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## Foreword

This publication deals with the food consumed at home by housekeeping families and single persons in the United States in the spring of 1942. The material presented forms part of the study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime conducted by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics and the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1942. The Department of Agriculture has previously published Rural Family Spending and Saving in Wartime, Miscellaneous Publication 520 , a summary volume on rural consumption for the year 1941 and the first quarter of 1942. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has in preparation a summary volume containing both urban and rural data and national estimates for 1941 and 1942. The present publication is the first to contain more detailed information about food consumption in the second quarter of 1942, although much of the information has been released previously for the administrative use of the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies.
The study discussed in this publication was planned and conducted under the direction of Hazel K. Stiebeling, Day Monroe, and Dorothy S. Brady for the Department of Agriculture, and Faith M. Williams for the Department of Labor. Plans for the study were developed by the two agencies cooperatively and were reviewed by the Division of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget. Other Government agencies with an active interest in the results were consulted at various stages. The analysis of food data for both urban and rural consumers and the preparation of this report have been the particular responsibility of the Family Economics Division, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, under the general direction of Helen R. Jeter. Esther F. Phipard and Sadye F. Adelson have prepared the report with the assistance of Yetta Carmel, Faith Clark, Edith Munsell, Mary Ruth Pratt, Ruth Scrivener, and Bernice K. Watt. They have had the advantage of consultation and advice from Hazel K. Sticbeling, Assistant Chief, and Dorothy S. Brady, formerly senior statistician, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, and of Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the Lnited States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Field work in urban areas was conducted by the Cinited States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Members of the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics who assisted in the collection and tabulation of the urban data include Alice C. Hanson, Jerome Cornfild, and Lenore A. Epstein.

Field work in rural areas was conducted by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. Acknowledgment is made to the Extension Service, the Farm Security Administration, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the Office of Experiment Stations and to their representatives who rendered valuable aid to the ficld staff in the rural areas in which the study was conducted.
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# Family Food Consumption 

 in the United States
## Spring 1942

## Introduction

The United States is in the midst of producing and distributing a food supply adequate to feed a population at war. It is assisting others of the United Nations to feed their people. These are tasks that raise many difficult questions. Administrators with responsibilities for production, for distribution, for rationing, for preventing inflation, for improving the level of nutrition, and for other aspects of public welfare in wartime, need basic information on family food consumption. They ask many questions: What quantities of different kinds of foods, such as eggs, sugar, meat, or fats do we ordinarily eat? How adequate are our diets? How well do our food supplies meet our needs? How should consumption patterns be changed to make best use of food? How should production goals be changed to make the most economical use of land and manpower? How would our diet be affected by the enxichment of certain products with vitamins and minerals? What were families spending for food at the beginning of the war? How does a rise in income affect the quantities of food bought?

Some of the earlier studies of food consumption in the United States had answered certain of these questions but these earlier studies alone were not sufficient to solve the problems of a wartime economy. The most recent previous comprehensive study of food consumption was conducted in 1936 when the country was emerging from a long depression period. Although it was known that certain aspects of food consumption would remain constant, it was uncertain how other aspects would be affected by changes in income, prices, and other wartime conditions.

The study reported was undertaken, therefore, to show the early effects of the war on family saving and spending, including family food consumption. Following the entry of the United States into the war, rapid changes were becoming apparent. Employment was increasing, incomes and prices were rising, some goods were becoming noticeably scarce. By the time this study was well under way, sugar had been rationed and rationing of other commodities was under discussion. The question naturally arose, therefore, as to how these and other factors were influencing food habits.

This report discusses the quantities of foods of various kinds that were consumed in the spring of 1942 by civilian housekeeping families and single persons, the nutritive value of this food, and its money value.

As a part of the study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime this report on family food consumption applies to the entire civilian housekecping population of the United States. The interviewed families were selected by a random sampling method devised for the purpose of getting information that would represent all regions and all economic levels. ${ }^{\text {t }}$

[^0]This sample included not only household groups, living and cooking together and sharing expenses, but also unattached individuals who prepared at least one meal a day at home. The estimated number of such housekeeping units for 1942 is shown in table 1.
Table 1.-Popllation distridution: Estimated number of housekeeping families and single persons and total number of persons represented by housekeeping families and single persons in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States in 1942 C

| Type of coramunity | Families and single persons |  |  | Total number of persons represented by housekeeping families and single persons and percentage distribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Distribution ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | Average size ${ }^{2}$ | Number | Distribution |
| United States: | Thousands 37,063 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} P_{\text {ersons }} \\ 3.41 \end{gathered}$ | Thousands 126,138 | Percent 100 |
|  | 30,725 | 83 | 3.23 | 98,320 | 79 |
| All ruralc... | 14,419 | 39 | 3.83 | 55,256 | 44 |
| Urban. | 22,646 | 61 | 3.13 | 70, 882 | 56 |
| Rural nonfarm | 8,079 6,340 | 22 17 | 3.52 4.23 | 28,438 26,818 | 23 |

${ }^{1}$ The percentage of families and single persons in the civilian noninstitutional population that were housekeepi ug has been estimated as follows: United States, 91.7 percent; urban, 88.5 ; rural nonfarm, 94.9 ; rural farm. 100 percent.
${ }^{2}$ Based on number of meals eaten from family food supplies reported on food schedules; 21 meala are equivalent to 1.00 person.
${ }^{3}$ Includes urban and rural nonfarm communities.
sincludes rural nonfarm and rural farm communities.
Although the sample was small, its general characteristics check very well with Census data and it is believed to be representative for the purposes for which it is used in this publication. Readers must be reminded that 43 percent of the occupied rural dwelling units and 50 percent of the farm operators in 1940 were in southern States. The sample, therefore, includes southern rural families and single consumers in about these proportions and the results are influenced by southern customs and habits. Moreover, since 53 percent of all families of farm operators in the United States received less than $\$ 500$ in net money income at the time of this study, the food consumption of farm families discussed in this volume represents the consumption of families with relatively low cash income who were able to eat as well as they did only because they produced a large part of their food at home.

On the other hand, since the nonfarm population in 1942 represented more than 83 percent of the total civilian population of the housekeeping population of the United States, the sample for the United States as a whole is predominantly nonfarm and the characteristics of farm family consumption have relatively little influence on the total, except in the low-income groups and in the consumption of milk.

National averages shown in the various parts of this publication are composite figures for the entire civilian housekeeping population. Averages are also presented separately for farm families and for nonfarm families. The nonfarm averages are further broken down into figures for urban and rural nonfarm families. Families living in the open country and not actually engaged in farming for the market were classified in the rural nonfarm group.?

[^1]Consumption figures for each of these population groups--farm, nonfarm, urban, and rural nonfarm-and for the civilian housekeeping population as a whole are further classified as to income group. Income distributions for the families in the first quarter of 1942 are shown in table 2. Since quantity and varicty of consumption depend to a large extent upon the amount of income that the family has at its disposal, comparisons between income groups generally will be more significant than comparisons of one entire population group with another in which the income distribution varies. In the lower income groups, however, there are marked differences between the consumption of urban and farm families. In food consumption, moreover, rural nonfarm families hold an intermediate position between urban and farm families in most respects. This reflects their intermediate position in respect to nonmoney income as well as to money income. The rural nonfarm group is composed both of families that produce a substantial part of their food supply at home and of those that produce little or no food through their own efforts.

Table 2.-Income distribetion: Percentage distribution of housekeeping families and single persons in the civilian noninstilutional population, by type of community and annual net money income class, spring 1942

| Annual net money income class (dollare) | Hounckeeping farnilies and aingle persons, by type of community |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | United Stateb | $\underset{\text { nonfarm }}{ }{ }^{\text {All }}$ | $\underset{\text { rural }{ }^{\text {All }}}{ }$ | Urban | Rural nonfarm | Rural farm |
| All classers.--..- | Percent 100 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 83 \end{aligned}$ | Percent 39 | Percent 61 | Percert 22 | Percent 17 |
| Negative. | 3 | (3) | 3 |  | (3) | 3 |
| 0-499-------- | 16 | 10 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| 500-989--.. | 14 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| 1,000-1,499... | 13 | 11 | 4 |  | 4 | 2 |
| 1,500-1,999 | 14 21 | 13 20 | 4 | ${ }^{10} 17$ | 3 | 1 |
| $2,000-2,999 \ldots$ 3,000 or over. | 21 19 | 20 18 | $\stackrel{4}{3}$ | 18 816 816 | 3 2 2 | 1 |

${ }^{1}$ Includeb urban and rural nonfarm population.
: Includes rutal nonfarm and rural farm population.
$\therefore 0.50$ percent or less.
${ }^{4}$ Separated as follows: $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,499,10$ percent; $\$ 2,500-82,099,7$ percent.
s Separated as follows: $\$ 3,000-54,999$, 11 percent; $\$ 3,000-\$ 9,989,4$ percent; $\$ 10,000$ or over, 1 percent.
In this report all income data relate to net money income. ${ }^{3}$ This presentation differs, therefore, from recent consumption studies in which the data were presented according to total family income, including nonmoney income as well as money income.

Each family was interviewed about food used during the 7 days preceding the interview and also about food bought ${ }^{4}$ during that time whether or not it had been eaten. The data include both quantity and cost. A distinction was made between food purchased and food produced at home but for urban families these figures are not separately presented in this volume because home food production by urban famihes in the spring of 1942 was relatively unimportant. ${ }^{5}$

[^2]Previous studies have shown that many factors combine to govern the selection and quantity of foods used by a population. The extent to which families live in cities, in villages, or on farms is one factor; the amount of family income, the size of family, the sex, age, and activity of family members, and the knowledge and skill of the homemaker are among other major factors influencing family food consumption. This study emphasizes only two factors: (1) Whether families live in urban places, on farms, or in rural nonfarm homes; and (2) the amount of money income that the family has at its disposal. The effects of other controlling conditions such as composition of the family, region of the country, and race have been studied in other surveys conducted within the past decade. ${ }^{6}$

The families were interviewed in April, May, and June 1942. As this period represents only one season, the reader should keep in mind that the consumption of some foods shows a seasonal fluctuation and that the data may not be valid for another season. More eggs, for example, are used in the early spring than at other seasons. In the summer, farm families use more fresh vegetables and milk than at other times. City families are more dependent on the contents of the grocer's shelves and his prices and the scasonal variation in their use of food is not so great as that of farm families.

Although figures are presented in this publication for the United States as a whole and for four separate population groups, discussion of figures in the text is centered chiefly about the consumption of urban and farm families, since these two groups show the most marked differences between farm and nonfarm food habits. Estimates of total or average per capita consumption for the Cnited States as a whole are uscful in over-all planning for production and distribution of the national food supply. The more detailed analysis, however, showing variations with income, money saving through home production, and the effect of residence in urban, farm, or rural nonfarm communities is needed to provide the answers to many questions.

## Quantity of Food

## All Food

In the spring of 1942 housekeeping families and single persons in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States consumed at home an average of almost 30 pounds of food per person ${ }^{\text {' }}$ per week. This figure refers to the weight of the food when brought into family kitchens from retail stores, freezer lockers, storage shelves, the garden, or the farm, before further preparation for table use.

Some of this quantity actually was not eaten. It is estimated ${ }^{8}$ that about 8 percent of it was unavoidable refuse. Inedible parts of food,

[^3]such as pits and seeds in vegetables and fruit and bones in meat, poultry, and fish, as well as edible portions of foods that commonly are discarded in preparing them for table use, such as potato skins and edible parts adhering to other vegetable peels, were included in this estimate of refuse. No estimates are available on unnecessary household waste resulting from excessive trimming of vegetables and fruit, discard of usable portions of food such as meat and poultry fat, beet tops and celery leaves, food left in pots or pans or on plates, and food spoiled by deterioration or faulty cooking.

## The Food Groups

For case in analyzing family food consumption in this volume, food items have been classified on the basis of nutritive value and use in the diet into the following 11 groups:

Milk
Potatoes, sweetpotatoes
Dry beans and peas, nuts
Green and yellow vegetables
Tomatoes, citrus fruit
Other vegetables and fruit
The average quantities consumed per person per week of each of these 11 food groups in the spring of 1942 by urban, rural nonfarm, and farm families are shown in table 3. These are averages for the entire United States, in which the food habits of the many nationality, racial, religious, regional, and income groups in the country are blended together according to their weight in the population. They may not be exactly the same, therefore, as the averages that may be found in any single community or region of the country.

Table 3 indicates that urban families consumed twice as much tomatoes and citrus fruit as farm families; one and one-half times as much meat, poultry, and fish; and also more green and yeliow vegetables and other vegetables and fruit. Urban families used only about two-thirds of the quantities of sugars and sweets, grain products, dry beans and peas and nuts, and dairy products that farm families did, as well as somewhat less of the other three food groups: Potatoes and sweetpotatoes, fats and oils, and eggs.
Rural nonfarm families followed a consumption pattern in the spring of 1942 that was more like that of farm families in some respects and more like urban families in others. This intermediate position reflects the fact that many of these families in villages or open country were able to produce part of their food supply at home. The survey of Rural Family Spending and Saving in Wartime for the winter quarter of 1942 shows that 35 percent of the rural nonfarm group used some food that they had produced at home: 31 percent had eggs from their own hens; 16 percent, dairy products; 14 percent, poultry; 6 percent, vegetables; 3 percent, fruit, and meat; and 2 percent, other miscellaneous items. Moreover, unlike most urban families, rural nonfarm families can buy many farm products direct from the farm, or at least at lower prices than in cities. For example, they paid an average of only 30.2 cents per dozen for eggs in the spring of 1942 whereas urban families paid 36.4 cents. For some products the rural nonfarm group must patronize the usual retail stores, sometimes paying more for these products than families in
cities where competition between stores is keener and transportation problems simpler. Rice, for which rural nonfarm families paid 10.0 cents per pound and city families 7.7 cents, illustrates this difference.

## Milk

The term "milk," as used in this report, refers to the fluid whole milk equivalent ${ }^{\theta}$ of milk in all its forms except butter. It includes the whole, skim, fluid, and dry forms of milk as well as cheese, buttermilk, cream, and ice cream. The average quantities of each of these items used by families are given in terms of the usual purchase units unless stated otherwise.

## Quantity of Milk Consumed

Urban families consumed 3.83 quarts of milk or its products other than butter, per person per week, and farm families almost 50 percent more, 5.71 quarts (table 4).

Urban families used less milk than farm families in the same income groups. For example, among families with money incomes below $\$ 500$, those in cities had the equivalent of 2.86 quarts per person per week or scareely more than half as much as the 5.26 quarts that farm families had. Increases in income made considerable difference in the consumption of milk by urban families, but little difference in the case of farm families. City families with incomes of $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$ had an average of 3.93 quarts per person per week compared to 5.62 for farm families.

Table 5 shows how families living in cities and villages and on farms in the several income classes were distributed with respect to consumption of specified quantities of milk or its equivalent per person per day. These figures show the variation from the averages-l pint a day per urban person and well over $11 / 2$ pints per farm person.

In its family food plans the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics suggests about $11 / 2$ pints of milk for an adult a day. The need for this much milk or its products is emphasized in the section of this report dealing with the nutritive value of family diets, in which the close relationship between the quantity of milk consumed and the cal-

[^4] \end{subarray}\) \& ${ }_{\text {cose }}$ \& , \& ${ }_{5}^{20.4}$ \& (60) \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { a }}}^{\substack{130 \\ i z 20}}$ \&  \& (2:5] <br>

\hline  \& \& \& (12) \& \& \& ${ }^{(320)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}



1 Figures in parenthesis represent impuled values.
Dashes indicate that to saitable values mere found
Yalues correspond with the minjaum level in force in the spring of 1942 for enriched gour.
Yahes are two-thirds of the minimum levels in force in the sprifig of 1942 for enriched haur evels mere adopted for entiched four
Higher levels were adepted October 1. 19 93


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ General methods of study, including sampling, have been deecribed in detail in Rural Family Spending and Saving in Wartime, U. S. Dept. Agr. Mibe. Pub. 520 . Further details concerning the study of food will be found in the section on Methodology in this volume, $p^{*} 134$.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ See U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Pub. 520, p. I4, for a description of the grouping of households ac* cording to farm and nonfarm.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Less than 1 percent of rural nonfarm families and 18 percent of farm families were found to be in the so-called negative income class. The consumption data for theze familiee are not presented separately but are included in the average figures for all classes of families. See explanation in MethodoJogy. p. 136.
    ${ }_{4}$ Data on the quantity and expenditures for food purchased for home consumption and percentage of households purchasing are not presented in this volume; they are available upon request, however.
    $\$$ Crban families used 50.28 worth of home-produced food per family per week in the spring of 1942 , Most of it was in the form of canned vegetsblea and fruit and jellies, jams, and preserves. The average auantities of home-produced foods that were consumed were: 0.17 pound of potatoes and sweetpotatoes; 0.23 pound of tomatoes and citrus fruit; 0.22 pound of green and yellow vegetables; 0.62 pound of other yegetables and fruit; 0.09 dozen eggs; 0.08 pound of meat, poultry, and fish; 0.03 pound of fats and oils; 0.17 pound of sukars, sirups, and preserves; and 0.005 pound or less of the other food groups.

[^3]:    6 Family Food Consumption and Dietary Levels (2 volumes)Five regions, Urbanand Village Series. U. S. Dept, Agr. Mise. Pub. 452, 268 pp., illus. 1941; Five regions, Farm Series. Ü. S . Dept. Agr. Misc. Pub, 405, 393 pp. , ilhs. 194 t .
    Fumily Expenditures in Selected Cities, 1935-36, Vol, 2. Food. L. S. Dept. Labor Bul. 648, 106 pp. 1940.
    Family Spendink and Saving as Related to Age of Wife and Age and Number of Childrea, 193536. Ě. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Pub. 489, 126 pp., illusi. 1942.

    Money Dibbursementa of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers, 1034-36. Summary Volume.
    U. Dept. Labor Bul 638 , 401 pp, illus. 1041 . U. S. Dept. Labor Bul. 638,401 pp., illus. 1041.

