked goorls, but the quantities bought of these ready-to-eat products were small. White flour and corn meal were the forms in which grain products were chiefly obtained; next in order of average quantity came rice and hominy grits.

    Estimates of food consumption, covering some week in the season March-November 1936, showed home-grown cabbage, greens of many kinds, peas, tomatoes, and snap beans to be the vegetables consumed in largest quantities. From one-half to three-fourths of the total quantity of vegetables other than potatoes belonged in the nutritionally important category of leafy, green, and yellow vegetables. Few canned vegetables were used; of these, average consumption of tomatoes was highest. Somewhat more sweetpotatocs than potatoes were consumed. Aside from melons in season, peaches and apples were the fresh fruits consumed in largest quantity; and peaches, the canned fruit.

    Since farm family consumption of vegetables, fruit, eggs, dairy products, and meat tends to be related to home-production programs, it is of interest to note that in the year 1935-36 practically all families of types 4 and 5 in the income class $\$ 500-\$ 999$ had gardens, and most of them ( 90 percent or more except among the sharecroppers in South Carolina and Mississippi) had some farm-furnished eggs at some time during the year. The proportion having home-produced milk was lowest in North Carolina-48 percent of the operators and 27 percent of the sharecroppers-and highest in Georgia where practially all families, both operators and sharecroppers, had milk furnished by the farm at some time during the year. Eighty percent or more of the families in each section had some home-produced pork. Some families also raised fruit, poultry, and part of the corn for their meal and hominy, and had sirups or molasses from home-produced cane.

    From 80 to 90 percent of the Negro farm families did some home canning to supplement winter diets. The average quantitics so preserved were small, however, amounting to 55 and 56 quarts for families of farm operators canning any food at home, and to 40 and 44 quarts for sharecroppers. Only 10 of the 2,208 families studied had pressure cookers. Few, therefore, had proper equipment for caming meat or nonacid vegetables. Fruit made up about half of the total quantities of food canned; vegetables, chiefly tomatoes, made up the next largest quantities. Relatively more familios of farm operators than of sharecroppers raised half or more of the foorl that was canned. A larger proportion of families raised half or more of the vegetables canned than of the fruit; the differences were more marked in the Carolinas than in the Georgia-Mississippi section.

    ## Nutritive Value of Diets of Negro Farm Families

    ## Nutritive Value as Related to Money Value of Food

    The content and nutritive value of family diets are reflected in the money value of the food supply. A large proportion of the Negro families furnishing food records for this study had food of low money value, as is shown below:

    |  | Petcentage of Negro families having specified monev ratue of food per week per food-erpendilure unit |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Money-value class: | operators | Sharecroppers |
    | Under \$0.69 | 3 | 5 |
    | \$0.69-81.37 | - 35 | 46 |
    | \$1.38-\$2.07 | 36 | 32 |
    | \$2.08-\$2.76 | - 14 | 13 |
    | \$2.77-\$3.45 | 5 | 2 |
    | \$3.46-84.14 | 3 | 2 |
    | $\$ 4.15$ or over. |  | 0 |

    For the three money-value classes with the largest proportion of families, the nutritive value of the diets was computed in terms of food encrgy (calorics), protein, three minerals, and four vitamins (table 39). Because most of the food records were analyzed individually, it is possible also to show how the dietary supply of the several nutrients differed from family to family.

    Ijiets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per week per food-expenditure unit-and a large proportion of families had food valued in this class-
    provided an werage of about 3,000 calories per matrition unit per day. However, 25 percent of the operators and 14 percent of the sharecroppers received fewer than 2,400 calories per nutrition unit. At this low level of money value of food, grain products assumed great prominence in the diet, furnishing about half of the total calories. This figure represents an average consumption of a little over 5 pounds of grain products per person in a week (operators and sharecroppers combined). Fats, consumed at a rate of about 1 pound per person in a week, furnished 23 percent of the calorics. The proportion furnished by milk, meat, potatoes, and sugars was from 5 to 7 percent each (table 40).