    Diets of Familieas of Employed Wage Farners and Clerical Workers in Cities, 1934-36. U.S. Dept. Agt. Cir. 507, 141 pp., illus. 1939.
    721 meals from home food supplieas are equivalent to 1.00 person. Sce Methodoloky, Measurement of Household Size in Equivalent Persons, p. 137.
    8 Computations are based on "refuse" percentages given in Proximate Composition of American Food Materials, U. S. Dept. Agr. Cir, 549, 91 pp. 1940.

[^4]:    - To get the total eonstmption of milk in its various forms the amount of each dairy product has been converted to the gusntity of fuid whole milk which that product represents. For example, as 17 ounces of evaporated uilk by weight furnishes about the same quantities of nutrients as 1 quart ( 2.15 pounds) of whole milk, a family using two tall cans (weight 29 ounces) would get the equivalent of about 1.7 quarts of fluid milk. The factors used for expressing dairy products in terme of their milk equivalents are shown below:
    
    cium and riboflavin content of the diet is demonstrated. A pint of milk (the average quantity per person per day used by urban families) supplies about threc-fourths of the recommended allowance of calcium, and one-third of the riboflavin allowance.
    At every income level, even the highest, there were some families that did not get enough milk to safeguard their diets in calcium and riboflavin. Only 22 percent of urban families with incomes under $\$ 500$ had at least the equivalent of $15 / 2$ pints of milk per person per day. So marked was the difference between farm and urban families in this respect that a larger proportion of farm families in the lowest income class (49 percent) than of urban families in the highest income class (24 percent) had an adequate milk supply.
    Tabie 3.-Constmption of spectried yood grotps: Average quantity of specified groups of food consumed at home per person per weeh, by type of communily and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942

    | Type of community and annual net money income class (dollars) | Average quantity consumed perperson per week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Mik 2 | Potatoes, бफеет-potatoes | Dry beans and peas, nuts ${ }^{3}$ |  | Tomatoes, citrus fruit | Other vegetables and fruit ${ }^{4}$ | Meat. poultry fish 6 | Egzs | Grain preducte 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fats, } \\ & \text { oils } 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sugars, } \\ & \text { sweets } \end{aligned}$ |
    |  | Quarts | Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | unds | Pounds | Dozens | Pounds | Poundt | Pounds |
    | Att elasses 8.-.......... | 3.83 | 2.66 | 0.27 | 2.36 | 3.33 | 3.32 | 2.77 | 0.65 | 2.96 | 1.12 | 0.87 |
    | 0-499 | 2.86 | 3.11 | . 43 | 1.81 | 1.79 | 2.80 | 1.85 | . 51 | 3.14 | 1.12 | . 80 |
    | $500-999$ | 3.24 | 2.48 | . 35 | 2.29 | 2.21 | 2.89 | 2.67 | . 58 | 3.14 | 1.15 | . 83 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 3.47 | 2.58 | . 37 | 2.20 | 2.73 | 3.09 | 2.22 | . 63 | 3.16 | 1.15 | . 91 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 4.02 | 2.74 | . 26 | 2.23 | 2.75 | 2.94 | 2.43 | . 71 | 2.88 | 1.18 | . 81 |
    | 2.000-2.999 | 3.93 | 2.71 | . 27 | 2.44 | 3.60 | 3.34 | 2.99 | . 69 | 2.98 | 1.08 | . 82 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 3.84 | 2.77 | . 24 | 2.38 | 3.44 | 3.42 | 2.85 | +69 | 3.08 | 1.10 | . 86 |
    | 3.500-2.989 | 4.06 | 2.63 | . 30 | 2.52 | 3.82 | 3.71 | 3.19 | . 70 | 2.87 | 1.05 | . 86 |
    | 3,000 or over ${ }^{8}$ | 4.04 | 2.59 | . 21 | 2,46, | 4.03 | 3.61 | 3.24 | . 65 | 2.88 | 1.11 | . 86 |
    | 3.000-4,999. | 4.07 | 2.80 | . 22 | 2.36 | 3.95 | 3.48 | 3.21 | . 67 | 2.98 | 1.10 | . 85 |
    | 5,000-8,999 | 4.02 | 2.69 | . 18 | 2.62 | 3.83 | 3.73 | 3.32 | . 60 | 2.75 | 1.11 | . 87 |
    | remal nompary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | 4.05 | 2.87 | . 49 | 1.83 | 2.04 | 2.72 | 1.76 | . 66 | 4.43 | 1.22 | 1.14 |
    | 0-499 | 3.59 | 2.67 | . 50 | 1.67 | 1.49 | 2.24 | 1.10 | . 57 | 5.37 | 1.29 | 1.12 |
    | 500-999 | 3.52 | 2.77 | . 52 | 1.64 | 1.80 | 2.24 | 1.54 | . 55 | 5.22 | 1.26 | 1.17 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 3.97 | 3.33 | . 54 | 1.73 | 1.72 | 2.63 | 1.61 |  |  | 1.16 | 1.16 |
    | 1,500-1.999 | 4.30 | 3.21 | . 45 | 1.74 | 2.26 | 3.15 | 2.08 | . 72 | 3.98 | 1.22 | 1.08 |
    | 2,000-2.999 | 4.42 | 3.02 | -44 | 2.16 | 2.61 | 3.01 | 2.21 | . 73 | 4.03 | 1.19 | 1.18 |
    | 3,000 or or | 4.88 | 2.74 | . 45 | 2.50 | 3.17 | 3.67 | 2.62 | . 84 | 3.42 | 1.14 | 1.06 |
    | beral parm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All clases | 5.71 | 3.26 | . 45 | 1.83 | 1.64 | 2.81 | 1.83 | . 69 | 4.71 | 1.35 | 1.41 |
    | 0-499. | 8.26 | 2.76 | . 51 | 1.94 | 1.14 | 2.29 | 1.44 | . 55 | 5.04 | 1.29 | 1,36 |
    | 500-999. | 5.59 | 3.38 | . 47 | 1.82 | 1.59 | 2.97 | 1.73 | . 64 | 5.13 | 1.38 | 1.65 |
    | 1,000-1.499 | 5.95 | 4.36 | . 31 | 1.81 | ${ }_{1}^{1.86}$ | 3.51 | 2.28 | . 75 | 4.27 | 1.36 | 1.39 |
    | 1. $2006-1.999$ | 6.40 | 4.10 | . 32 | 2.01 | 3.30 | 3.69 | ${ }_{2}^{2.29}$ | . 83 | 4.07 | 1.43 | 1.4 .5 |
    | 2,000-2,909 | $\stackrel{5.63}{5.85}$ | 3.86 3.97 | . 38 | +1.64 | 2.94 2.38 | 3.29 3.30 | 2.46 2.61 |  | 3.93 3.37 | 1.31 1.28 | 1.50 1.25 |
    | 3,000 oy over | 5.85 | 3.97 | . 25 | 1.69 | 2.38 | 3.30 | 2.61 | . 80 | 3.87 | 1.28 | 1.25 |

    Table 4.-Milk: Average quantity consumed per person per week, and percentage distribution among specified kinds of milk products, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{2}$

    | Type of community and antual net money zncome class (dollars) | Average quantity of mills consumed per personper week |  |  |  |  | Percentage distribution of mills consumed 2 |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Total 2 millk equiva-lent | Milk |  | Cream, ice cream | Cheese | Total milk equivalent | Milk |  | Cream, ice cream | Cheese |
    |  |  | Fluid | Oher <br> than <br> Buid ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Fuid | Other than fuid |  |  |
    | All clabses ${ }^{\text {4 }}$-....... | Quarts | Quarta | $P_{\text {eunds }}$ | Pounds | Pounds | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Patcent |
    |  | 3.83 | 2.70 | 0.42 | 0.27 | 0.21 | 100 | 70 | 10 | 3 | 17 |
    | 0-499. | 2.88 | 1.72 | . 75 | . 05 | . 14 | 100 | 58 | 26 | 1 | 14 |
    | 500-989 | 3.24 | 2.18 | . 67 | . 07 | . 13 | 100 | 67 | 20 | 1 | 12 |
    | 1,000-1,409. | 3.47 | 2.32 | . 52 | .17 | . 20 | 100 | 67 | 14 | 2 | 17 |
    | 1.500-1.989. | 4.02 | 2.78 | . 52 | . 22 | . 23 | 100 | 68 | 13 | 2 | 16 |
    | 2,000-2.988. | 3.93 | 2.92 | . 31 | . 30 | . 20 | 100 | 35 | 8 | 2 | 15 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 3.84 | 2.81 | . 34 | . 25 | . 21 | 100 | 73 | 9 | 2 | 16 |
    | 2,500-2.899 | 4.06 | 3.10 | . 29 | .37 | - 19 | 100 | ${ }^{76}$ | 7 | 3 | 14 |
    | 3,000 or over | 4.04 | 2.88 | . 33 | . 40 | . 26 | 100 | 70 | 8 | 3 | 19 |
    | 3,000-4,999. | 4.07 | 2.88 | .34 | . 39 | . 25 | 100 | 71 | 8 | 3 | 18 |
    | 5,000-9,909. | 4.02 | 2.70 | . 33 | .40 | . 29 | 100 | 67 | 8 | 3 | 22 |
    | ajos.l montara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Alt classe ${ }^{5}$. | 4.05 | 3.09 | . 13 | . 21 | . 16 | 100 | 36 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
    | 0-489 | 3.59 | ${ }^{2} .89$ | . 42 | .13 | . 09 | 100 | 81 | 11 | 1 | 7 |
    | 500-999 | 3.52 | 2.75 | . 43 | . 10 | . 11 | 100 | 78 | 12 | 1 | 9 |
    | 1.000-1,499 | 3.97 | 2.80 | . 48 | . 18 | . 22 | 100 | 71 | 11 | 2 | 16 |
    | 1.500-1.998 | 4.50 | 3.44 | . 37 | . 36 | . 20 | 100 | 76 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
    | 3,000-2,999 | 4.42 | 3.32 | . 50 | . 25 | . 18 | 100 | 75 | 11 | 2 | 12 |
    | 3,000 or over | 4.88 | 3.89 | . 32 | . 32 | . 19 | 100 | 80 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
    | rtanl fabm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5.71 | 5.01 | . 11 | . 42 | . 18 | 100 | 88 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
    | 0-499. | 5.26 | 4.72 | . 10 | . 28 | 12 | 100 | 89 | 2 | 2 |  |
    | 500-699 | 5.59 | 5.03 | .11 | . 38 | . 11 | 100 | 80 | 2 | 2 |  |
    | 1,000-1,498. | 5.85 | 5.06 | .13 | . 65 | .18 | 100 | 85 | 2 | 4 | 9 |
    | 1,500-1,988 | 6.40 | 5.38 | . 29 | . 55 | . 18 | 100 | 84 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
    | 2,000-2,998. | 5 | +.61 | . 03 | . 55 | . 27 | 100 | 82 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
    | 3,000 | 5.85 | 4.77 | . 05 | . 73 | . 26 | 100 | 82 | 1 | 4 | 13 |

    I See tsble 3. footnoto 1.
    2 Approximately the quantity of fuid maill to wbich the various dairy products included are equivalent in minerais and protein. (See D. 6, footnote g.)
    3 includes avaporated, sweetened condensed, dry skim, and dry whole milk,
    4 Includes families with incoctes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately.
    3 Includes families with negative incomes, not shown separately.

    ## Importance of Various Milk Products

    As shown in table 4, 70 percent of the total milk equivalent consumed by urban families was fluid milk (whole milk, buttermilk, skim milk, chocolate milk); 10 percent was milk other than fluid (evaporated, condensed, dried); 3 percent was cream and ice cream; and 17 percent was cheese (American, cottage, other). For farm families the percentages were higher for fluid milk and lower for the other products.

    The use of milk other than fluid, more than 90 percent of which was evaporated, decreased in quantity as family income increased. Urban families with higher incomes used relatively more fluid milk, cream, and ice cream, and less evaporated milk. On the other hand, farm families with higher incomes used more cheese, cream, and ice cream. At no income level did farm families add a substantial quantity of purchased milk to the milk that they produced at home. They, therefore, were not as dependent on money income for fluid milk as they were for cheese that they purchased.

    Table 5.-Distribution of hojbeholds by quantity of milk consumed: Average quantity consumed at home per person per day, and percentage distribution of households by specified quantity of milk (or its equivalent), by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942

    | Type of community and sanusl net money income class (dollars) | Average quantity ${ }^{2}$ per person day | Percentage diftribution of households by specifed quantity of milk (or its equivalent ${ }^{2}$ ) consumed per person per day |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | None |  | Kpint, but less than 1 pint | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1pint } \\ \text { but less } \\ \text { than } 11 / 2 \\ \text { pints } \end{gathered}$ | $11 / 2$ pints, than 2 pinte | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { pints } \\ \text { or } \\ \text { more } \end{gathered}$ |
    |  | Pints | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    |  | 1.09 | 1 | 15 | 30 | 32 | 13 | 9 |
    | O-499 | . 82 | 14 | 22 | 31 | 21 | 15 | 7 |
    | $500-899$ | . 93 | 1 | 33 | 23 | 24 | 11 | 8 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 98 | 1 | 23 | 27 | 34 | 9 | 8 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 1.15 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 31 | 13 | 12 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 1.12 1.10 | 4 | 11 | 32 | 33 31 | 15 | 9 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 1.10 | 1 | 110 | 36 | 31 | 11 | 10 |
    |  | 1.16 | 0 | 10 | 27 | 36 | 20 | 7 |
    | $3,000 ~ o r ~$ $3,000-4989$ 3,989 | 1.15 | 0 | 9 8 8 | 30 30 | 35 | 17 | 8 |
    | $3,000-4,999$ $5,000-9,999$ | 1.18 | 0 | 18 | 31 | 36 33 | 18 | 8 10 |
    | bteral nonfarm <br> All clasers ${ }^{3}$ | 1.16 | 2 | 17 | 29 | 26 | 13 | 13 |
    | 0-489- | 1.03 | 5 | 23 | 30 | 19 | 11 | 12 |
    | 500-999 | 1.01 | 1 | 23 | 30 | 23 | 11 | 12 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.13 | $\stackrel{7}{0}$ | 15 | 32 | 26 | 11 | 14 |
    | 1,500-1.998. | 1.29 | 0 | 14 | 31 | 23 | 14 | 18 |
    | 2,000-2,999.. | 1.26 | 1 | 7 | 32 | 38 | 12 | 10 |
    | 3,000 or over-- | 1.28 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 38 | 25 | 12 |
    | horal fary <br> All classes ${ }^{\text {b }}$ <br> .............. | 1.63 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 22 | 18 | 34 |
    |  | 1.50 | 2 | 13 | 15 | 21 | 15 | 34 |
    |  | 1.60 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 28 | 12 | 34 |
    | 1,000-1,499-1.-.-. | 1.70 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 23 | 16 | 39 |
    |  | 1.83 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 21 | 25 | 37 |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 2,000-2,999 \\ & 3,000 \text { or over } \end{aligned}$ | 1. 61 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 16 | 23 | 35 |
    |  | 1.67 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 37 | 20 | 27 |

    Farm families with incomes of $\$ 3,000$ and over consumed twice as much cheese as those with less than $\$ 500$, one-fourth pound per person per week as compared with one-eighth pound. In the highest income class 55 percent of farm families had one-quarter pound or more of cheese per person per week but in the lowest income class only 16 percent had this much.

    The greatest quantity of milk was consumed in the form of fluid whole milk (table 4). More than two-thirds of all milk in both urban and farm diets was in this form. Evaporated milk (9 percent) was second in importance in urban diets and buttermilk (18 percent) in farm diets. American cheese held third place and cottage cheese fourth place in the diets of both.

    ## Home-Produced Milk

    In the spring of 1942 farm families with dairy cows for the farm business or for family use consumed on the average 5.12 quarts of homeproduced milk or its equivalent per person per week. This was 90 per-
    cent of their total milk consumption ( 5.71 quarts). Income made little difference in the average quantity that was furnished by the farm. Families in the lowest income class, $\$ 0-\$ 499$, produced 93 percent of their dairy products at home or the equivalent of 4.89 quarts of milk per person per week and those with incomes between $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499,90$ percent, or 5.35 quarts (table 31 ).

    ## Vegetables and Fruit

    Since some of the vegetable and fruit groups are used interchangeably in family diets, they are considered together in this section.

    ## Quantity of Vegetables and Fruit Consumed

    Urban families, in the spring of 1942, used more than 12 pounds of vegetables and fruit per person per week; farm families, nearly 11 pounds (table 6). The lower consumption by farm families is explained in part by the season. Vegetable gardens in most areas are less productive in the spring than in the summer and fall. In addition, stored and canned vegetables and fruit usually have been reduced in quantity because they have been heavily drawn upon during the winter months when there is little garden produce.

    The classification of all vegetables and fruit into the usual groups, as shown in table 6, reveals that farm families were using considerably more than urban families of the high-calorie, "filling" vegetables-potatoes and sweetpotatoes, dry beans and peas and nuts, and less of the succulent ones-tomatoes, citrus fruit, green and yellow vegetables, other vegctables, and other fruit.

    As is the case with other food products, urban families increase their consumption of vegetables and fruit more consistently as their income rises than do farm families.

    Table 6 indicates that at successively higher income classes the vegetables and fruit used by urban families contained a smaller proportion of potatoes and sweetpotatoes and of dry beans and peas and nuts, and a larger proportion of tomatoes, citrus fruit, and other fruit. With rising income, farm families shifted from dry beans and peas and nuts and from green and yellow vegetables to the other kinds of vegetables and fruit. The consumption of citrus fruit increased materially in the case of both urban and farm families, with increase in income.

    The differences in consumption of citrus fruit and of dry beans and peas and nuts were undoubtedly due to differences in money income. But the higher consumption of green and yellow vegetables by low-income families may be accounted for in part at least by regional differences or practices rather than by income. Southern families, known to consume relatively large quantities of leafy greens were found in greater numbers in the low- than in the high-income groups.

    ## Importance of Various Vegetables and Fruit

    The food groups are made up of many individual items of food that may be more or less interchangeable in the diet. Certain items appear to be important in the spring. If the study had been made in another season or if it had covered more than one season, other food items might have appeared more important.

    The vegetables and fruits most prominent in the diets of urban and farm families in the spring of 1942 are given in table 7 . The figures
    indicate similar preferences for many items by urban and farm families. In a season when sweetpotatoes were more plentiful white potatoes would bave been less prominent, particularly in farm diets. The greater use of spinach in cities and of turnip greens on farms shows the influence of northern food customs in urban diets and of southern customs in farm diets. The greater emphasis on oranges by urban families probably is explained by the comparative ease with which certain bulky foods are transported to cities. On the other hand, the preference of farm families for canned tomatoes and canned peaches reflects the home-production and canning activities of this group. About 16 percent of the total quantity of vegetables and fruit consumed by urban families and 21 percent of that consumed by farm families was canned.

    Table 6.-Vegetables and frdit: Average quantity consumed per person pet week, and percentage distribution among specified kinds of vegetables and fruit, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19482
    

    Canned vegetables and fruit appeared to a somewhat greater extent on farm than on city tables. Farm families used about a tenth more than urban families- -2.22 pounds as compared to 2.01 pounds per person per week. The difference in the consumption of canned goods between the two groups of families was greatest at the low-income levels. Farm fam-
    ilies in the income group $\$ 500$ - $\$ 999$ used over two-ffths more and those in the $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$ group almost a tenth more canned food than urban families with similar incomes.
    Table 7.-Important vegetable and frett iteas: Vegetable and fruit items consumed in greatest average quantity and the percentage that each item represents of its kind

    | Kind of vegetable and fruit | Food item | Average percentage thet item represents of its kind |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Utban families | Farm families |
    |  | Potstoes | Percent | Percent 93 |
    | Dry beans and peas.... | Dry beang.- | 71 | 79 |
    | Nuts and peanut butter.. | Peanut butter. | 74 | 71 |
    | Tomatoes, fresh and canned | Canned tomatoe | 62 | 82 |
    | Citrus fruit--------- | Oranges---- | 72 | 66 |
    | Fresh, leafy greens. | Cabbage | 46 | 48 |
    |  | Lettuce-... | 28 | 20 |
    | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Turnip greeno | 15 | 13 |
    | Other fresh, green and yellow vegetables | Pesa | 12 | 25 |
    |  | Snap beans | 17 | 16 |
    | Other fresh vegrtables. | Culery. | 39 | 65 |
    | Other canned vegetables. | Corn--- | 49 | 39 |
    | Other fresh fruit-...... | Apples.- | 38 | 42 |
    |  | Bananis | 24 | 27 |
    |  | Berries. | 24 | 17 |
    | Other canned frut. | Praches | 34 16 | 44 |
    | Dried fruit | Prunes.-- | 53 | 39 |
    |  | Rajsins. | 25 | 27 |

    ## Home-Produced Vegetables and Fruit

    More than one-half of all the vegetables and fruit eaten by farm families was produced at home. The proportion that they raised declined steadily with rising money income. On the average, families in the class $\$ 0-\$ 499$ grew more than three-fifths of their vegetable and fruit supply and those in the class $\$ 3,000$ and over, a little more than two-fifths.

    The vegetable garden and the fruit orchard added an average of 3.62 pounds of fresh produce to the farm family's food supply as well as 1.69 pounds of processed food from the previous season-or a total of 5.31 pounds per person per week (table 30). Roughly, 2 pounds of potatoes and dry beans, 2 pounds of vegetables, and 1 pound of fruit out of every 5 pounds were home-produced.

    Income had more effect on the kind than on the total quantity of vegetables and fruit grown at home. Farm families in the higher income classes raised fewer dry beans and peas and green and yellow vegetables and more potatoes and tomatoes, than those in the lower income classes.

    It was to be expected that farm families would eat more canned produce than urban families because of the considerable quantity of homegrown vegetables and fruit they can each year. Of the 2.16 pounds of canned vegetables and fruit consumed in the spring of 1942, 1.69 pounds were produced at home. In 1941, farm families canned an average of 76 pounds (canned weight) per person per year of garden and orchard stuff. ${ }^{10}$ This included 18 quarts of vegetables, 5 quarts of pickles and relishes, and 14 quarts of fruit.

    For perhaps a fourth of the year canned goods are used little or not at all by farm families, because of the plentiful supply of fresh produce furnished by the farm. The stock-pile of canned goods, therefore, has to last approximately 40 weeks of the year. Spread over this period, the 76 pounds of farm-furnished vegetables and fruit that were homecanned in 1941 allowed for a weekly average consumption of about 2 pounds per person. The 1.69 pounds that farm families reported during the period covered by this study in 1942 is somewhat less than this average. But supplies of vegetables and fruit canned in the summer and fall could have dwindled considerably by spring-enough to have them appear on the table less frequently than they did in the fall and winter.

    ## Eggs

    ## Quantity of Eggs Consumed

    Both urban and farm families consumed an average of more than 1 egg a day per person in the spring of 1942 . Urban families used slightly fewer than 8 eggs per person per week, varying from about 6 eggs per person per week in the lowest income group to more than 8 in the income group \$2,500-\$2,999 (table 3). Farm families used somewhat more than 8 eggs per person per week, ranging from almost 7 eggs in the lowest income group to a little more than 12 in the income group $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$. Spring is a season of high egg consumption since eggs are both plentiful and relatively cheap. If the study had been made in another season, egg consumption probably would have been lower.

    ## Home-Produced Eggs

    Farm families got an average of about 8 eggs per person per week or 96 percent of the total number used, from their own poultry flocks. The proportion that was produced at home by the different income groups varicd from 93 percent to 99 percent.

    ## Meat, Poultry, and Fish

    The term "meat," as used here includes beef, veal, pork, lamb, game, ground-meat mixtures, and special meat products; it excludes bacon and salt pork as well as any part-meat products such as a meat-and-cereal or a meat-and-vegetable combination, or meat soup. Poultry includes chicken, turkey, and other poultry such as duck and goose. Fish includes both scaly fish and shellfish.

    ## Quantity of Meat, Poultry, and Fish Consumed

    Urban families consumed 2.77 pounds of meat, poultry, and fish combined per person per week and farm families about a third less, 1.83 pounds (table 8).
    With the exception of tomatoes and citrus fruits, the consumption of meat, poultry, and fish increased to a greater extent with increase in money income than the consumption of any other of the 11 food groups discussed in this publication. Urban families with incomes less than $\$ 500$ used little more than half as much meat, poultry, and fish as those in the income group $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,999$. Similarly, farm families with incomes less than $\$ 500$ consumed only about two-thirds as much of these foods as those in the income group $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$.

    Table 8--Meat, polltay, fish: Average quanity consumed per person per week, and percentage distribution among specificd kinds of meat animals, poultry, and fish. by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942{ }^{1}$
    


    ## Importance of Various Meat Products, Poultry, and Fish

    Urban families consumed 2.09 pounds of their 2.77 pounds per person per week of this food group as meat, 0.36 pound as poultry, and 0.32 pound as fish. Farm families averaged less of each: 1.34 pounds as meat, 0.29 pound as poultry, and 0.20 pound as fish. Some conception of the distribution around these averages can be obtained when it is known that with an average meat consumption of 2.09 pounds, 70 percent of urban families had $21 / 2$ pounds or less per person per week, and 55 percent 2 pounds or less.

    As the figures in the previous paragraph show, meat made up about three-quarters of this food group for both urban and farm families (table 8). Of the remaining quarter, poultry was a larger share than fish, 13 and 12 percent, respectively, for urban families, and 16 and 11 percent for farm families.

    Urban families, reflecting the northern preference for beef, consumed about half of their meat as beef and a fourth as pork. On the other
    hand, pork, favored by southerners, was more prominent than beef in farm diets; almost half was pork, and somewhat less than one-third, beef. Veal and lamb were eaten in fairly insignificant quantity by farm families, but veal made up 6 percent and lamb 9 pereent of the meat in urban diets. The remaining one-eighth of meat for urban families and one-sixth for farm families was other meat, consisting of liver, bologna, game, and unspecified meat mixtures.

    The average consumption of each kind of meat as well as of poultry and of fish was greater for families in the higher income groups than for those in the lower groups. In cities, families with incomes of $\$ 3,000$ or over consumed about twice as much meat and poultry and more than one and one-half times as much fish as families with less than $\$ 500$. Among farm families there were similar differences between these two income groups; almost twice as much meat and one and one-half times as much poultry and fish was consumed by those with the higher incomes as by those with the lower incomes.

    Urban families showed some tendency to increase the proportions of meat, poultry, and fish they consumed as meat and as poultry and to decrease the proportion they consumed as fish. There was a shift in the consumption of meats as incomes rose, from pork to beef, veal, and lamb.

    Farm diets differed from the urban pattern in that poultry was a smaller proportion of the total food group at the higher than at the lower income levels. Given the purchasing power, it was rather to be expected that farm families would increase meat consumption more than poultry consumption. Farm families in the lowest income group consumed on an average two-thirds as much poultry as families in the highest income group, but only a little more than half as much meat.

    ## Home-Produced Meat, Poultry, and Fish

    The consumption of meat, poultry, and fish by farm families probably was dependent to a large extent upon their ability to raise and store meat animals and poultry and to catch fish for home use, as well as upon the level of prices at which they could sell their meat and poultry.

    The farm furnished an average of about three-quarters of a pound of meat per person per week for the family table in the spring of 1942 and also during the year 1941. ${ }^{11}$ But the quantity of poultry was considerably less in the later period, little more than one-fourth of a pound in the spring of 1942 as against two-thirds of a pound per person per week in 1941. The quantitics of caught fish and game reported for both periods were negligible.

    Farmers may have reserved for the family table less meat and poultry than was wanted because of the relatively high financial return for their sale. The average farm value ${ }^{12}$ per pound of pork was 44 percent higher in the spring of 1942 ( 21.0 cents) than in the year 1941 ( 14.6 cents) ; of lamb, 28 percent higher ( 19.7 cents compared to 15.4 cents); of beef, 20 percent higher ( 22.4 cents compared to 18.6 cents); and of hens, 18 percent higher ( 20.4 cents compared to 17.3 cents).

    In the spring of 1942 an average of 1.11 pounds of the 1.83 pounds of meat, poultry, and fish consumed by the farm family per person per week-slightly more than three-fifths of the farm family's total con-


    sumption of these products-was produced at home (table 31). All but 4 percent of the poultry, more than of any other product in this group, was raised on the home farm. A fourth of the fish consumed was caught by family members. Threc-fifths of all meat was furnished by the farm. More of this was pork than any other kind of meat. About four-fifths of the pork used was furnished by the farm but only a half of the veal, a fourth of the beef, and a fifth of the lamb.

    The percentage of beef furnished by the farm was greater in the higher than in the lower income classes. Veal and lamb raising was limited primarily to the upper income classes. Pork, poultry, and fish were produced at home to about the same extent by all income classes. The proportion of other meat (liver, game, canned meat, bologna, etc.) obtained from the farm was less at successively higher income levels.

    ## Grain Products

    Grain products include flour, meal, cereals, pastes, and commercialiy baked goods such as bread, cake, and pies. With the exception of commercially baked goods this group excludes canned or cooked food mixtures that are partly grain products and partly items belonging in other food groups. When reference is made to the quantity of total grain products or flour-equivalent consumed, two-thirds of the weight of baked goods has been added to the weight of flours, meal, and cereals.

    ## Quantity of Grain Products Consumed

    In the spring of 1942 urban families consumed 2.96 pounds of grain products per person per week. Farm families consumed almost 60 percent more than this, 4.71 pounds (table 9 ).

    From lower to higher income classes, farm families showed sharper decreases in their consumption of grain products than urban families, but at no income level was the average consumption in cities as great as on farms.

    ## Importance of Various Grain Products

    Families in cities, with fresh bakery products available in shops within easy walking distance, and with higher incomes, purchased almost three-fifths of their grain products as commercially baked goods, in the proportion of about three parts bread to one part crackers, cakes, cookies, and the like (table 9). The remaining two-fifths of the quantities of grain products consumed in cities were flours, meal, and cereals of which considerably more than half was flours and meal.

    Families on farms, on the other hand, purchased more than four-fifths of their grain products as flours, meal, and cereals. All but 8 percent of this was flours and meal, indicating their known practice of baking a large share of their bread, biscuits, cakes, and cookies at home. In fact, they bought only 10 percent of their grain products as bread and 3 percent as other baked goods.
    With increasing income, the consumption of flours and meal became a constantly decreasing proportion of the total consumption, while other types of grain products, particularly commercially baked bread for farm families, and baked goods other than bread for city families, became an increasing proportion. The smaller share of baked goods bought by the lower income families probably was the result of the concentration in this group of southern families, whose fondness for hot breads is well known, rather than the result of their smaller amounts of money.

    Table 9.-Grain prodtets: Average quantity consumed per person per week, and percentage distribution among specified kinds of grain products, by type of community and annual net money income class, housckeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942

    | Type of community and annual net money income class (dollars) | Average quantity of grain products consumed perperson per week |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage distribution of grain prodeets consumed |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  | Commercially: <br> baked grods |  |  |  |  |  | Commercially baked goods |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  | ज |  |  |  |  |  | F | 雩 |  |
    |  | L6. | Lbs. | Lbs. | $L \delta 6$. | Lbs. | Lbs. | Pct. | Pct. | Pat. | Pct. | Pet. | Pct. |
    | All elasses ${ }^{3}$...-............. | 2.86 | 0.73 | 0.54 | 2.53 | 1.80 | 0.64 | 100 | 25 | 18 | 57 | 42 | 15 |
    | 0-499- | 3.14 | 1.38 | . 5 B | 1,76 | 1.47 | . 29 | 100 | 44 | 18 | 38 | 32 | 6 |
    | 500-999 | 3.14 | 1.10 | . 61 | 2.13 | 1,70 | . 43 | 100 | 35 | 20 | 45 | 36 | 9 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 3.16 | 1.21 | . 52 | 2.14 | 1.65 | . 49 | 100 | 38 | 17 | 45 | 35 | 10 |
    | 1,500-1,989 | 2,82 | . 63 | . 50 | 2.52 | 1.85 | . 67 | 100 | 22 | 18 | 60 | 44 | 16 |
    | 2,000-2,988 | 2.88 | . 66 | . 58 | 2.60 | 1.89 | . 71 | 100 | 21 | 20 | 59 | 43 | 16 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 3.06 | . 78 | . 52 | 3.63 | 1.92 | . 71 | 100 | 25 | 17 | 58 | 42 | 16 |
    | 2,500-2,998 | 2.87 | . 49 | . 65 | 2.59 | 1.87 | . 72 | 100 | 17 | 23 | 60 | 44 | 16 |
    | 3,000 or over ${ }^{3}$ | 2.88 | . 51 | . 51 | 2.78 | 2.06 | . 72 | 100 | 18 | 18 | 64 | 47 | 17 |
    | 3.000-4,999. | 2.96 | . 53 | . 53 | 2.83 | 2.09 | . 74 | 100 | 18 | 18 | 64 | 47 | 17 |
    | 3,000-9,083. | 2.75 | . 49 | . 43 | 2.73 | 2.03 | . 70 | 100 | 18 | 16 | 86 | 49 | 17 |
    | brgal gonpary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All clases ${ }^{4}$ | 4.49 | 3.11 | . 43 | 1.41 | 1.10 | . 31 | 100 | 69 | 10 | 21 | 16 | 5 |
    | 0-498- | 5.37 | 4.27 | . 43 | 1.00 | . 77 | . 23 | 100 | 78 | , | 13 | 10 | 3 |
    | 500-999. | 5.22 | 4.05 | . 45 | 1.07 | . 84 | . 23 | 100 | 77 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 5 |
    | 1.090-1. 499 | 4.17 | 2.67 | . 46 | 1.55 | 1.23 | . 32 | 100 | 64 | 11 | 25 | 20 | 5 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 3.98 | $\underline{3.4}$ | . 37 | 1.79 | 1.39 | . 40 | 100 | 81 | 9 | 30 | 23 | 7 |
    | 2,000-2.890 | 4.03 | 2.45 | . 47 | 1.65 | 1.27 | . 38 | 100 | 01 | 12 | 27 | 21 | ${ }^{6}$ |
    | 3,000 or over | 3.42 | 1.89 | . 43 | 1.64 | 1.25 | . 39 | 100 | 35 | 13 | 32 | 25 | 7 |
    | miral pabk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All cissies ${ }^{\text {a }}$--...........-- | 4.71 | 3.71 | . 39 | . 92 | . 70 | . 22 | 100 | 79 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 3 |
    | 0-489 | 5.04 | 4.30 | . 33 | . 61 | . 47 | . 14 | 100 | 85 |  | 8 | 7 | 2 |
    | 500-899 | 5.13 | 4.19 | . 41 | . 78 | . 38 | . 21 | 100 | 82 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 4.27 | 3.06 | . 47 | 1.11 | . 83 | . 28 | 100 | 72 | 11 | 17 | 13 | 4 |
    | 1,500-1.999 | 4.07 | 2.36 | . 47 | 1.85 | 1.43 | . 42 | 100 | 58 | 12 | 30 | 23 | 7 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 3.93 | 2.88 | . 50 | 1.27 | . 85 | . 32 | 100 | ${ }_{56}^{60}$ | 13 | 21 | 16 | 5 |
    | 3.000 or over | 3.37 | 1.85 | 44 | 1.60 | 1.25 | . 33 | 100 | 55 | 13 | 32 | 25 | 7 |

    1 Sce table 3 , footnote 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Inclides the weigbt pof flours, meal, and cereals added to two-thirds of the meight of commereisliy baked goods.
    ${ }^{3}$ Includes familiea with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately.
    ${ }^{4}$ Includes families with negative incomes, not shown separately.
    The same kinds of grain products predominated in the diets of both urban and farm families (table 27). Among the commercially prepared breads, white was most popular, about three-fourths of all bread eaten in cities and four-fifths of that on farms being white. Only about a tenth of the bread in both dicts was described as " 100 percent" whole-wheat. With small exception, the flour used was white. The popularity of corn meal, especially white corn meal, with southerners was shown by its greater prominence in the farm than urban diets. Farm families favored the white variety almost to the exclusion of the yellow, while in urban diets about a seventh of the total was yellow. Ready-to-eat cereals were more commonly used by city than farm families, while rice and oatmeal were more customary among the latter.

    ## Hame-Produced Grain Products

    From the average of 4.71 pounds of grain products per person per week consumed by farm families, almost a fifth, or 0.90 pound, was furnished by the farm (table 31). White flour and white corn meal constituted
    almost all of this. Close to onc-eighth of all white flour and one-half of all corn meal was home-produced.