    Table 39.-nuthitive value of difts, by money value of food: Average nutritive value of diets per nutrition unit per day and average household size, by money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit, Southeast Negro operator and Negro sharecropper analysis units, ${ }^{1}$ 1936-37
    [Kouscholds of Negro nonrelicf farnilies that include a husband and wife, both native-born]
    

    The average protein content of diets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per week per food-expenditure unit was 65 grams per nutrition unit per day for operators and 66 for sharecroppers. Although these figures are well above a level believed to represent average minimum requirements, there were a few families-3 percent of the operators and 8 percent of sharecroppers-that received subminimal amounts (less than 44 grams) of protein per unit per day during the week of the food record. A large proportion-63 percent of the operators and 44 percent of the sharecroppers-received more than 44 but less than 67
    grams per nutrition unit per day, quantities too small to afford much margin of safety. Over half of the protein ( 55 percent) came from grain products and only about one-third, from animal products such as meat, eggs, and milk.

    Table 40-contribution of food groups to nutritive valee of diets: Proportion of each nutrient furnished by specified groups of foods in diets in the money-value class $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per week per food-expenditure unit, Negro operators and sharecroppers in the Southeast, ${ }^{\text { }}$, 1936-S7
    [109 households of nonrelief Negro families tbat include a husband and wite, both native-born]

    \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \hline Food group \& $$
    \left|\begin{array}{c}
    \text { Food } \\
    \text { energy }
    \end{array}\right|
    $$ \& Protein \& $$
    \underset{\text { cium }}{\text { cal- }}
    $$ \& $\underset{\text { phorus }}{\text { Phos }}$ \& Iron \& $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \text { Vita- } \\
    \text { min } A \\
    \text { value }
    \end{gathered}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { Thia- } \\
    & \text { min }
    \end{aligned}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \text { Ascor- } \\
    \text { bic } \\
    \text { acid }
    \end{gathered}
    $$ \& Ribo- <br>
    \hline Allfood \& $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{gathered}
    $$ \& $$
    \left|\begin{array}{r}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{array}\right|
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{array}{r}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{array}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{gathered}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{gathered}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{array}{|c}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{array}
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{array}{|c|c|}
    \hline \text { Percent } \\
    1 & 100
    \end{array}
    $$ \& $$
    \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{array}\right.
    $$ \& $$
    \begin{array}{|l|l|}
    \text { Percent } \\
    100
    \end{array}
    $$ <br>
    \hline \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{(2)

    6
    23
    6
    49
    49
    7
    1
    1
    (2)} \& 1 \& (2) \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& 1 \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& 0 \& 1 <br>
    \hline Milk, chesse, crean \& \& 15 \& (2) ${ }^{43}$ \& 18
    2 \& 5
    3 \& 4 \& \& 5
    0 \& $\stackrel{44}{1}$ <br>
    \hline Mest, poultry, fish. \& \& 17 \& 1 \& 9 \& 11 \& \& 20 \& \& 1 <br>
    \hline Grain products .-. \& \& 55 \& \& ${ }^{81}$ \& 53 \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& 39 \& (2) \& 8 <br>
    \hline Sugar, sirups, preserves-| \& \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& \& (2) \& 8 \& 0 \& 7 \& (2) \& 0 <br>
    \hline Potatoes, sweetpotatoes. \& \& \& \& \& 5
    4
    4 \& 52 \& 7 \& ${ }_{0}^{22}$ \& 3 <br>
    \hline Tomatoes, citrus fruit .-. \& \& (2) \& (2) \& $(2)^{2}$ \& 1 \& 2 \& 1 \& 9 \& 1 <br>
    \hline Leafy, green, and yel-
    low vegetables \& 2 \& 4 \& 8 \& 4 \& 8 \& 31 \& 10 \& 55 \& 11 <br>
    \hline Other vegetables and \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{${ }^{(2)}{ }^{1}$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(2) ${ }^{1}$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(2) ${ }^{1}$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(2) ${ }^{1}$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(2) 1} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(2) ${ }^{1}$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{(2) ${ }^{8}$} \& <br>
    \hline Miscellaneous.. \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
    \hline
    \end{tabular}