    Families with incomes unter $\$ 1,000$ raked far more of these items than those with higher eash incomes. Few families rased grain products other than white corn meal for home use; consequently, the quantity homeproduced was low-not even reaching an average of 5 pounds per family per week for any income class.

    ## Fats and Oils

    Fats and oils discussed in this publication include besides the table and cooking fats and oils, bacon (other than Canadian or Irish), salt pork, mayonnaise, and other salad dressings.

    ## Quantity of Fats and Oils Consumed

    Families in cities used 1.12 pound of fats and oils per person per week (table 10). Farm families used about a fifth more of these high-calorie foods; their average was 1.35 pounds.

    The average consumption of fats and oils, as such, showed a tendency to be slightly less at successively higher-income levels. Top-income families, however, probably got more than lower-income families when the fat that was incorporated in the commercially baked, cooked, and canned goods they purchased is considered. Moreover, they obtained more invisible fat from their greater consumption of milk, meat, poultry, fish, and eggs. Both urban and farm families with incomes of less than $\$ 500$ got about 55 percent of the total fat (visible plus invisible) in their diet from the fats and oils food group, but urban families in the income group $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,999$ got only 42 percent, and farm families in the income group $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499$ got only 48 percent from these foods.

    ## Importance of Varicus Fats and Oils

    Urban families consumed more of their fats and oits as table fats, oil, and salad dressings than farm families, who used relatively more bacon, salt pork, lard, and other shortening (table 10). Although farm families produce butter at home, they also get lard, bacon, and salt pork from the slaughtering of hogs for meat. Besides, they use lard and other shortening in the bread, cakes, pies, and cookies they bake, which urban families get in the baked goods they buy.

    Compared with families in lower income groups, those in higher income groups used a smaller proportion of their fats and oils as lard and other shortening and as bacon and salt pork and a larger proportion as table fats and as oils and dressings.

    The four items in the fats and oils group that were consumed in largest quantity by urban familes were, in order of importance: Butter, bacon, lard, and other shortenings. Together they made up about three-fourths of all fats and oils used by families in cities. On farms butter, lard, bacon, and salt pork made up close to nine-tenths of the fats and oils consumed.

    ## Home-Produced Fats and Oils

    The farm furnished almost three-fifths of all fats and oils used on farm tables, an average of 0.78 pound out of the 1.35 pounds consumed per person per week. The quantity produced at home tended to be less at the high-income levels than at the low-income levels. The percentage
    that farm-furnished fats and oils were of the total consumed varied from 61 percent for the group with incomes of less than $\$ 500$, to 51 percent for those in the class $\$ 3,000$ or over.

    More than two-thirds of the butter and bacon, about three-fifths of the salt pork and lard, and a fourth of the other shortening used was produced at home.
    Table 10.-Fats, oils: Average quanfity consumed per person per week, and percenlage distribution among specified kinds of fats and oils, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942

    | Type of community and sanual net money income class (dollars) | Ayerage quantity of fats and oils consumed per person per week |  |  |  |  | Percentage distribution of fats and oils consumad |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Total | Butter, margarine | Bacan, salt pork | Lard, other shorteving | $\begin{gathered} \text { oil } \\ \text { salad } \\ \text { dress- } \\ \text { ing } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Butter, margarine | Bacon, salt pork | Lard other shorteming | $\begin{gathered} \text { Oid } \\ \text { galad } \\ \text { dress- } \\ \text { dig } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
    | crban | ${ }_{1}$ Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    | Ail classes ${ }^{2}$. | 1.12 | 0.43 | 0.24 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 100 | 38 | 22 | 23 | 17 |
    | 0-499. | 1.12 | . 33 | . 37 | . 37 | . 05 | 100 | 29 | 34 | 33 | 4 |
    | 500-909 | 1.15 | . 38 | . 33 | . 33 | . 11 | 100 | 33 | 29 | 29 | 1 |
    | 1,000-1.499. | 1.15 | . 31 | -27 | . 31 | . 16 | 100 | 33 | 24 | 29 | 14 |
    | 1,500-1,699 | 1.18 | . 41 | . 24 | . 29 | . 24 | 100 | 35 | 20 | 24 | 21 |
    | 2,000-2,099 | 1.08 | . 42 | . 22 | . 23 | . 21 | 100 | 39 | 21 | 21 | 19 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 1.10 | .42 | . 23 | . 23 | . 22 | 100 | 38 | 21 | 21 |  |
    | 2,500-2,999 | 1.05 | . 43 | . 21 | . 22 | . 18 | 100 | 41 | 20 | 21 | 18 |
    | 3,000 or over ${ }^{2}$. | 1.11 | . 47 | . 21 | . 21 | . 22 | 100 | 43 | 19 | 19 | 18 |
    | 3,000-4,989 | 1.10 | . 47 | . 20 | . 22 | . 21 | 100 | 43 | 18 | 20 | 18 |
    | 5, 000-9,299 | 1.11 | . 46 | . 22 | . 21 | . 22 | 100 | 41 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
    | RURAl nontagm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All clawes ${ }^{\text {8, }}$ | 1.22 | . 39 | . 32 | . 40 | . 11 | 100 | 32 | 20 | 33 | 9 |
    | 0-409. | 1.29 | . 34 | . 40 | . 49 | . 06 | 100 | 2 c | 31 | 39 | 4 |
    | 500-989 | 1.26 | . 35 | . 36 | . 46 | . 09 | 100 | 29 | 28 | 37 | 7 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.16 | .40 | . 29 | . 38 | . 08 | 100 | 33 | 25 | 32 | 10 |
    | 1,500-1,989 | 1.22 | . 44 | . 26 | . 38 | . 18 | 100 | 36 | 21 | 32 | 11 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 1.19 | . 42 | . 30 | . 33 | . 14 | 100 | 35 | 25 | 28 | 12 |
    | 3.000 or over. | 1.14 | . 43 | . 27 | . 25 | . 19 | 100 | 38 | 23 | 22 | 17 |
    | beral yatm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | At clazses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.35 | . 48 | . 37 | . 44 | . 06 | 100 | 35 | 28 | 33 | 4 |
    | 0-499 | 1.29 | . 42 | . 36 | . 47 | . 04 | 100 | 33 | 28 | 36 | 3 |
    | $500-899$ | 1.38 | . 48 | . 38 | . 48 | . 06 | 100 | 35 | 28 | 33 | 4 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.36 | . 54 | .31 | . ${ }^{28}$ | . 09 | 100 | 38 | 23 | 31 | 7 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 1.43 | . 67 | . 38 | . 38 | . 12 | 100 | 41 | 25 | 26 | 8 |
    | 2,000-2,098 | 1.31 | . 50 | . 38 | +35 | . 08 | 100 | 38 | 28 | 27 | 6 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 1.28 | .53 | . 32 | . 34 | . 00 | 100 | 42 | 25 | 26 | 7 |

    ${ }^{1}$ See table 3, footnote 1 .
    $?$ Includes families with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately
    a Inoludes families with negativa incomes, not shown separstely.

    ## Sugars and Sweets

    Sugars and sweets include the total weight of sugars, sirups, preserves, and candy consumed at home without any deduction for the water present in sirups or the fruit in jellies, jams, and preserves. Jellies, jams, and preserves have been considered "home-produced" if the fruit from which they were made was grown at home.

    ## Quantity of Sugars and Sweets Consumed

    The quantity of sugars and sweets consumed by families in cities was only three-fifths of that of families on farms. Urban families had 0.87 pound and farm families, 1.41 pounds per person per week (table 11).
    For both city and farm families, there was a slight tendency toward higher consumption of sugars and sweets with greater purchasing power.

    ## Importance of Sugars and Various Sweets

    Sugar made up the greatest part of this food group; urban families consumed almost two-thirds of the group as sugar and farm families nearly one-half (table 11). In cities, jellies, jams, and preserves, 17 percent, were next in importance, followed by candy and other sweets, 11 percent, and lastly, sirups, 8 percent. On farms the order of importance was: Sirups, 26 percent; jellies, jams, and preserves, 20 percent; and candy and other sweets, 5 percent.
    Table 11.-Sugars, sweets: Average quantity consumed per person per week, and percentage distribution among specified hinds of sugars and sweets, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19421

    | Type of corlmunity and annual net money income class (dollars) | Average quantity of sugara and sweets consumed per person per week |  |  |  |  | Percentsge distribution of sugars and sweets consumed |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Tots 1 | Sugars | Sweets |  |  | Total | Sugars | Sweets |  |  |
    |  |  |  | Moleases, sirups | Jellies, jams, pre- serves | Candy. other sweets |  |  | Molasses, sirupa | Jellies, jams, presorves | Candy, other 8weets |
    |  | Pounds | Pounds | Pounds | Pounde | Pounds | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
    |  | 0.87 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0,10 | 100 | 84 | 8 | 17 | 11 |
    | 0-499. | . 80 | . 46 | . 15 | .11 | . 08 | 100 | 57 | 19 | 14 | 10 |
    | 500-989 | . 83 | . 53 | . 13 | . 12 | . 05 | 100 | 65 | 15 | 14 | 6 |
    | 1,000-1,499... | .91 | . 59 | . 08 | . 16 | . 08 | 100 | 65 | 9 | 17 | 9 |
    | 1.500-1,999 | . 81 | . 59 | . 08 | . 13 | . 09 | 100 | ${ }^{65}$ | 7 | 18 | 12 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 92 | . 59 | . 06 | . 15 | . 12 | 100 | 65 | 7 | 15 | 13 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 86 | . 59 | . 07 | .17 | . 13 | 100 | 62 | 7 | 18 | 13 |
    | 2,500-2,999. | . 86 | . 59 | . 05 | . 17 | . 10 | 100 | 68 | 6 | 14 | 12 |
    | 3.000 or over 2 | . 86 | . 53 | . 05 | . 17 | . 11 | 100 | 63 |  | 19 | 12 |
    | 3.000-4.999 | . 85 | . 53 | . 05 | +17 | . 11 | 100 | 62 | 6 | 19 | 13 |
    | 5,000-9,999 | . 87 | . 32 | . 07 | . 17 | . 11 | 100 | 61 | 8 | 19 | 12 |
    | beral nomparm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Ait clasges ${ }^{3}$, | 1.14 | . 63 | . 20 | . 22 | . 09 | 100 | 55 | 17 | 20 | 8 |
    | 0-499. | 1.11 | . 36 | . 32 | . 19 | . 04 | 100 | 50 | 29 | 17 |  |
    | 500-999. | 1.17 | . 64 | . 25 | . 21 | . 07 | 100 | 55 | 21 | 18 | 6 |
    | 1,000-1.499. | 1.16 | . 65 | . 16 | . 24 | .11 | 100 | 56 | 14 | 20 | 10 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 1.09 | . 63 | . 12 | . 23 | . 11 | 100 | 58 | 11 | 21 | 10 |
    | $3,009-2,999 \ldots$ | 1.18 1.06 | .65 | .14 | . 26 | . 13 | 100 100 | 50 60 | 12 10 | 22 19 | 11 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes 3. | 1.41 | . 68 | . 36 | . 29 | . 08 | 100 | 49 | 26 | 20 | 5 |
    | 0-409. | 1.38 | . 68 | . 44 | . 24 | . 05 | 100 | 46 | 32 | 18 | 4 |
    | 500-949. | 1.65 | .i9 | . 41 | . 35 | . 10 | 100 | 48 | 23 | 21 | 6 |
    | 1, $2000-1.499$ | 1.39 | .72 | . 24 | . 33 | . 10 | 100 | 52 | 17 | 24 | $\bar{i}$ |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 1.45 | . 73 | . 23 | -29 | . 10 | 100 | 57 | 16 | 20 | 7 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 1.50 | .83 | . 18 | . 29 | . 12 |  | 50 52 | $\stackrel{21}{15}$ | 25 23 | ${ }_{10}^{4}$ |
    |  |  |  |  | . 2 |  |  |  |  | 23 | 10 |

    1 Soe table 3, footnote 1 .
    2 Includes fanilies with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately.
    ${ }^{2}$ Includes families with negative incomes, not shown separately.
    Families in cities consumed a quarter of their sugars and sweets as sirups, jellies, and jams and three-quarters of it as sugars, candy, and other sweets. Families on farms with less cash and with dietary practices influenced by the foods the farm furnished and the custom of putting jellies, sirups, and other such sweets on hot breads, had a different pattern of consumption for this food group. They used almost half of their sugars and sweets as sirups, jellies, and jams which in whole or in part could be produced at home and only little more than half as sugars, candy, and other sweets which had to be bought.

    Low-income families in cities as well as on farms had a larger part of their sugars and sweets as molasses and sirups than families in the upperincome groups. With rising income both groups shifted some of their consumption from molasses and sirup to jellies, jams, and preserves, to candies and other sweets, and even to sugars.

    Granulated sugar was the sweet used in greatest quantity; it constitated 58 percent of sugars and sweets in city dicts and 44 percent in farm diets. Other items that constituted more than 10 percent of this food group for urban families were jellies, jams, and candies; and for farm families, jellies, jams, and molasses.

    ## Home-Produced Sugars and Sweets

    The figures in table 31 indicate that sugar itself was not produced at home in any appreciable quantity. The 0.38 pound of sirups and preserves furnished by the farm per person per week constituted a fourth of all the sugars and sweets ( 1.41 pounds per person per week) consumed and more than half of the sirups, preserves and other sweets ( 0.73 pound) alone.

    Farm families reported that in 1941 they had put up from home-grown berries and other fruit an average per person per year of around 5 quarts of jellies, jams, and preserves and 3 quarts of sirups, molasses, and honey. ${ }^{13}$ Considering the weight of a quart as 3 pounds, this was a total of 24 pounds per person per year or 0.46 pound per week.

    Farm families reported in the spring of 1942 an average consumption of 0.26 pound of jellies, jams, and preserves and 0.11 pound of sirups, molasses, and honey per person per week from home-produced supplies. It would seem from these figures that spring is probably a season of lower than average consumption of these products, especially of sirups. Winter, when hot cakes are placed on the table more frequently, would probably show heavier consumption of sirups.
    Jelies, jams, preserves, and molasses were the kinds of sweets most frequently produced at home; more than nine-tenths of the former and almost half of the latter used by farm families in the spring of 1942 came from the farm. All income groups showed a fairly substantial average quantity of home-produced jellies, jams, and preserves, varying from 1 to $11 / 2$ pounds per family per week. But the farm furnished an average of as much as one-half pound of molasses only to families in the two lowest income groups, $\$ 0-\$ 499$ and $\$ 500-\$ 999$, which had the heaviest concentrations of southern families.

    ## Nutritive Value of Diets

    How well do the diets of families included in this study in the spring of 1942 meet standards of good nutrition? To answer this question in part, average quantities of nutrients in the diets of the several groups have been computed and compared with recommended allowances.

    ## Comparison of Nutritive Value of Diets With Recommended Allowances

    The yardstick used here for measuring the adequacy of the diets is the one proposed in May 1941 by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council (table 42). It states the quantities of the


    better known dietary essentials recommended for individuals of different age, sex, and activity. These average quantities are believed to be liberal enough to provide a fair margin above minimum requirements. They allow for individual differences in requirement and utilization and for variations in the composition of foods. They do not, however, allow for extensive losses of nutrients in cooking such as may occur frequently in the case of ascorbic acid and to a lesser extent of other nutrients.

    Since the nutritive values computed for the family diets in this study are based on values of foods as they are purchased, losses in nutrients caused by preparation and household waste must be considered in comparing the results with the yardstick. The extent of such losses is not well known and probably is highly variable; consequently, it is impossible at present to estimate just how much the nutritive values of diets calculated from foods as they enter the Nation's kitchens overestimate the quantities actually consumed by families.

    Average quantities of nutrients in the diets of the several groups of families and single persons are given in tables 32 and 33 , both on a perperson basis ${ }^{14}$ and also, as a means of relating them to requirements, on a per-nutrition-unit ${ }^{15}$ basis. Data on houschold size used in the derivation of these averages are presented as equivalent persons and as equivalent nutrition units in table 34 . The nutritive values per pound of food materials used in making the nutritional evaluation of the diets are shown in table 45.

    The average daily nutritive values found per nutrition unit based on food as it was brought into the kitchens of all the families studied, were as follows:

    > Average nutritive value per nutrition unit per day of food brouaht into the kitcher.
    

    For several natrients the reported diets of families in the spring of 1942 averaged well above the recommended levels. But considering the probable effects of cooking losses on vitamins, the nutritive values reported here perhaps should be reduced by about a fourth or a fifth for ascorbic acid, thiamine, and niacin and by a tenth for riboflavin. Besides, the use of later values for niacin content of meat would have resulted in lower averages for this nutrient. This would indicate that on the whole the average diet in the spring of 1942 probably did not meet the recommended allowances in thiamine, riboflavin, and niacin and that the margin by which the ascorbic acid value exceeded these


    allowances was slight. Losses of vitamin A caused by cooking may not be as high as the losses of some of the other vitamins, but the practice of discarding the deep green outer leaves of vegetables results in the loss of much of the vitamin A value from this one important source. Minerals, also, are reduced often by the common custom of discarding the water in which vegetables have been cooked.

    In addition to losses through ordinary cooking and other forms of foorl preparation, some allowance should be made in the computed nutritive values for losses occurring through food waste. Throwing out stale bread and sour milk, failure to eat all the portion served, food spoilage, and many other forms of waste take an additional toll of the nutrients.

    There are regional and other variations in the consumption of smaller groups of families that are obscured by these averages for all families taken together. Many families, especially those in the low-income groups, as it will appear later in this volume, obtain smaller quantities of the nutrients than they need while others consume generous quantities.

    ## Effect of Type of Community and Home-Production on Adequacy of Diets

    Farm families, on the whole, had more satisfactory diets than city families, judging from the average nutritive values per nutrition unit per day given in table 12. The superiority of the diets of farm families in calcium, which is associated with their higher milk consumption and that in turn with their facilities for producing milk at home, is particularly outstanding. Urban families had better diets, measured in ascorbic acid and niacin, but the diets of farm families equalled or exceeded those of urban families in other respects.

    Farm families had a better opportunity than nonfarm families to maintain or even improve upon their usual levels of food consumption in the face of rising food costs, food shortages, and probable reduction in the variety of foods offered for sale, because such a large share of their total food supply was obtained from the farm.
    Table 12.-Netritive valee of diets: Average nutrilive value per person and per nutrition unit per day of food brought into the kitchen, by type of community, housekeeping families and single persors in the United States, spring $1942^{1}$
    

    Home-produced food accounted for about 60 percent of the total money value of the farm family's average food supply (p. 40). The importance of home-produced food is shown also in its percentage contribution to the nutritive value of the diet. Per capita quantities of certain nutrients calculated to be in the farm family's total food supply and in the home-produced portion of it, are shown below, together with the percentages that the home-produced portion represents of the total:
    

    The three nutrients influenced most by farm production for home use were calcium, vitamin A, and riboflavin, of which three-fourths or more were provided by home-produced foods, especially by milk and vegetables.

    Milk, 9 of every 10 quarts of which consumed by farm families was farm-furnished, supplied these families with 69 percent of their total calcium, 53 percent of their riboflavin, 28 percent of their protein, 18 percent of their vitamin A, and appreciable although smaller quantities of other nutrients (tables 31 and 35). Green and yellow vegetables, with 3 pounds home-produced of every 5 pounds used, supplied approximately two-fifths of both the vitamin A value and ascorbic acid content of the entire diet.

    Meat, poultry, and fish, about 60 percent of which was raised on the farm, was another food group that made important contributions to some of the nutrients-niacin, 44 percent ; thiamine, 29 percent; and protein, 17 percent.

    A smaller proportion of calories ( 47 percent) was provided by homeproduced food than of the other dietary essentials, because many foods high in energy value, such as sugars and some of the grain products, are not suitable for home production on many farms. The same is true of iron, more than one-fifth of which was contributed by grain products.

    ## Effect of Income on Adequacy of Diets

    Poor diets are frequently the result of low incomes. Even without any deduction for nutrient losses in preparing food for the table, the average nutritive values of the diets of families in the lower income groups were below satisfactory levels in several respects in the spring of 1942 as shown in table 33. Riboflavin was the most limited nutrient in the diets of urban families; and niacin, in the diets of farm families. Niacin was the only dietary essential studied for which the average for some income groups of farm families did not meet the recommendations.

    Diets of urban families with low incomes were likely to be short in niacin, calcium, and food energy as well as in riboflavin.

    Since at the time that the computations of nutritive value were made for this study the food values and human requirement for niacin were less well known than for the other dietary essentials considered, it is disregarded in the following discussion of the effect of income on the adequacy of the diets.

    Not until the income level, $\$ 1,500-\$ 1,999$, was reached did the average values per nutrition unit for the food brought into urban kitchens meet the recommended allowances for the eight dietary essentials considered. Approximately 32 percent of urban fanilies had incomes that were below the level at which the average value of family diets met the recommended allowances for good nutrition for all dietary essentials studied except niacin. In the case of farm families, however, the average values met the recommendations at all income levels.

    How much it costs to obtain an adequate diet depends upon such factors as the general level of prices, the selection of items, and the skill of the homemaker in buying and preparing food. City families with money incomes of $\$ 1,500-\$ 1,999$ (the lowest income class in which the average nutritive value of city diets met all average recommended allowances) consumed food valued at $\$ 3.49$ per person per week; farm families in the lowest income class averaged $\$ 2.54$ per person. Neither amount of money can be considered the minimum that would buy a good diet in the spring of 1942, however. Undoubtedly some families attained a good diet at lower cost since many families spend enough but fail for other reasons to obtain an adequate diet. Allowing, however, for customary food patterns, for common lack in knowledge about nutritive returns for money spent for food, and for human error, about $\$ 3.50$ per person per week in cities and $\$ 2.50$ on farms could have provided a satisfactory diet in the United States in the spring of 1942.

    With rising income, diets tend to improve in nutritional quality because families consume more food, especially more vegetables and fruit, and more milk, eggs, and meat. City diets, poorer than farm diets in the lowest income groups, showed more marked improvement at successively higher income levels in the spring of 1942 than farm diets. The diets of both farm and city families increased more markedly in niacin, ascorbic acid, and riboflavin content in accordance with income than in any other dietary essential (table 33). The diets of families in the lowest income groups were in greater need of improvement in respect to two of these, niacin and riboflavin, than with respect to any other nutrient; but they were already in a better position in respect to ascorbic acid than to any other nutrient. It would have benefited city families more if they had increased the calcium as well as the ascorbic acid content of their diets. This would have meant increasing their consumption of milk and moderately increasing their consumption of citrus fruit. In farm diets average values for vitamin A showed less consistency in trend than other nutrients. The decrease in vitamin A value reflected a decrease in consumption of sweetpotatoes and green and yellow vegetables. This decrease was the result of regional food practices rather than of economic conditions. About 60 percent of the families in the income class $\$ 0-\$ 499$ resided in the South.

    ## The Food Groups As Sources of Dietary Essentials

    Almost all of the 11 groups into which foods are classified for purposes of analysis make some contribution to the total supply of each of the nutrients (tables 13, 14). The importance of any particular food group as a source of a nutrient depends, however, upon the quantities eaten and upon the nutritional content of the particular items within the group. There may be considerable variation among items in some respects; consequently, the contribution that the group can make to the diet as a whole depends upon the choices made within the group. For example, the proportion of the total vitamin A value in family diets coming from the potato and sweetpotato group will depend upon the relative quantities of white and sweetpotatoes consumed.

    Table 13.-Contribetion of food groups to food energy, protein, minerals : Average percentage of food energy, protein, calcium, and iron contributed by specified food groups, urban and farm families, by selected income classes, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942'
    

    Table if.-Conthibttion of food grotips to vitamine: Average percentage of five vitamins contributed by specified food groups, urban and farm families, by selected income classes, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{1}$
    

    1 Sce table 3, footnote 1 .
    2 See table 13 , footnote 3.
    3 See tables 22 through 28 for itemo included in cach food group.
    40.50 percent or tess.

    ## Food Energy

    Grain products were the most important source of food energy (table 35). From this food group farm families got an average of almost a third and urban families more than a fourth of their calories. Although every food group contributed some calories, four of themgrain products, fats and oils, milk, and meat, poultry, and fish-accounted for almost three-fourths of the calories in both city and farm diets.

    In successively higher income classes, milk, meat, poultry, and fisk became more important sources of calories, while grain products, fats and oils became less important (table 13). Urban families in the income class $80-8499$ obtained an average of 31 percent of their calories from grain products, 22 percent from fats and oils, 10 percent from milk, and 9 percent from meat, poultry, and fish. In the class $\$ 2,500-$ $\$ 2,999$ for the same food groups, percentages were $26,18,14,14$ percent, respectively. The trend with income was similar for farm families.

    ## Protein

    Grain products also ranked high as contributors of protein-aecounting for as great a proportion of the protein in family diets as of the calories and being for farm families the principal source of protein (table 35). For urban families, meat, poultry, and fish were the principal sources of protein. Milk was another important protein source; in farm diets it outranked meat, poultry, and fish. Both farm and city families got an average of three-fourthis or more of their protein from these three food groups combined--grain products; meat, poultry, fish; and milk.

    As incomes increased, the proportion of protein obtained from the relatively expensive animal sources-meat, poultry, fish, milk, and eggsincreased, while that from the relatively cheap vegetable sources-grain products, dry beans and peas and nuts--decreased (table 13). In every income class but one, farm families obtained less protein from animal sources than urban families; but in no income class did any group of families get as little as a third of their protein from animal sources.

    ## Calcium

    About two-thirds of all calcium came from milk, cheese, cream, and ice cream; nonfarm families got a slightly smaller proportion of calcium from these foods and farm families a somewhat greater proportion (table 35). No other food group contributed as much to a single nutrient. Grain products, from which about one-eighth of the calcium in city diets and one-tenth in farm diets was derived, were second in importance in respect to calcium contribution. The now common practice of using milk solids in the manufacture of commercial bread has added appreciably to the calcium value of the grain products in urban diets, while the southern custom of using self-rising flour enhances the calcium value of the grain products in farm diets. Green and yellow vegetables ranked third as a contributor to calcium although they contributed less than 5 percent of the calcium.

    In both urban and farm diets the proportion of calcium from milk increased with rises in income (table 13). Grain products contributed 13 percent of the calcium in the diets of farm families in the income class \$0- $\$ 499$, but only 7 pereent in the diets of those in the class $\$ 1,000-$ $\$ 1,499$. This reffected a downward trend in consumption of grain products, from 5.04 pounds in the lower class to 4.27 pounds per person per week in the higher one, and an upward trend in consumption of milk (table 3).

    ## Iron

    Urban families got most of their iron from meat, poultry, and fish; and farm families obtained most of theirs from grain products (table 35).

    The iron from these two food groups plus that from eggs, dry beans and peas and nuts, averaged more than three-fifths of the iron in the diets of both city and farm families.
    With more money to spend for food, families had a tendency to get more of their iron from the rather costly groups of animal foods and less from the cheaper vegetable foods (table 13). Low-income city families got more iron from dry beans and peas and nuts than from meat, poultry, and fish, but the reverse was true in the higher income classes. Crain products contributed substantial proportions of iron to the diets of urban and farm families of every income class.

    ## Vitamin A Value

    Green and yellow vegetables were the most important source of vita$\min$ A value (table 35). Their contribution of about two-fiftbs of the total vitamin A value in city and farm diets was about equal to the sum of the vitamin A received from the four groups of animal foods: Milk; meat, poultry, fish; fats, oils; and eggs. Of these animal sources of vi$\operatorname{tamin} A$, milk furnished the largest quantity.
    At the higher income levels in both urban and farm diets smaller proportions of the vitamin A value came from green and yellow vegetables and larger proportions from animal sources (table 14). But at all income levels green and yellow vegetables were most important sources of vitamin A value.

    ## Ascorbic Acid

    Farm families obtained the largest share of their ascorbic acid from green and yellow vegetables out of their gardens (table 35). Urban families received their largest share from tomatoes and citrus fruit. These two food groups combincd contributed an average of a little more than two-thirds of the ascorbic acid in city diets and a little less than twothirds of that in farm diets. Two other food groups-potatoes and sweetpotatoes, and other vegetables and fruit-made up all but about 8 percent of the rest of the ascorbic acid content of the diets.
    Tomatoes and citrus fruit, from which urban families received their largest share, are more dependable sourees of ascorbic acid than other foods since both, especially citrus fruit, are less subject to losses in cooking and are more often eaten raw than cooked.

    The higher the income, the greater was the proportion of ascorbic acid contributed by tomatoes and citrus fruit and other vegetables and fruit, and the smaller the proportion by green and yellow vegetables (table 14). Crban families in the income class $\$ 0-8499$ got 29 percent of their ascorbic acid from tomatoes and citrus fruit and 37 percent from green and yeliow vegetables; those in the $\$ 2,500-\$ 2,999$ class, 42 percent and 28 percent, respectively.

    ## Thiamine

    Meat, poultry, and fish, and grain products were the outstanding sources of thiamine in the diets of both urban and farm familics. These two food groups combined accounted for an average of more than half of the thiamine in the diets of both groups (table 35 ).

    The enrichment of bread and flour contributed substantially to the quantity of thiamine coming from grain products. On farms a relatively high consumption of grain products as a whole and also of corn meal,
    much of which was undegerminated, was responsible for the importance of this group as a source of thiamine.

    City and farm families with high income secured more of their thiamine from meat, poultry, and fish, and less from grain products, than families with low income (table 14). Urban families in the income class $\$ 0-\$ 499$ received 28 percent of their thiamine from meat, poultry, and fish and 26 percent from grain products; those in the class $\$ 2,500-$ $\$ 2,999,37$ percent and 16 percent, respectively.

    ## Riboflavin

    The main source of ribollavin, as of calcium, was milk (table 35). It accounted for more than half of the riboflavin in the farm family diets and almost two-fifths of that in the urban family diets in which average consumption was lower. Meat, poultry, and fish; and eggs were, respectively, second and third in importance with respect to riboflavin contribution. The riboflavin contributed by the three food groups amounted to 70 percent or more of the total riboflavin content of city and farm diets.

    In successively higber income classes the percentage of riboflavin contributed to urban diets by milk and eggs was fairly uniform but that contributed by meat, poultry, and fish became larger (table 14). The pattern in farm diets was similar except that more riboflavin was obtained from eggs in the higher income classes.

    ## Niacin

    Meat, poultry, and fish furnished almost three-fifths of the niacin in diets of urban families and more than two-fifths of it in diets of farm families (table 35). Grain products and potatoes and sweetpotatoes made considerably smaller but nevertheless important contributions to the niacin content of diets, particularly those of farm families.

    Meat, poultry, and fish provided a greater share of the niacin at higher than at lower income levels, refiecting the trend in consumption of those foods (table 14). The reverse was true in the case of grain products and, in urban diets, of potatoes and sweetpotatoes. In farm diets the proportion of niacin from potatoes and sweetpotatoes did not change much with rising income.

    ## Sources of Dietary Essentials Summarized

    The position of any food group as a source of the dietary essentials studied is dependent on the nutritive content of the specific foods selected within the food group and the quantities of each eaten. How much is eaten depends upon desirability of the food to the consumer, its price, and the consumer's capacity to pay and, for farm families, the ability to produce part or all of the food group at home. During wartime there are the added factors of shortages and ration allowances which were just beginning to be felt during the period of this study.
    The food choices made by families in the spring of 1942 indicate the food groups that were the most economical sources of the dietary essentials studied only insofar as consumers as a group were informed on how to choose the foods that give the best nutritional return on money and land and insofar as knowledge was stronger than custom and other forces in shaping food patterns. During this period, meat, poultry, and fish were the main sources of the protein, iron, thiamine, and niacin content of the diets and an important source of riboflavin (tables 13,
    14). Milk made the largest contribution to calcium and riboflavin and provided a considerable share of the vitamin A value and protein. Grain products were the most prominent contributors to calories and lesser but substantial ones to protein, iron, thiamine, and niacin. Green and yellow vegetables excelled in their contribution of vitamin A value; they also ranked high in their contribution of ascorbic acid. Citrus fruit and tomatoes topped all other food groups in providing ascorbic acid in the diet. The remaining food groups made important but not main contributions to the several dietary essentials-potatoes and sweetpotatoes, to ascorbic acid; dry beans and peas and nuts, to iron; fats and oils, to food energy and vitamin A; other vegetables and fruit, to ascorbic acid; eggs, to riboflavin; and sugars and sweets, to food energy.

    ## Comparison of Diets in Spring 1942 and in 1936

    The average money value of all food consumed by families and single persons in the spring of 1942 was $\$ 3.35$ per person per week, 30 percent more than the average value of $\$ 2.58$ in $1935-36$. Between these two dates, average family incomes (money plus nonmoney) had risen from an average of $\$ 470$ per person in the earlier period to an average of $\$ 709$ per person in the later period. Increased income in 1942 was not clear gain in purchasing power, however, because of a rise of about 20 percent in the cost of food and of all living items combined, between the two periods. ${ }^{16}$

    Besides rising food costs, food shortages were beginning to affect food consumption patterns and sugar rationing was put into effect during the period of collection of the data.

    For several months prior to the date of the study, a widespread nutrition program had been carried on throughout the Nation. In order to correct some of the dietary deficiencies revealed by the extensive study of 1935-36, people were being urged to increase their consumption of milk, fruits, and succulent vegetables, and of whole-grain cereals. For many families this was a matter of education in food selection; for others, it was a matter of having money enough to buy these foods.
    In any comparison of the two periods, due consideration needs to be given to the season of the year covered and the effect of season on food consumption and, therefore, on the nutritive value of the diets studied. The schedules in the food consumption study of 1936 were obtained during the period, March to November, with more of them representing the spring and summer seasons of the year. The schedules in the study of 1942 were obtained in only one season, the spring.

    ## Average Nutritive Values of Diets in Spring 1942 and in 1936

    In view of these changes and the difference in season it is of interest to see how food consumption patterns have varied in the two periods and how the changes in these patterns have affected the average nutritive values of family diets. ${ }^{17}$ Table 15 shows the average quantities of groups of food consumed per person per week by all families and by farm and nonfarm families in the year 1936 as compared with consumption in 1942, based on the spring season alone. Table 16 shows the average nutritive value per person per day of the diets in both periods.

    Table 15--Food conscmption in 1936 and spring 1942: Average quantity of specified groups of food consumed at home per person per week, by type of community, year 1986 and spring 1942
    

    and protein. (Seep. B, foatnote 9.)
    2 Ineludes the dry waight of cooked or canaed dry beans, peas, and lentios, suctu as baked beans. Inchudes the shelled कeight of nute.
    3 Includes the fresb fruit equivaleni of dried fruit.
    4 Ercludes bacon and salt pork.
    ${ }^{5}$ Includes two-thirds of the Feight of commercially baked goods wded to the weight of flours, meal, and cereals.
    B Ircludes bacon and satr porti.
    In the spring of 1942 both farm and nonfarm diets had a higher average content in all the dietary essentials studied than they did in the year 1936. This apparent improvement in nutritive value of the diets can be related to seasonal differences as well as to more lasting changes in food consumption patterns. For example, the 50 -percent increase in ascorbic acid can be attributed to the larger quantities of tomatoes and citrus fruit and of green and yellow vegetables eaten in the spring of 1942. Combined, these foods were responsible for about two-thirds of the ascorbic acid content of diets during that period (table 35).
    Farm diets in the spring of 1942 contained almost twice the weekly quantities of tomatoes and citrus fruit that were eaten by farm families in the year 1936, and nonfarm diets half again as much. Of the total quantity in farm diets in the later period, fresh oranges and grapefruit accounted for about two-thirds and tomatoes, one-third. In nonfarm diets citrus fruit was even more important-almost 4 pounds of citrus fruit were consumed to I pound of tomatoes. Since spring is a period of high citrus fruit consumption and summer is the period of lowest consumption, the difference between the two surveys in the months covered explains much of the apparent increase in use of citrus fruit. In part, also, this increase was a result of nutrition education, greater production, better distribution of citrus fruit, lowered prices, and advertising campaigns concerning their use. Families surveyed in the 1936 study paid 5.6 cents per pound on the average for fresh oranges and grapefruit, but those reporting in the spring of 1942 paid about a fifth less, 4.7 cents per pound.