    ${ }^{1}$ Data in this table are from food records furnished by families in the consumption sample. See Methodology for States and counties studied in the Sontheast region; See Glossary for definitions of terms used in this table. All percentages are based on the total number of Negro housebolds at this level of money value.
    ${ }^{9} 0.50$ percent or less.
    One of the most usual deficiencies found in the diets of Negro families at this level of money value of food was in calcium. The average quantity for operators was 0.56 and for sharecroppers, 0.60 gram per nutrition unit per day; these figures suggest a rather low level of calcium intake. The distribution of individual families according to the calcium content of their diets shows that a deficiency of this nutrient was common among families with diets of low money value. Supplying less than 0.45 gram per nutrition unit per day were 30 percent of the diets of operators and 42 percent of those of sharecroppers. Another 31 and 18 percent, respectively, provided as much as 0.45 but less than 0.68 gram of calcium per nutrition unit per day, a level allowing little leeway above probable requirements (table 41).

    The meager calcium supply of these families is associated with a low consumption of milk, which averaged for operators and sharecroppers about 4 pints per week, or slightly over 1 cup per day per person. Used in this quantity, milk (or its equivalent) contributed 43 percent of the total calcium. Grain products accounted for 42 percent, while leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, the next most important source, supplied 8 percent of the entire dietary supply of calcium.

    The averages for phosphorus and iron suggest a more plentiful supply of these nutrients relative to body need than was found for calcium in diets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per week per foodexpenditure unit. Only a few families of each group were receiving average quantities of these minerals which might be considered seriously low.

    Table 41.-distribution of households by quantity of nutrients: Distribution of households by quantity of specified nutrients per nutriticn unit per day, $\mathbb{Z}$ selected levels of money value of food, Southeast Negro operator and Negro sharecropper analysis units, ${ }^{1} 1986-3 \%$
    [Households of Negro nonrelief farailics thut include a husband and wife, both native-born]