    Again, the higher consumption of green and yellow vegetables in the spring of 1942 may have been due partly to season. Four of the important green vegetables that are rich in ascorbic acid-spinach, asparagus, cabbage, and green beans-were at their peak season ${ }^{18}$ during the period of the 1942 survey.

    The consumption of 25 percent more milk in the spring of 1942 than in 1936 explains the increases of close to one-fifth in calcium and in riboflavin. Both farm and nonfarm families were using more milk in the second quarter of 1942 than in 1936. Since season does not exert a marked influence on milk consumption, the increase in milk consumption appears to represent a definite change in food habits.
    The improvement in the vitamin A value of the diets can be ascribed to the greater consumption of milk and of green and yellow vegetables. A striking increase, almost three-fifths, was found in the consumption of green and yellow vegetables in the spring of 1942. As previously indicated, this, perhaps, was partly a seasonal effect. In the case of nonfarm families the shift was made at the expense of other vegetables and fruit, but farm families decreased their consumption of these other foods very little.

    Other apparent changes in food habits that assisted in bettering the mutritive content of diets in the United States in this period, include a higher consumption of dry beans and peas, and nuts, and of potatoes and sweetpotatoes, in the spring of 1942 than in 1936. Higher egg consumption probably reflects the fact that the 1942 study was made in the months when eggs were still fairly plentiful. Meat consumption (including poultry and fish, but not including bacon and salt pork) was slightly lower in farm communitics in the later period but about the same in nonfarm communities. On farms this may be in part a seasonal factor.

    Table 16.-Nutritive valge of deets in 1936 and spring 1942: Average nutritive value per person per day of food brought into the kitchen, by type of community, year 1936 and spring 1942

    | Year and type of community | Average ${ }^{1}$ putritive value oi diets, per person per day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Food entergy | Protein | Calcium: | Iron |  | Ascorbic acid | Thiamine | Ribo Gavin | Viscin |
    | Yetr 1936 | Calories | Grams | Grams | Milliorama | Inder-national Unils | Milligrams | Milliuтams | Milligrams | Milli- prams |
    | Crited States | 2,900 | 83 | 0.87 | 14.2 | 6,400 | 90 | 1.57 | 1.74 | 15.4 |
    | All noniarm | 2,800 | 81 | . 81 | 14.0 | 6,500 | 95 | 1.57 | 1.68 | 15.6 |
    | Rurakiarm | 3,300 | 91 | 1.10 | 15.7 | 6,600 | 70 | 1.63 | 1.90 | 14.5 |
    | Sphing 1942 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | United States | 3,000 | 93 | 1.04 | 15.9 | 7,900 |  |  |  | 16.4 |
    | all nonfarm. | 2,800 | 90 | . 96 | 15.5 | 7,700 | 135 | 1.81 | 2.10 | 16.5 |
    | Rural farm | 3,400 | 101 | 1.30 | 17.0 | 8,000 | 120 | 2.07 | 2.51 | 14.8 |

    ${ }^{1}$ For method of computing averages per person per day, see Methodology, p. 137.
    Although the consumption of sugars and sweets was markedly lower and of grain products slightly lower in the spring of 1942 and the consumption of fats and oils remained similar, there was a small increase ( 3 percent) in the average calorie content of the diets. The lower consumption of sugar in the spring of 1942 may reflect the fact that rationing of this item got under way in May.

    Sometime after the 1936 study and before the spring 1942 stuay, bread, flour, and cereals, enriched in thiamine, niacin, and iron, and margarine with vitamin A added, were placed on the market. They were purchased in sufficient quantity to be factors in the improvement of the spring 1942 diet over that of 1936 .

    Such shifts in food consumption as have taken place between 1936 and the spring of 1942 are in the direction of improving the average nutritive values of family diets in the Linited States in every dietary essential studied. The average quantity per person of ascorbic acid increased to half again as much as it was in 1936; riboflavin increased about a fourth; calcium, thiamine, and vitamin A increased around a fifth; and protein, iron, and niacin about a tenth.

    Nonfarm and farm diets exhibited similar improvement. But compared to farm diets nonfarm diets showed a somewhat greater improvement in niacin and iron. Farm diets, on the other hand, showed more improvement in ascorbic acid, thiamine, riboflavin, and vitamin A.

    ## Proportion of Families With Diets Meeting Recommended Allowances in Spring 1942 and in 1936

    In interpreting estimates of the average nutritive value of diets, it should be remembered that while averages for large groups of families may meet the recommendations of nutritionists, individual families may be far above or far below the average, and that a large proportion of families may have diets seriously deficient in one or more nutrients. The 1936 study indicated that fewer than a fifth of the families in this country had diets that met the National Research Council's recommendations for all of the seven nutrients considered (protein, calcium, iron, vitamin A value, ascorbic acid, thiamine, and riboflavin).

    Since the average diet in the spring of 1942 was greatly improved over the average diet in 1936, it is natural to inquire whether it is true also that a smaller proportion of families had diets that failed to meet the allowances recommended for the various dietary essentials. There is reason to believe that many of the families that had poor diets in 1936, benefiting from higher incomes and from nutrition education in the spring of 1942 , were able to enlarge and enrich their diets. As a result there was a general dietary improvement for the country as a whole even though at the same time families with fixed incomes were finding it difficult to maintain their usual levels of food consumption with higher living costs.

    It has been estimated ${ }^{19}$ that there were fewer families in the spring of 1942 than in 1936 that had diets which did not meet the recommended allowances for each of the dietary essentials. The estimates given later in this publication of the probable proportion of families with diets unsatisfactory in certain dietary essentials are optimistic for both periods, since no correction has been made in the average nutritive values for losses in nutritive content of the food between the time it was brought into the kitchen and the time it was eaten. (See p. 4 for discussion of losses in nutritive content of foods.)

    In 1936 three-fourths of the families in the Lnited States had diets that did not meet the National Research Council recommendations for riboflavin and about half had diets that were low in calcium, thiamine, and ascorbic acid. It is estimated that in the spring of 1942 the diets of more than one-half of the families still did not meet the recommended allowances for riboflavin and that the proportion of diets low in calcium had been reduced to less than a third; the proportion low in thiamine, to a fourth; and the proportion low in ascorbic acid, in which there was the greatest improvement, to less than a tenth. There was also a great re-


    duction in the estimated proportion of families that had diets low in vitamin A value, iron, and protein-from about one-fourth in the earlier period to about one-tenth in the later period.

    ## Money Value of Food

    ## Purchased Food

    ## Expenditures for Purchased Food

    In the spring of 1942 as at other times food for the family meant a larger money outlay in cities than on farms where part of the food supply is produced at home. Expenditures for food purchased during the period covered by the study, but not necessarily caten during that time, amounted to $\$ 3.73$ per person per week in cities and $\$ 1.15$ in farm communities. ${ }^{20}$ In every income group urban families purchasing almost their entire food supply spent between two and three times as much money per person per week for food as farm families.

    ## Proportion of Money Income Spent on Food

    Average expenditures for food by both urban and farm families in the spring of 1942 amounted to about one-fourth of their average money income. This was true even though the average money income of city families was more than two and one-half times that of farm families during the first quarter of $1942-\$ 2,548$ per family at an annual rate as compared with $\$ 1,000$. The distribution of both urban and farm families by net money income class is shown in table 2.

    Since average incomes were lower for farm than for urban families and since the lower the income the higher the percentage usually spent on food, farm families might be expected to spend a larger proportion of income for food than urban families. This is not the case, however, since farm families produce a large quantity of their food. With the exception of the low-income group, therefore, farm families needed to use a smaller proportion of their cash income for food than urban families, as the following figures show:

    |  | Percentage of income spent on food |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Money income class: | Urban | Farm |
    | \$0-8499 | 65 | 85 |
    | \$500-\$999 | 46 | 32 |
    | \$1,000-s1,499. | 37 | 23 |
    | \$1,500-\$1,999. | 31 | 23 |
    | \$2,000-\$2,999. | 28 | 15 |
    | \$3,000 or more. | 17 | 5 |

    The proportion of money income spent for food decreased with rising incomes for all groups of families. This effect of income was more marked in farm communities than in cities. Farm families with incomes of less than $\$ 500$ spent on the average a high proportion ( 85 percent) of their money income for food that the farm did not furnish and that they must have considered essential food, because its purchase left them little for purchases other than food.


    ## Money Value of Food From All Sources

    Since a large proportion of the food of farm families is produced at home, no significant statements can be made about comparative costs of food consumed by farm and urban families or for both groups considered together, if only the costs of purchased food are considered. A better basis of comparison is the money value for food from whatever source--purchase, home production, gift, relief, and payment for goods or services. The money value of food received without actual expenditure has been estimated by applying average prices of the same purchased item paid by other families of similar incomes living in the same type of community.
    This section of the report is concerned with the money value of all food and also with the money value of the following eight food classes: Milk; vegetables, fruit; meat, poultry, fish; eggs; grain products; fats, oils; sugars, sweets; miscellaneous foods, accessories.

    ## Money Value of All Food Consumed

    The average money value of the food of urban families was $\$ 3.71$ per person per week; that of farm families, $\$ 2.98$, about a fifth less (table 17). The comparatively low per capita money value of the food of farm families was the result in large part of the lower prices they paid for their food. It was no indication of lack of abundance or inadequacy in their diets for they succeeded in getting a diet that was better than that of city families in calories and in five of the eight other dietary essentials studied (table 12).

    The per capita money value of food increased from one income class to the next as would be expected. Increases were more marked for families in cities than on farms; also, they were more marked in the lower ranges than in the higher ranges of income.

    Rises in per capita money value of food with income were the result of increases both in food consumption and in prices paid per unit of food. For every food class, families in the top-income groups paid more per unit than families in the lower-income groups.

    The per capita money value of urban families' food started low$\$ 2.48$ per week at the income level $\$ 0-\$ 499$-and had a continuous upward trend with rising income, reaching $\$ 4.22$ at the income level $\$ 3,000$ or more. The per capita money value of farm families' food had a narrower range, however- $\$ 2.54$ to $\$ 3.79$ per week. Among the various groups of farm families, there was a greater sameness in the kinds of food purchased than among groups of urban families, since staples constituted a larger part of the food expenditures of farm families than those of urban families.

    Farm families in the income groups below $\$ 2,000$ consumed food of a higher per capita money value than city families with similar money incomes. All but 14 percent of farm families were represented in these income classes. Farm families were able to consume food of higher money value and to enjoy a higher level of living than would be suggested by their money income because of the larger nonmoney income they had, principally from products furnished by the farm for family living. Especially was this true in regard to food since a large share of their nonmoney income came from food supplied by the farm. In the first quarter of 1942, the average amount of nonmoney income was
    $\$ 105$ per farm family; of this amount $\$ 59$ represented the value of food produced at home and $\$ 42$ the value of other farm-furnished products; only $\$ 4$ came from sources other than the farm. Urban families, on the other hand, had an average of only $\$ 42$ of income in kind in this period; only $\$ 6$ of this represented food received in kind.

    Tame 17.-Money value of rood: Average money value of all food and of specified groups of food consumed at home per person per week, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{1}$
    
    ${ }^{1}$ Sce table 3 , footnote 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Iricudes all mill products excopt batter.
    ${ }^{2}$ Exeludes bacon and salt park.

    - Includes bscon and selt pork.

    6 Includes familisa with incornes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately.
    ${ }^{6}$ Inciudes families with negative incomes, not shown geparateiy.

    ## Money Value of Food Consumed-by Food Classes

    Table 17 indicates that the average money value of food consumed per person per week for five of the eight food classes was higher for urban families than for farm families. For vegetables and fruit this may be attributed to the consumption on the average of larger quantities; for eggs and grain products, to the higher prices they had to pay; and for meat, poultry, and fish, to both larger quantities and higher prices. The
    lower money value of milk, fats and oils, and sugar and sweets in urban diets was the result of lower consumption alone. Consumption of these products was enough lower in cities than on farms to offset the higher prices paid in cities for these three food classes.

    The money value of consumption per person per week of each of the eight food classes advanced from one income class to the next higher for both urban and farm families. Together, higher consumption and higher prices paid by the upper income families contributed to the rises in money value of all but two of the food classes-grain products and fats and oils. The higher money value of these foods was caused by the higher prices paid for them, since per capita consumption of grain products decreased with income and that of fats and oils remained fairly constant. The most marked increases in money values of foods consumed at successively higher income levels occurred in meat, poultry, and fish and in milk for urban families, and in meat, poultry, and fish and in eggs for farm families.

    ## Proportion of Money Value of Food Representing Eight Food Classes

    The way in which farm and urban families apportioned the money value of their food among the various types of food is shown in table 18. Meat, poultry, and fish, and eggs, combined, accounted for the greatest share of the money value of all foods in urban and farm diets. Vegetables and fruit were second and milk third, in importance.
    Pable 18.-Dibtribution of money valite of food: Percentage distribution of money value of food among specified groups of food, by type of community and selected income classes, howsekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19431

    | Type of coromusity and sanual nat money income clags? (dollari) | - Pereentage distribution of money value of food |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { food } \end{aligned}$ | Milk ${ }^{1}$ | Vegetables, fruit | Meat, poultry. figh 4 | Egge | Grain products | Fats, oils ${ }^{6}$ | Sugars, sweets | Mipcel laneous, soriea |
    | All clabses....... | 100 | 15 | 24 | 28 | 6 | 11 | $g$ | 3 | 6 |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 0-499 \ldots \\ & 2,500-2,999 \end{aligned}$ | 100 | 13 18 | 27 | 18 | 7 8 | 14 | 12 | 3 2 | 7 |
    | All clasges | 100 | 17 | 24 | 18 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 5 |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 0-499 \ldots-\ldots \\ & 1,000-1,499 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 16 | 14 | 4 5 | 5 8 |
    | RCRAL FABY | 100 | 22 | 23 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 4 |
    | 0-499 | 100 100 | ${ }_{23}^{22}$ | 24 | 15 | 88 | 119 | 113 | 5 5 | 4 |

    1 See table 3, footnote 1.
    ERee table 13, footnote 2.
    ${ }^{1}$ Includes all milk products except butter.
    Urban families allocated a greater proportion than farm families of the money value of their food to meat, poultry, and fish. This fact may be attributed both to the higher prices they paid for these foods- 33.8 cents per pound in cities and 28.7 cents on farms-and to the greater quantity consumed- $\mathbf{2 . 7 7}$ pounds per person per week in cities, compared with 1.83 pounds on farms. The smaller proportion of the money value of food allocated to milk, to fats and oils, and to sugars and sweets
    by urban families, was the result of their markedly lower consumption of these foods. Average prices for all of the food classes were higher in cities than in farm communities.
    As incomes of farm families rose the distribution of the total money value of food among the different food classes showed little change. As incomes of city families rose, however, a larger proportion of the food money was allocated to milk and to meat, poultry, and fish. Payment of higher prices per unit and consumption of greater quantities of these foods by city families at successively higher income levels contributed to this trend. But the decrease in the proportion going to vegetables and fruit and to fats and oils, as their incomes rose, was the result of lowered consumption of potatoes and sweetpotatoes, dry beans and peas, and salt pork.

    ## Prices Paid

    The term "price per unit," as used in this discussion, represents a composite of prices actually paid for purchased food items and imputed values assigned to home-produced food or food received as gift or pay. As explained earlier, the imputed values were the average prices paid for the same item by other families of similas incomes in the same type of community.

    Fur every food class, urban families paid a higher price per unit than farm families. The explanation is two-fold. Nearness to producer made prices for foods bought raw or not needing much processing lower in farm communities than in cities. Then, again, farm families were more numerous in the low-income than in the high-income groups and, therefore, selected cheaper food items within the food classes (table 36).

    Factors of this kind are reflected in the price of such products as eggs. for example, for which city families paid 35.4 cents per dozen in spring 1942 and farm families, 28.5 cents. Nearness to producer frequently results in the elimination in whole or part of transportation costs for farm products bought at such places as the village store or local creamery. There is also the possibility of buying some foods directly from the producer who may sell at prices anywhere between farm and retail prices. Milk, if not produced in sufficient quantity at home, might be purchased from a neighbor at the next farm. City families paid an average of 13.5 cents per quart for fluid whole milk; farm families, only 11.2 cents. Farm families may purchase vegetables and fruit also directly from other farms at lower prices than those paid by city families. For example, city families paid 13.8 cents per pound for fresh peas and farm families, 9.4 cents.

    The selection of lower priced items by farm families as a group than by city families was associated in part with the low average incomes of the farm group. In part, also, it reflects different practices in food buying and food preparation. For example, the custom on farms of making a large share of the family's bread and other baked goods at home and, to a smaller extent, of using uncooked rather than ready-to-eat cereal enabled farm families to obtain their grain products as a whole at about half the price paid for it by city families. Also, using a larger part of their fats than urban families in the form of lard and salt pork and a smaller part as butter, bacon, and oil, farm families obtained their assortment of fat at a lower price per pound.

    Price per unit of each food class was greater for families in the higher income groups than for those in the lower income groups. This fact
    probably is related in part to differences in the market quality of the products purchased (grade of meat and eggs), and in the place of purchase (cash-and-carry or delivery). However, much of this difference, as the data indicate, can be attributed to a shifting emphasis from lower to higher priced items within the food classes by families in successively higher income groups.
    There was greater difference for some groups of food than others between the prices paid by families with small incomes and those with large incomes. With increasing income, prices paid per pound varied most markedly for milk products, for meat, poultry, and fish, for fats and oils, and for grain products. The data indicate that for dairy products this increase in price was the result of an increase in the proportion of cream and ice cream in the total quantity of dairy products consumed, as families had more money to spend for family living; for meat, pouitry, and fish it was the result of the purchase of more tender cuts of meat, a larger proportion of poultry, and a smaller proportion of fish; for fats and oils it was the result of greater use of butter, bacon, and oils rather than salt pork and lard; and for grain products, of increased purchase of commercially prepared baked goods and cereals. There were shifts also from the purchase of cabbage to lettuce, fresh lima beans, and canned asparagus and from dry, uncooked beans to canned beans, nuts, and peanut butter.