    | Nutrient and quantity per nutrition unit ? per day | Households having food with money value ${ }^{3}$ per food-expenditure unit per week of- |  |  |  | Nutrient and quantity per nutrition unit ${ }^{2}$ per day | Households having food with money value ${ }^{3}$ per food-expenditure unitper week of- |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | \$0.69-\$1.37 |  | \$1.38-\$2.07 |  |  | 80.69-\$1.37 |  | \$1.38-\$2.07 |  |
    |  | Operators | Share-croppers | Operators | Share-croppers |  | Operators | Share-croppers | Operators | Share-croppers |
    | Food-energy, in calories: | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per } \\ \text { cent } \\ 25 \\ 14 \\ 19 \\ 8 \\ 20 \\ 11 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | Percent 14 2012 16 20126 | Percent 0301052850 | Per cent 2441283139 | Vitamin $A$, in International Units: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | Per- cent | Per- <br> cent | r'eтcent |
    | Cinder 2,400...... |  |  |  |  | L'nrder 1,560....... | 11 |  | ${ }^{3}$ |  |
    | 2,400-2,699 ... |  |  |  |  | 1,500-2,999.. | 17 |  | 8 |  |
    | 2,700-2,999 |  |  |  |  | 3,000-4,409 | 8 | 22 | 13 |  |
    | 3,000-3,299. |  |  |  |  | 4,500-5,999 | 11 | 10 | 0 |  |
    | 3,300-3,599. |  |  |  |  | 6,000-11,499 | 28 | 8 | 28 | 22 |
    | $3,600-4,199$ |  |  |  |  | 12,000-23,099 | 22 | 26 | 24 | 29 |
    | 4,200 or over |  |  |  |  | 24,000 or ove | 3 | 12 | 24 | 27 |
    | Protein, in grams: 3 8 3 2 <br> Vnder 44     |  |  |  |  | Thiamin, in milligrams: |  |  |  |  |
    | 44-66 | 63 | 44 | 10 | 12 | U'nder 1.00........ | 14 | 24 | 8 |  |
    | 67-88. | 17 | 32 | 21 | 27 | 1.00-1.49 | 39 | 20 | 29 | 22 |
    | $89-110$ | 17 | 16 | 42 | 37 | $1.50-1.99$ | 25 | 28 | 13 | 29 |
    | 111-132 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 10 ; | $2.00-2.99$ | 19 | 24 | 24 | 29 |
    | 133 or over | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 3.00-3.99 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 14 |
    | Calcium, in erams: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Under 0.3 t.... | 19 | 24 | 3 | 4 | Ascorbic acid, in mil- |  |  |  |  |
    | 0.34-0.44 |  | 18 | 15 | 8 | ligrams: |  |  |  |  |
    | 0.45-0.67 | 31 | 18 | 11 | 25 ! | Inder 25 | 19 | 30 | 13 | 4 |
    | $0.68-0.89$ | 28 | 32 | 34 | 25 | 25.49 | 56 | 30 | 47 | 45 |
    | 0.40-1.12 | 8 | 4 | 21 | 16 | 50-74 | 17 | 18 | 24 | 29 |
    | 1.13 or over | 3 | 4 | 16 | 22 \% | 75.99 | 8 | 2 | 13 | 18 |
    | Phosphorus, in grams: |  |  |  |  | 109-124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
    |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 22 \end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | 125 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
    | under 0.8s.......... |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 20 \end{array}$ |  | 2 <br> 8 | Riboflavin, in milli* |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.32-1.75, .---------- | 48 | 38 | 11 | ${ }^{8} 1{ }^{\prime}$ | grams: ${ }^{\text {R }}$ (tam* |  |  |  |  |
    | 1.76-2.19 | 8 |  |  | 25 | Under 1,20 ....... | 55 | 40 | 13 |  |
    | 2.20 or ove | 19 | 14 | 50 | 49 | 1.20-1.79 | 31 | 30 | 37 | 29 |
    | Iron, in milligrams: |  | 10 |  |  | 1.80-2.39 | 14 | 18 | 26 | 33 |
    |  | 3 |  |  |  | $2.40-2.94$. | 0 | c | 11 | 2 |
    |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3.00 or ov | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 |
    | 120-159 | 3 | 10 |  |  | Riboflavin per kilo- |  |  |  |  |
    | 18.0-23.9 | ${ }_{28}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | 18 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 24.0 or over.....---- | 14 |  | 42 | 31 | geim, in miligrams: | 47 | 38 | 10 |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  | 0.020-0.029..------ | 39 | 38 | 32 | ${ }_{25}^{16}$ |
    |  |  |  |  |  | 0.030-0.039 . .-....- | 11 | 10 | 26 | 25 |
    |  |  |  |  |  | 0.040-0.043 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 16 |
    |  |  |  |  |  | $0.050-0.059$ | 0 | 10 | 5 | ${ }^{6}$ |
    |  |  |  |  |  | 0.060 or over | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 |

    The average vitamin A content of the diets valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per food-expenditure unit per week was estimated to be 8,100 International Units per nutrition unit per day for operators and 9,500 International Units for sharecroppers. These avcrages represent a wide range in values for individual families, as shown in table 41. They suggest that while many families were bountifully sup-
    plied-for example, the 25 percent of the operators and 38 percent of the sharecroppers having 12,000 International Units or more per day per nutrition unit-many of the diets were in need of improvement with respect to vitamin A. The two outstanding sources of vitamin A in these diets of low money value were sweetpotatoes, which together with potatoes furnished about 52 percent, and leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, which furnished 31 percent of the total.

    The dietary supply of thiamin averaged 1.7 milligrams per nutrition unit per day for both operators and sharecroppers when food was valued in the range $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ por week per food-expenditure unit. Of the individual families 14 percent of the operators and 24 percent of the sharecroppers were receiving less than 1.0 milligram per nutrition unit per day, a lower level than is considered desirable. In these diets grain products contributed 39 percent of the total thiamin. The use of lightly milled corn meal by Negro families is of special importance as a source of thiamin. Meat, chiefly pork, was the next best source, accounting for 20 percent of the entire quantity of thiamin.

    At this low level of money value of food ( $\$ 0.69-\$ 1.37$ per foodexpenditure unit per week) diets furnished an average of 38 milligrams of ascorbic acid per nutrition unit per day in the case of families of operators and 35 for sharecroppers. Low ascorbic acid values for individual families were usual at this money-value level (table 41). Food supplies provided less than 25 milligrams per nutrition unit per day in the case of 19 percent of the operators and 30 percent of tho sharecroppers. A large proportion of the two tenure groups, 56 and 50 percent, respectively, had diets furnishing as much as 25 but less than 50 milligrams of ascorbic acid per nutrition unit per day. Averages for individual families falling within this range could searcely be considered generous, and those at the lower end probably were close to average minimum requirements. Over half, 55 percent, of the ascorbic acid was furnished by leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, and 22 percent by potatoes and sweetpotatoes. Since the preparation of these groups of foods may involve large losses of the vitamin due to oxidation and discarding of cooking water, it secms probable that the actual intake of ascorbic acid was even lower than the computed figures would indicate. That there were many cases of actual or borderline deficiency of ascorbic acid among Negro families in this money-value-of-food class, there can be little doubt.

    The average riboflavin content of dicts valued in the range $\$ 0.69-$ $\$ 1.37$ per expenditure unit per week was 1.1 milligrams per nutrition unit per day for families of operators and 1.2 for sharecroppers. Of the families of the two tenure groups represented by these averages, only 14 and 24 percent, respectively, were receiving as much as 1.8 milligrams per nutrition unit per day. In fact, 55 percent of the operators and 46 percent of the sharecroppers obtained from their food less than 1.2 milligrams of riboflavin per nutrition unit per day.

    With food supplies more liberal and of higher money value, the chances of having good diets increased. About a third of the families of both operators and sharecroppers had food valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per week per food-expenditure unit. At this level of money value the nutritive value avcrages were higher than those found at the level discussed above; moreover, a larger proportion of the families were obtaining gencrous quantities of each nutrient.

    Riboflarin and ascorbic acid were the nutrients most likely to be inadequately supplied by diets valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per week per unit. About hatf of the diets furnished less than 1.8 milligrams of riboflavin per nutrition unit per day. This is in part because of the low consumption of milk. The average consumption of milk was almost 7 pints per person per week, but there was considerable variation in consumption from family to family, as shown by the following figures:

    Percentage of families having specified quantities of milk
    Pints: per person in a week
    
    
    
    
    
    The average ascorbic acid content of diets valued in the range $\$ 1.38$ $\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week was 50 milligrams per nutrition unit per day for operators and 55 for sharecroppers. Obtaining less than 50 milligrams were 60 percent of the former and 49 percent of the latter tenure group. The relatively small supply of ascorbic acid can be accounted for by a low consumption of those foods that are rich sources of this nutrient. For example, the consumption of citrus fruit was negligible; in fact, 98 percent of the families in this moncy-value-of-food class used none at all in the week during which they kept the food record. Similarly, their average consumption of other fruit was less than a pound per person in a week, and the diets of over two-thirds of these families included no fruit.
    Some tomatoes were used but in such small quantity that they contributed but a small part of the total ascorbic acid for families in this class-diets valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$. Leafy, green, and yellow vegetables were the most important sources, supplying over half of the ascorbic acid in the entire food supply. These foods were used in quantities averaging over 2 pounds per person in a week, a level of consumption high enough to supply significant amounts not only of ascorbic acid but of calcium, iron, thiamin, riboflavin, and especially of vitamin A. The habits of individual families with respect to consumption of leafy, green, and yellow vegetables are shown in the following distribution:
    Pounds: green, and yellow vegetables fer person in a ueek
    Under 1.0 ….... 15
    
    
    
    4.0 or over 8

    Percentage of famities haping specified guantities of teafy,

    In general, the dicts most in need of improvement were those in which there was little milk, tomatoes, or fruit. In many diets butter and eggs likewise were used in small quantity. Of families with food supplies valued in the range $\$ 1.38-\$ 2.07$ per food-expenditure unit per week, 41 percent used no butter and 44 percent, no eggs during the week of the special consumption study. Such data on the food consumption of individual families help to explain why so many diets supplied inadequate quantitics of one or more nutrients.