    ## Money Value of Home-Produced Food

    ## Money Value of Home-Produced Food-At Prices Paid

    Farm families produced enough food at home to account for almost three-fifths of the money value of their food supply, priced at rates for purchased food items paid by families in the same type of community and income class. The value of home-produced food amounted to $\$ 7.74$ out of a total of $\$ 12.60$, the value of all food per family per week. The greatest contribution of the farm to the family's food supply was in the form of dairy products, which accounted for one-third of the money value of all home-produced food. Vegetables and fruit and meat, poultry, and fish each represented a fifth more or less of the money value of home-produced food consumed by farm families; fats and oils and eggs, about a tenth each; and sugars and sweets and grain products, less than 5 percent each.

    Although the total money value of home-produced food tended to be larger for farm families at successively higher income levels, it represented a gradually diminishing proportion of the total money value of food from all sources. The farm contributed an average of 65 percent of the money value of the food of families with incomes of less than $\$ 500$ ( $\$ 6.99$ worth of the $\$ 10.71$ worth consumed per family per week) and 60 percent of that of families in the income group $\$ 2,000-\$ 2,999$ ( $\$ 10.07$ worth of home-produced food out of $\$ 16.74$ ).

    ## Money Value of Home-Produced Food-At Farm Prices

    Thus far the analysis has been concerned with home-produced food when it is valued at the prices for purchased food paid by farm families in each income group. Adding this value to expenditures for food indicates how much the diet would have cost if it had been necessary to purchase all of it, and makes possible a comparison of the money value of the food of urban and rural families.

    The farmer probably thinks of the part of the family's food that the farm furnishes, also in terms of its alternate sales value. The price he might have received for the produce if he had sold it excludes the processing, transportation, and other marketing costs for which he does not pay. These costs, however, are included in retail prices. The difference between the purchase value and the alternate sales value of the part of the food supply that is produced at home is, in reality, a financial saving to the farm family. The farm prices ${ }^{21}$ used in this report to estimate the alternate sales value of the food furnished by the farm appear in table 19.
    Table 19.-Prices padd and farm prices per polnd: Average prices paidand farm prices per pound of specified food groups used in valuing home-produced food, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1943 ${ }^{1}$

    | Type of comIH:Sity and annual net money iacome, class (dodiars) | Mill ${ }^{-2}$ | Potstoes, sweet-potatoes | Dry beans and peas, nits | Green and yelow vege tables | Tomatoes. citris fruit | Other vegetables and fruit | Meat, <br> poultry, [ish ${ }^{3}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g} g} 3$ | Grain <br> arod <br> uets <br> i | Fats, ois | Sugars, sweets |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Average prices paid per pound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | ectral Nospafm | Centa! | Cents | Cents | Centr | 1 Cents | Cents | Cents | Conts | Cents | Centa | Cents |
    | Ali classes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5.1 | 3.2 | 14.6 | 10.5 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 29.8 | 20.1 | \% 3.7 | 32.1 | 15.4 |
    | 0-403. | 4.6 | 2.9 | 12.6 | 8.7 | 3.8 | 11.0 | 31.2 | 18.1 | 4.1 | 30.3 | 14.9 |
    | 500-949 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.8 | 26.8 | 19.7 | 3.7 | 31.0 | 17.7 |
    | 1.(M)0-1,499. | 4.8 ! | 2.5 | 39.4 | 11.9 | 8.6 | 11.6 | 25.4 | 19.3 | 8.4 | 29.7 | 16.0 |
    | $1.500-1.969$ | 5.5 | 2.8 | 21.0 | 10.8 | 18.5 | 11.3 | 30.4 | 20.1 | 3.0 | 32.6 | 18.4 |
    | $2.04030-2.999$ | 5.71 | 3.1 | 8.4 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 30.4 | 30.6 | 4.0 | 29.0 | 15.7 |
    | 3,000 or over... | 6.5 | 3.6 | 33.3 | 12.4 | 7.3 | 12.8 | 31.8 | 22.7 | 3.8 | 30.9 | 18.3 |
    | St:RAL FARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | AlJciasier 5 | 5.41 | 3.8 | 13.1 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 10.7 | 30.6 | 19.0 | 3.3 | 29.0 | 13.7 |
    | 0-4*9 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 11.3 | 7.2 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 29.6 | 18.18 | 3.4 | 29.4 | 11.3 |
    | 200-499 | 5.6 | 3.3 | 17.4 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 30.8 | 16.8 | 3.3 | 28.6 | 16.6 |
    | 1,0100-1,490. | 6.4 | 3.2 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 12.6 | 25.2 | 18.8 | 4.6 | 28.0 | 22.3 |
    | 1,500-1.999 | 5.9 | 3.9 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 12.0 | 35.2 | 23.9 | 3.3 | 28.6 | 13.0 |
    | 2.000-2.993-..-- | 7.4 | 3.1 | 7.9 | 8.2 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 32.0 | 23.4 | 4.2 | 28.71 | 21.2 |
    | 3.000 or cuetr.. | 6.61 | 2.3 | 11.3 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 33.8 | 18.8 | 3.8 | 29.2 | 18.4 |
    | REPAL NONPARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Alf classes | 1.8 | 1.9 | 5.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 19.0 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 22.1 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 5.2 |
    | 0-49 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 19.4 | 17.7 | 2.4 | 22.3 | 4.7 |
    | $500-990$ | 1.91 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 19.0 | 17.7 | 2.2 | 21.6 | 5.1 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 19.0 | 17.7 | 2.2 | 21.1 | 5.2 |
    | L.500-1,998...- | 1.9 | 1.9 | 5.7 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2,6 | 16.3 | 17.7 | 2.2 | 23.1 | 5.0 |
    | 2,000-2,999 . ...) | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 18.7 | $1 \bar{i} .7$ | 2.2 | 20.2 ; | 5.3 |
    | 3.000 or over.... | 1.9 | 1.9 | 10.4 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 21.4 | ! 17.7 | 2.2 | 26.6 | 5.3 |
    | BLhat PARM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Al' ctasses ${ }^{\text {Br.-..-. }} 1$ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 20.2 | 17.7 | 2.2 | 20.0 | 4.0 |
    | 0-499 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 20.4 | 12.7 | 2.2 | 20.7 | 3.5 |
    | 500-590 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 17.3 | 12.3 | 19.9 | 4.0 |
    | 1.000-1,498--. - | 1.8 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 1.8 | $\underline{2} .5$ | 20.5 | 17.7 | $\underline{2} 2$ | 19.7 | 5.1 |
    | 1.500-1.999 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 20.6 | 15.3 | 2.2 | 19.6 | 4.9 |
    | $2.000-2.934$ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 19.6 | 4.8 |
    | 3.000 or over...- | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 20.3 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 18.7 | 4.8 |

    2 fincudes all dairy products except butter.
    3 Excludes bacon and salt port.
    4 ineludes bacon and salt pork.
    5 Inciledea families with negative incomes, not shown separately
    r. Calerlated from data on farm ppices in E. S. Department of Agrienlture reports entitled "Price Spreads Between itse Farmer and the Consumer," and from unpubfished data of the L. S. Burcau of Agricultural Economics.

    At farm prices the money value of the home-produced food of the farm family in the spring of 1942 amounted to $\$ 3.86$ per family per week (table 20). This is only half of the $\$ 7.74$ at which it was valued aceording to prices paid or what may be called the "purchase value" (table 21). The difference between the money value and the "purchase value," 83.88, represents a saving to the farm family achieved through raising dairy cows, meat animals, poultry, vegetables, fruit, and grain rather than buying the same food. It was almost one-third of the purchase value of the family's weekly food supply ( $\$ 12.60$ ).
     money value of home-produced food at priccs phad and al farm prices per family per zrek, by type of community and arnual net money income class, houscheeping fanilies and single persons in the tinited States. spring 194:3
    

    Table 21.-Farm yalde of home-produced food compared to purchase value: Average money value of home-produced food estimated at farm prices expressed as a percentage of home-produced food at prices paid, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{2}$

    | Type of community and abnual nat moдey income clas (dollers) | Farm value ${ }^{2}$ of bome-produced food as percentage of burchase value <br> (Purchase value $=100$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | $\underset{\text { food }}{\text { All }}$ | Miek ${ }^{3}$ | Potathes, sweet-potatoes | Dry beans and реая, nuts | Green and yellow vegetablea | Tomstoes, citrus frait | Other vegetables and fruit | Meat. poultry fish fish | Egg | Grain products | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fats, } \\ & \text { oilat } \end{aligned}$ | Sugars, aweets |
    | sceal montary <br> All classes ${ }^{8}$ $\qquad$ | Pct. | Put. | Pat. | Prt. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pct. | Pet. | Pat. | Pet. | Pet. |
    |  | 47 | 37 | 59 | 33 | 16 | 18 | 22 | 63 | 88 | 62 | 68 | 33 |
    | 0-499. | 50 | 41 | 67 | 38 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 61 | 98 | 64 | 73 | 31 |
    | $500-999$ | 50 | 41 | 58 | 109 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 21 | 90 | 57 | 70 | 29 |
    | 1.000-1,489 | 47 | 41 | 76 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 22 | 74 | 92 | 20 | 71 | 33 |
    | 1.500-1.999 | 44 | 34 | 69 | 25 | 16 | 19 | 23 | 48 | 88 | 100 | 71 | 28 |
    | 2.0100-2,999 | 48 | 33 | 62 | 67 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 61 | 88 | 50 | 70 | 34 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 43 | 29 | 53 | 30 | 14 | 26 | 19 | 67 | 78 | 50 | 66 | 29 |
    | htiki fary <br> i! classes 0 $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | 50 | 35 | 50 | 35 | 21 | 19 | 23 | 66 | 93 | 67 | 69 | 29 |
    | [j-499 | 51 | 38 | 38 | 41 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 71 | 95 | 65 | 70 | 30 |
    | $500-909$ | 49 | 34 | 58 | 30 | 23 | 16 | 23 | 64 | 105 | 70 | 70 | 24 |
    | 1.000-1,499......- | 48 | 30 | 59 | 45 | 17 | 17 | 20 | 73 | 94 | 48 | 70 | 23 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 48 | 32 | 49 | 40 | 19 |  | 19 |  |  |  | 69 | 41 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 45 | 26 | 61 | 54 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 61 | 79 | 54 | ${ }_{88}^{86}$ | ${ }_{26}$ |
    | 3,000 or over. | 48 | 28 | 83 | 44 | 18 | 13 | 25 | 60 |  | 62 | 64 | 26 |

    1 See table 3, footnoth 1.
    2 Calculated from data on farmprioes in U. S. Department of Agriculture reports ontitled "Price Spreads Between the Farroer and the Consumer," and from unpublished data of the Bureau of Agrieultural Economica.
    ${ }^{3}$ Irchude eall mils products except butter.
    Excludes bacon and alit pork.
    t [peludes bacon and salt port.
    6 Includes farilies with negative incomes, not shown separately.
    Farm families in the upper income groups raised more food and paid higher prices for the food they bought than those in the lower income groups; consequently, the gains from their home-production programs were even greater. Families with incomes under $\$ 500$ saved $\$ 3.45$ per family per week and those in the income group $\$ 1,000-\$ 1,499, \$ 4.99$. But at each income level, the savings from home production represented about the same proportion-a third-of the money value of all food.

    For different classes of food, however, the average amount of money saved by producing food at home represented a range of from 3 percent for grain products to 58 percent for milk. The extent to which the home production of specified types of food affected a saving is shown below:
    

    Percentage of total purchase talue sated by home production
    (Amount saved divided
    by purchase volue)

    | \#ilk | \$1.63 | 58 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Vegetables, fruit | 1.21 | 43 |
    | Meat, poultry, fi | . 49 | 22 |
    | Eggs.. | . 06 | 7 |
    | Girain products. | . 04 | 3 |
    | Fats, oils. | . 30 | 19 |
    | Sugars, sweets | .16 | 27 |

    In dollars and cents, therefore, farm families saved more through home production of milk and its products than of any other food group. This was the result of both the large quantity of home-produced milk they consumed, 21.67 quarts of fuid milk equivalent per family per week, and of the relatively wide margin between the farm price ( 1.9 cents per pound of fuid milk equivalent) and the purchase price ( 5.4 cents per pound of milk). Home-produced vegetables and fruit were second in importance in the savings they netted the farmer on his food costs, and meat, poultry, and fish, third. Although the proportion of eggs for the family table from owned poultry flocks was large ( 96 percent), the saving in food cost made from this farm enterprise was a minor one. This was attributable to the relatively few dozens of eggs in comparison to the many quarts of milk or the many pounds of vegetables farm families consumed per week, and to the closeness between the farm price ( 26.5 cents) and the purchase price ( 28.5 cents) per dozen eggs.

    ## Summary

    This publication contains information on the food consumed at home in the United States in the spring of 1942. The data are based on the food consumption reported for a 7 -day period by families and single persons representative of the entire civilian housekeeping population. The quantities and money value of specified food items and food groups consumed per family per week and the percentage of households consuming them, are given for income groups in the United States as a whole and separately for nonfarm, urban, rural nonfarm, and farm communities. The nutritive value of the diets is presented for the same population groups in terms of averages per day per person and per nutrition unit. These appear as tables in Appendix A. Throughout the text, relevant summarized tables are given on a per-person per-week basis. A "person" as used in this report is equivalent to 21 meals consumed from the home food supplies. No attempt has been made to include food consumed in eating establishments outside the home.

    ## Quantity of Food Consumed

    Housekeeping families and single persons in the United States had about 30 pounds of food per person per week available for consumption in the spring of 1942 . On the basis of nutritive value and use in the diet, the food items this quantity includes have been classified into 11 food groups. The quantities of each group are shown below:

    Food group:

    | Milk or its equivalent ${ }^{2}$ <br> Potatoes, sweetpotatoes <br> Dry beans and peas, nuts. <br> Green and yellow vegetables. <br> Tomatoes, citrus fruit. <br> Other vegetables and fruit <br> Meat, poultry, fish. $\qquad$ <br> Eggs. <br> Grain products. <br> Fata, vils.. <br> Sugars, sweets. <br> .------.............. |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |

    $\begin{gathered}\text { Quantity consumed per } \\ \text { person per week }\end{gathered}$
    4.26 quarts
    2.85 pounds
    .35 pound
    2.12 pounds
    2.68 pounds
    3.08 pounds
    2.35 pounds
    3.66 dozen
    3.68 pounds
    1.19 pounds
    1.04 pounds

    The consumption pattern of families living in cities differed in many respects from that of families on farms. During the period covered by the study urban families used twice as much tomatoes and citrus fruit as farm families; one and one-half times as much meat, poultry, and fish; and also more green and yellow vegetables and other vegetables and fruit (table 3). They used only about two-thirds of the quantitics of milk, sugars and sweets, grain products, dry beans and peas and nuts that farm families did, as well as somewhat less of the other three food groups-potatoes and sweetpotatoes, fats and oils, and eggs.

    Rural nonfarm families exhibited a consumption pattern that was more like that of farm families in some respects and more like urban families in others. The intermediate position of rural nonfarm families in respect to consumption reflects the ability of many of these families to produce part of their food supply at home and to buy some farm products at lower prices than families in cities, as well as their intermediate standing in respect to income.

    ## Nutritive Value of Diets

    Some indication of adequacy of the food available for home consumption may be obtained from the quantities this food afforded of the nine dietary essentials. These quantities, per nutrition unit per day, are given in the accompanying tabulation:

    |  | Quantity per nuetrition unit per day |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | Nutrient: |  |
    | Food energy | 3,300 calories |
    | Protein. | 100 grams |
    | Calciurn | 0.9 gram |
    | Iron. | 16 milligrams |
    | Vitamin A value | 8,400 International Cnits |
    | Ascorbic acid. | 140 milligrams |
    | Thiamine | 2.3 milligrams |
    | Ribotlavin | 2.7 milligrams |
    | Nircin | 20 milligrams |

    The average nutritive value of the food brought into the kitchen in the spring of 1942 appeared to equal or exceed the allowances for a moderately active man ( 1.00 nutrition unit) recommended by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council in May 1941 (table 42). The vitamin figures of the National Research Council are calculated requirements for food as eaten and do not allow for losses in cooking. The average diet, therefore, probably was somewhat short in thiamine, ribofiavin, and niacin and may have contained little more ascorbic acid than the quantity recommended. Moreover, some of the margin between the average diet and the recommended allowances may have been narrowed for the other dietary essentials by such wasteful food practices as discarding the edible deep green, outer leaves of salad and other greens, the liquid in which vegetables have been cooked, stale bread, sour milk, and the food left on plates, as well as by some spoilage of food.

    ## Comparison of Diets in Cities and on Farms

    Urban families had better diets, measured in ascorbic acid and niacin, but the diets of farm families equaled or exceeded those of urban families in the other respects (table 33). The 25 percent more ascorbic acid found in the diets of urban families than farm families primarily reflects the consumption by urban families of more vegetables and fruit, especially tomatoes, citrus fruit, and green and yellow vegetables, whereas 30 percent more niacin in urban diets may be accounted for by the greater use of meat in cities than on farms.

    Forty percent more calcium in the diets of farm families, on the other hand, is associated with a higher farm consumption of dairy products. As a result of their greater use of 7 of the 11 groups of food, farm families obtained in their diets 5 to 10 percent more protein, food energy, ribofiavin, and iron than urban families. The diets of both farm and urban families were about equal in thiamine and vitamin A value.

    ## Effect of Home Production on Adequacy of Diets

    Farm families had a better opportunity than nonfarm families to maintain and improve upon their usual levels of food consumption in the face of rising food costs, food shortages, and reduction in the variety of foods offered for sale because such a large share of their total food supply was obtained from the farm (table 31). Ninety percent of the milk, 95 percent of the eggs, 60 percent of the meat, poultry, and fish and fats and oils, 25 percent of the sugars and sweets, and 20 percent of the grain products consumed by farm families were produced at home.

    Threc-fourths or more of three nutrients-calcium, vitamin A, and ribo-flavin-found in the diets of farm families, was provided by home-produced foods, especially milk and vegetables. Home-produced foods also contributed a little more than half of the ascorbic acid, thiamine, protein, and niacin in farm dicts. A relatively smaller proportion of calories and iron were provided by home-produced foods, because grain products, important contributors of these dietary essentials, are not suitable for home production on many farms.