    ## Classification of Diets by Grade

    About half of the Negro farm families furnishing food records had diets that failed in one or more respects to meet the specifications of fair diets. (See p. 82 for a discussion of specifications used in grading diets.) The proportion classed as poor decreased with increasing money value of food, as is shown below:

    |  | Percentage of diets oraded- |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Moncy value of food per week per expenditure unit: | Ercellent or good | Fair | Poor |
    | \$0.69-\$1.37 | 3 | 17 | 80 |
    | \$1.38-\$2.07 | 19 | 39 | 42 |
    | \$2.08-\$2.76 | 56 | 29 | 15 |

    Of the diets graded poor, almost half failed to meet the specifications for a fair diet with respect to calcium and ascorbic acid; about a third, vitamin A and riboflavin, and nearly a fifth, protein and thiamin. When only one nutrient was the limiting factor, it was most likely to be calcium or vitamin C. Shortages of other nutrients were found as part of multiple rather than as single deficiencies. Of diets classed as fair, about a half and a third failed to meet the specifications for a good diet with respect to ascorbic acid and calcium, respectively. When only one nutrient was the limiting factor, it was most likely to be ascorbic acid.
    

    Figure 9.-Grade of diet by income: Distribution of families by income, and proportion having diets graded poor, fair, good, and excellent, nonrelief Negro farm families in the Southeast region, 1936-37.

    The proportion of diets classed as excellent or good decreased with increasing size of family within an income class. For families of a given type, the proportion classed as excellent or good increased as incomes rose. These points are illustrated by the following figures:

    | Family-income class and family-type group: \$500-\$999; | Percentage of diets oraded- |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Excellent or good | $\underset{\text { poor or }}{\text { Fin }}$ |
    | Type 1. | 78 | 22 |
    | Types 2 and 3 | 21 | 79 |
    | Types 4 and 5 | 18 | 82 |
    | Types 6 and 7. | 14 | 86 |
    | Types 2, 3, 4, and 5 combined: |  |  |
    | \$250-\$499 | 12 | 88 |
    | \$500-\$749 | 16 | 84 |
    | \$750-\$909 | 26 | 74 |

    These trends in the proportion of diets classed as excellent or good follow in general the trends in consumption of eggs, dairy products, and the succulent vegetables and fruit. The proportion of diets classed as excellent, good, fair, and poor are shown in figure 9 for Negro families (all types combined) differing in income.
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    3. Proportion of money value of food represented by farm-furnished and by purchased food: Families of types 2 and 3 (husband, wife, and one or two children under 16) with incomes and value of living (except farm-furnished housing) under $\$ 750$, nonrelief white farm operators' families in 4 analysis units, 1935-36 ..... 51
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    ## Appendix B. Tables

    In analysis units for the Middle Atlantic and North Central and Southeast farms, seven types of families were studied-in the other analysis units, only five. In using data for all family types combined for comparisons among regions, allowances must be made for this variation in the composition of the families included in the analysis units. See Methodology and the reports on Family Income and Expenditures, Part 2, Family Expenditures, for a discussion of this, the use of the ali-incomes line, and other limitations which should be recognized when these data are used for regional comparisons.

    In tables giving the break-down of a total, it has been necessary in some cases to raise or lower one of the rounded components by one point in order to have the sum of the various categories comprising the total agree with the total. In a few instances, therefore, discrepancies of one point may appear between figures as given on different tables.

    Slight differences between the number of families in table 42 and in other tables presented for the consumption sample (tables 43,44 , and 57 ) are due to reediting of schedules for the more detailed reports. In some cases, the final editing resulted in a shift in a family's income classification. For example, final editing on automobile expenditures might show busincss use of the car that would increase business expenses and thus serve to reduce net income; this might shift a borderline family to a lower income level. (See Glossary, Income, for method of computing income.) In other cases, final editing may have caused the rejection or acceptance of a few expenditure schedules, so that the total number of families in a unit may differ slightly.

    Table 42.-all foon: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States. ${ }^{1}$ 1935-96
    [Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ${ }^{2}$ ]

    | Region, analysis unit, family type, and income class (dollars) | Families <br> (2) | Families obtaining rood withont direet expenditire |  | Average ${ }^{3}$ number of persons per family ${ }^{4}$ | Average ${ }^{3}$ value of food ${ }^{3}$ per family per year |  |  |  |  |  | A verage 3 vàue of family living |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  | All food <br> (6) | Purchased |  |  | Obtained without direct expenditure |  | All | Purchaced |
    |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yome } \\ \text { pro- } \\ \text { duced } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oift } \\ & \text { or } \\ & \text { pay } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Food homes | Food away from home? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Home } \\ & \text { pro- } \\ & \text { duced: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gift } \\ & \text { or } \\ & \text { pay } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
    |  |  | (3) | (4) |  | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
    | New england |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Vermont | Num- | Num- | Num- | Num- | Dol- | Dol* | Dol- | Dol- | Dol- | Dol. | Dol- | Doi- |
    |  | ber | ber | bet | ber | lars | lars | bars | lats | lars | dars | lars | lars |
    | All types. | 537 | 587 | 97 | 3. 28 | 446 | 251 | 243 | 8 | 190 | 5 | 1,175 | 711 |
    | 10-249 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 2.40 | 478 | 176 | 174 | 2 | 101 | 1 | 668 | 428 |
    | 250-499 | 28 | 28 | 5 | 2. 56 | 290 | 184 | 263 | 1 | 122 | 4 | 707 | 382 |
    | 501)-749 | 82 | 82 | 12 | 3. 11 | 350 | 200 | 198 | 2 | 150 | 6 | 881 | 513 |
    | 750-999. | 111 | 111 | 16 | 3.07 | 408 | 235 | 228 | 7 | 169 | 4 | 962 | 572 |
    | 1,000-1,249 | 94 | 94 | 22 | 3.35 | 460 | 250 | 246 | + | 203 | 7 | 1,109 | 635 |
    | 1,250-1,499 | 74 | 74 | 14 | 3.42 | 481 | 267 | 254 | 13 | 211 |  | 1,3:35 | 799 |
    | 1,500-1,749 ..... | 49 i | 49 | 11 | 3.69 | 527 | 312 | $30 \%$ | 7 | 212 | 3 | 1,458 | 929 |
    | 1,750-1,699 | 44. | 44 | 7 | 3.39 | 555 | 300 | 288 | 12 | 252 | 7 | 1,612 | 490 |
    | 2,000-2,499. | 34 | 34 | 7 | 3. 63 | 545 | 304 | 268 | 36 | 234 | 7 | 1,808 | 1,208 |
    | 2.500-2,999. | 11 | 11 | , | 4. 25 | 578 | 339 | 332 | 7 | 235 | 4 | 1,709 | 1,117 |

    See footrotes at end of table.

    Table 42-all food: Number of families having food ohfained withoul direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-S6-Continued
    [Nonrelicf farm families that include a husband and wife, both native-born ${ }^{\text {if }}$
    

    ## See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure. and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1996-36-Continued
    [Nonrelief farm families that include a husband sod wife, both native-born a]
    

    See footrotes at end of tuble.

    Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1985-36-Continued
    [Nonrelief farm families that include a husband and wife, botb native-born ?]
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 42.-all food: Number of families having food obtained without direct expenditure, average number of persons per family, average money value per family in a year of all food, purchased food, and food obtained without direct expenditure, and average value of family living, by family type and income, 19 analysis units in 20 States, ${ }^{1}$ 1935-36-Continued
    [Nonrelief farm families that include a hushand and wife, both native-born $\eta$ ]

    \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Region, anslysis unit, family type, and income class (doliars)} \& \multirow{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Fam- \\
    ilics
    \end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Families obtaining foad without direct expenditare}} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Aver. \\
    age \({ }^{8}\) \\
    num- \\
    ber of \\
    per- \\
    sons \\
    per \\
    fam- \\
    ily \\
    (5)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{A verage \({ }^{3}\) value of food \({ }^{s}\) per tamily per year} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Aversge \({ }^{3}\) value of family living} \\
    \hline \& \& \& \& \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    All food \\
    (6)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Purchased} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{```
    C}\begin{array}{c}{\mathrm{ Obtgined }}\\{\mathrm{ without }