    ## Effect of Income on Adequacy of Diets

    Even without any deduction for nutrient losses that occur in preparing food for the table, the average nutritive values of the diets of families in the lower income groups were below satisfactory levels in several respects in the spring of 1942. Riboflavin was the most limited nutrient in the diets of urban families, and niacin in the diets of farm families. Even in low-income groups average farm diets provided the recommended allowances of all nutrients except niacin. Diets of urban families with low incomes showed a tendency to be short in niacin, calcium, and food energy as well as in riboflavin. These shortages signify that both groups of low-income families needed more niacin-rich foods such as peanuts and meat in their diets and that those in cities also needed to add more milk, cheese, and grain products to their diets.

    ## Comparison of Diets in Spring 1942 and in 1936

    A comparison of diets in the spring of 1942 with those in 1936 indicates that increased incomes (offset somewhat by increases in the cost of food and other living items) and widespread nutrition education have improved the food-consumption patterns in the United States (table 15). Apparent changes in food habits that assisted in bettering the nutritive content of diets in the later period include the consumption of 25 percent more milk, 50 to 75 percent more eggs, green and yellow vegetables, tomatoes and citrus fruit, dry beans and peas, and nuts, and 15 percent more potatoes and sweetpotatoes. Part of the increased use of green and yellow vegetables, tomatoes and citrus fruit, and eggs is attributable to season. For all of these foods, spring is a period of high consumption. The earlier study covered the entire year 1936 and the later study, only the spring months, March to June, of 1942. There was no change or only a slight decrease in the consumption of fats and oils; meat, poultry and fish; and grain products; and a 25 percent decrease in sugars and sweets, as between the two periods.

    These shifts in food consumption between 1936 and the spring of 1942 improved the nutritional quality of family diets in the United States in every nutrient studied (table 16). The average quantity of ascorbic acid increased 50 percent; of riboflavin, about 25 percent; of calcium, thiamine, and vitamin A, about 20 percent; and of protein, iron, and niacin, about 10 percent.

    The general dietary improvement for the country as a whole indicates that a smaller proportion of families had diets that failed to meet the allowances recommended for the various nutrients. The estimates which follow are optimistic since no correction has been made for nutrient losses in food preparation. In 1936 about three-fourths of the families in the United States had diets that did not meet the National Research Council's recommendations for ribofiavin; and about half had diets that were low in calcium, thiamine, and ascorbic acid. It is estimated that in the spring of 1942 the diets of more than half of the families still did not meet the recommended allowances for riboflavin and that the proportion of clicts low in calcium had been reduced to less than a third; the proportion low in thiamine, to a fourth; and the proportion low in ascorbic acid, in which there was the greatest improvement, to less than a tenth. Some of the improved situation in respect to ascorbic acid was a result of seasonal increases in the consumption of citrus fruit and leafy greens. There was also a great reduction in the estimated proportion of families that had diets failing to meet current recommendations in vitamin A value, iron, and protein; from about a fourth in the earlier period to around a tenth in the later period.

    ## Money Value of Food

    The average money value of the food consumed at home in the spring of 1942 amounted to $\$ 3.35$ per person per week. About 25 percent of this amount represented meat, poultry, and fish; another 25 percent, vegetables and fruit; 15 percent, dairy products; 10 percent each, grain products and fats and oils; and about 5 percent each, eggs, sugars and sweets, and miscellaneous foods and accessories.

    The money value of the food of urban families came to $\$ 3.71$ per person per week; that of farm families, $\$ 2.98$, about a fifth less (table 17). Urban familics allocated a larger proportion than farm families of the money value of their food to meat, poultry, and fish and a smaller proportion to dairy products, fats and oils, and sugars and sweets (table 18). The proportion going to the other food groups was similar for families in cities and on farms. At successively higher income levels, dairy products and meat, poultry, and fisb each represented a greater part of the food money of urban families, and vegetables and fruit as well as fats and oils, each a smaller part. There was rather striking sameness from one income group to another in the way the money value of the food of farm families was distributed among the food classes.

    ## Savings to Farm Families From Home-Produced Food

    Farm families saved nearly $\$ 4.00$ per family per week by producing part of their food supply at home; most of this saving came from farmfurnished dairy products (\$1.63) and vegetables and fruit (\$1.21). These savings represent the differences between the money value of their homeproduced food at prices farm families paid and at prices farmers received for similar products (table 20). At each income level home production saved farm families about a third of the money value of their total food supply.

    ## Appendixes

    ## Appendix A. Tables

    Tabie 22.-Milk, cream, ice cream, cheese: Average guantity and money value of mill, cream, ice cream, and cheese consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spining $1942^{1}$
    
    


     hold per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persents in the United States, spring 1942:-Continued
    

    | I URAL NONFARM <br> All olagses 6 | 1.66 | 1.33 | 1.17 | 1.06 | . 09 | . 02 | ( ${ }^{\text {) }}$ | (7) | . 15 | . 01 | . 19 | . 11 | (7) | . 08 | . 14 | . 03 | . 10 | . 01 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 0-499. | . 98 | . 83 | . 71 | . 57 | . 10 | . 04 | . 00 | . 00 | . 12 | (7) | . 09 | . 07 | . 00 | . 02 | . 06 | . 01 | . 04 | . 01 |
    | 500-999 | 1.38 | 1.19 | 1.01 | . 86 | . 12 | . 02 | . 01 | . 00 | . 16 | . 02 | . 08 | . 05 | (7) | . 03 | . 11 | . 02 | . 08 | . 01 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.77 | 1.39 | 1.19 | 1.13 | . 04 | . 02 | (7) | (7) | . 17 | . 03 | . 18 | . 07 | . 01 | . 10 | . 20 | . 06 | . 13 | . 01 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 2.07 | 1.52 | 1.37 | 1.25 | . 11 | . 01 | (7) | . 00 | . 15 | (7) | . 35 | . 20 | . 01 | . 14 | . 20 | . 04 | . 15 | . 01 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 2.25 | 1.76 | 1.55 | 1.45 | . 07 | . 02 | . 01 | ( 00 | . 17 | . 04 | . 29 | . 15 | . 00 | . 14 | . 20 | . 05 | . 13 | . 02 |
    | 3,000 or over | 2.59 | 1.95 | 1.82 | 1.70 | . 12 | . 00 | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (7) | . 11 | . 02 | . 42 | . 24 | . 00 | .18 | . 22 | . 04 | . 15 | . 03 |
    | hural fary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes 4. | 2.78 | 2.12 | 2.08 | 1.81 | . 21 | . 06 | (7) | . 00 | . 04 | (7) | . 51 | . 45 | . 02 | . 04 | . 16 | . 05 | . 09 | . 02 |
    | 0-499. | 2.36 | 1.84 | 1.80 | 1.46 | . 33 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 03 | . 01 | . 44 | . 41 | . 02 | . 01 | . 08 | . 03 | . 05 | ${ }^{(7)}$ |
    | $500-999$ | 2.82 | 2.26 | 2.21 | 1.98 | . 21 | . 02 | . 00 | . 00 | . 04 | . 01 | . 43 | . 36 | . 03 | . 04 | . 13 | . 03 | . 09 | . 01 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 3.53 | 2.33 | 2.27 | 2.13 | . 07 | . 07 | . 00 | . 00 | . 06 | . 00 | . 91 | . 72 | . 11 | . 08 | . 29 | . 12 | . 13 | . 04 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 3.28 | 2.51 | 2.40 | 2.14 | . 16 | . 10 | 00 | . 00 | . 11 | . 00 | . 56 | . 48 | . 07 | . 01 | . 21 | . 04 | .15 | . 02 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 3.80 | 2.66 | 2.64 | 2.54 | . 09 | . 01 | (7) | . 00 | . 02 | ( 00 | . 78 | . 69 | . 01 | . 09 | . 35 | . 11 | . 21 | . 03 |
    | 3,000 or over- | 3.39 | 2.08 | 2.06 | 1.98 | . 03 | . 05 | . 00 | . 00 | . 02 | (7) | 1.01 | . 75 | . 03 | . 23 | . 30 | . 08 | . 19 | . 03 |
    | UNITED 8TATES | Percentage of households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes 4 | 98 | 98 | 90 | 85 | 20 | 2 | 2 | (8) | 36 | 5 | 44 | 28 | 3 | 23 | 53 | 17 | 36 | 13 |
    | 0-499. | 93 | 93 | 76 | 65 | 30 | 5 | 0 | (8) | 29 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 7 | 16 | 4 |
    | 500-999 | 99 | 88 | 80 | 74 | 26 | 2 | 1 | (8) 0 | 41 | 6 | 22 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 36 | 9 | 26 | 10 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 99 99 | 98 | 89 95 | 85 | 19 20 | 2 2 2 | 1 | ${ }^{(8)} 0$ | 40 | 5 4 | 39 48 | 21 | 4 3 3 | 23 | 56 63 | 16 | 39 47 | 13 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 99 | 99 | 95 | 94 | 13 | 1 | 3 | (8) | 35 | 5 | 57 | 32 | 3 | 34 | 63 | 21 | 40 | 17 |
    | 8,000 or over. | 100 | 100 | 97 | 96 | 12 | 1 | 3 | ${ }^{8}$ | 35 | 5 | 68 | 49 | 6 | 37 | 70 | 25 | 49 | 23 |
    | Il classes 4 | 98 | 98 | 88 | 85 | 16 | 2 | 2 | (8) | 41 | 6 | 45 | 27 | 3 | 26 | 57 | 17 | 39 | 14 |
    | 0-489... | 90 | 90 | 64 | 53 | 22 | 5 | 0 | (8) | 40 | 5 | 12 | 7 | (8) | 5 | 28 | 6 | 19 | 6 |
    | 500-999 | 99 | 98 | 77 | 70 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 48 | 6 | 18 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 38 | 9 | 27 | ${ }^{8}$ |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 99 | 98 | 88 | 84 | 16 | 1 | 1 | (8) | 44 | 6 | 37 | 18 | 3 | 24 | 57 | 15 | 40 | 14 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 99 | 99 | 95 | 93 | 19 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 44 | 5 | 48 | 25 | 3 | 29 | 63 | 18 | 48 40 | 14 |
    | 2,000-2,999... | 99 100 | 99 100 | 95 97 | 93 96 | 12 | 1 | 4 | (8) | 37 36 | 5 | 57 68 | 31 49 | 3 5 | 35 37 | 63 71 | 20 25 | 40 | 24 |
    | 3,000 or over....---....... | 100 | 100 | 97 | 96 | 11 | 1 | 4 | () | 36 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

    Tabla 22.-Milx, cream, ye cream, cheese: Average quantity and money talue of milk, cream, ice cream, and cheese consumed at home per houbehold per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{2}$ Continued

    | Type of community end arrusi met money income disus (dollant) | Mily, cresm, jee cresm, cheese |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Total milk equivaleat ${ }^{2}$ <br> (Cols. 3 , 12, 16) <br> (2) | Milk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cream and ice cream |  |  |  | Cheese |  |  |  |
    |  |  | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text { Tots }{ }^{2} \\ \text { (Coiss } \\ \text { 5-11) } \\ (3) \end{array}\right\}$ | Fluid |  |  |  |  |  | Other ${ }^{3}$(11) |  | Cream |  |  |  | Total(Cols$17-18)$ | Cottsge | ${ }_{\text {Amer }}$ | Other |
    |  |  |  | (Cols. | Whole | Butter- milk | Skim | Choco |  |  |  | Total(Cold,13-15)(12) | Smeet | Sour(14) |  |  |  |  |  |
    | ( ${ }^{\text {) }}$ |  |  | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |  |  |  | (18) | (15) |  | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |  |
    |  | Percentage of househalds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Ali classee 6....------- | 98 | 98 | 80 | 87 | 12 | 1 | 3 | ( ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 42 | 6 |  | 48 | 28 | 4 | 28 | 60 | 18 | 41 | 15 |
    | 0-429 | 85 | 85 | 58 | 48 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 43 | 9 | 11. | 4 | 1 | 6 | 33 | 10 | 21 | 5 |
    | 500-998 | 89 | 98 | 74 | 68 | 19 | 0 | 1 | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 51 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 39 | 8 | 29 | 3 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 99 | 98 | 91 | 87 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 48 | 7 | 38 | 18 | 8 | 25 | 59 | 15 | 41 | 18 |
    | 1,500-1,099.. | 98 | 99 | 98 | 95 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 48 | 23 | 4 | 28 | 63 | 19 | 48 | 10 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 99 | 69 | 94 | 94 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 34 | 8 | 52 | 29 | 3 | 31 | 60 | 21 | 43 | 21 |
    | 2,300-2,909.. | 100 | 89 | 95 | 94 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 42 | 2 | 67 | 34 | 4 | 43 | 60 | 10 | 35 | 18 |
    | 3,000-4,999 | 100 | 100 | ${ }^{67}$ | 95 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 3 | 69 | 47 | 6 | 42 | 72 | 24 | 51 | 25 |
    | 5,050-0,099. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 3 | 71 | 58 | 5 | 27 | 73 | 27 | 47 | 26 |
    | All otasses ${ }^{4}$ | 88 | 88 | 84 | 76 | 28 | 4 | 1 | (8) | 40 | 3 | 82 | 20 | 1 | 18 | 45 | 13 | 33 | 7 |
    | 0-498 | 24 | 03 | 70 | 57 | 31 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 3 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 4 | 18 | 8 |
    | $800-630$ | 98 | 09 | 81 | 74 | 32 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 42 | 2 | 24 | 14 | 1 | 14 | 35 | 11 | 24 | 5 |
    | 1,000-1,409. | 98 | 88 | 82 | 78 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 41 | 3 | 34 | 21 | 2 | 21 | 84 | 16 | 38 | 7 |
    | 1,500-1,909. | 100 | 100 | 93 | 86 | 31 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 47 | 29 | 1 | 32 | 84 | 17 | 52 | 7 |
    | 2,000-2,989. | 98 | 99 | 98 | 90 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 4 | 49 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 63 | 2 | 45 | 8 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 31. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 7 | 56 | 40 | 0 | 24 | 57 | 22 | 42 | 11 |

    
    ${ }^{1}$ The percentage of bonsekecping fantitits and single perbons in the civitian noninstitutiona population has leen estimated as fullows: all Unital States, 91.7 percem; urban, 88.5 percenb; ruxal nonfarm, 94.9 percert; rural farm, 100.0 percent.
     and table 2 for the proportion of housebolips in caeh group. Housebords were classified secording to their net money income class in the first quarter of 1942 and not sccording to their income class to their oet money urome class in the frst quarter of 1942 and not socording to their income class during the week they reported on their food consumption.
    2 Approximstely the quantity of fuid mills to which the yarious dairy products included here sre equivalent in minerals and protein. (Sceg. 6 , foothote 9 , for the factors used to convert pounds of dairy prorlucts to quarts of thid milk.)
    ${ }^{3}$ Approximately the guantity of guid milk to which sweetened oondensed milk sud dry whole milk are equivalent ia mineraksand protein, (iseep, $6_{1}$ footnots 9. )
    ithe sre equivaient is Maneraks and protein, (aee 9. 6, footnots 9.
    $\delta 0.0050 \mathrm{lh}$. or less.
    6 Includes families fith incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not abown separately.
    $7 \$ 0.0050$ or lass.
    80.50 percent or leas.

    Table 23.-Poratoes, bweetpotatoes and dry beans and peas, nuts: Average quantity and money value of potaloes, sweetpotatoes, dry beans and peas, and nuto consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the Uniled States, spring $194^{2}{ }^{2}$
    

    Table 23．－Potatoes，sheetpotatoes and dry beans and peas，nuts：Average quantily and money value of potatoes，sweetpotaloes，dry beans and peas，and nuts consumed at home per household per week，and percentage of households consuming， by type of community and annual net money income class，housekeeping families and single persons in the United States，spring 1942 ：－Continued

    | Type of community and aunual det money income class（doollars） | Potatoes， sweetpotatoes |  |  | Dry beane and pers，muta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | （2） |  <br> （3） |  <br> （4） | （5） | Dry beans and peas |  |  |  |  | Nuta，pesnut butter |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  <br> （B） | （7） |  | 器 | （10） |  | 易 合 <br> （12） | ${ }^{\text {cta }}$ | 总 号 3 3 <br> （14） |
    |  | Average money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes： | 10.34 | 50.31 | 80．03 | 50.15 | 80.09 | 30.06 | \＄0．02 | 90.01 | （9） | 10.05 | \＄0． 01 | 80．01 | \＄0．04 |
    | 9498. | ． 35 | ． 32 | ． 03 | ． 13 | ． 11 | ． 09 | ． 01 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 02 |  |  |  |
    | 500－899． | ． 28 | ． 20 | ． 02 | ． 16 | ． 11 | ． 08 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （6） | ． 05 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 03 |
    | 1，000－1，499 | ． 31 | ． 28 | ． 03 | ． 17 | ． 11 | ． 08 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 08 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 1，500－1，988 | ． 32 | ． 29 | ． 03 | ． 14 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 06 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 2，000－2，099． | ． 33 | ． 31 | ． 02 | ． 15 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 07 | ． 02 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 3,000 or over | ． 37 | ． 34 | ． 03 | ． 16 | ． 07 | ． 04 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 06 | ． 03 | ． 01 | ． 0.5 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classen ${ }^{5}$ | ． 28 | ． 27 | ． 02 | ． 14 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （b） | ． 06 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 6－489．． | ． 21 | ． 19 | ． 02 | ． 11 | ． 09 | ． 07 | ． 01 | ． 01 |  | ． 02 |  |  | ． 02 |
    | $500-989$ | ． 24 | ． 22 | ． 02 | ． 13 | ． 10 | ． 07 | ． 02 | ． 01 | 10.00 | ． 03 | （8） | （8） | ． 03 |
    | 1，000－1，499．．．．．－－ | ． 28 | ． 24 | ． 02 | ． 16 | ． 10 | ． 07 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （9） | ． 68 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 1，500－1，999．．．．．．． | ． 28 | ． 28 | ． 02 | ． 14 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 08 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 2，000－2，999 | ． 32 | .30 | ． 02 | ． 15 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 07 | ． 02 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 3.000 or over．－－－．． | ． 37 | ． 34 | ． 03 | ． 15 | ． 06 | ． 09 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 08 | ． 03 | ． 01 | ． 85 |
    | drban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes E．．．．．．．．．－ | ． 28 | ． 27 | ． 02 | ． 13 | ． 07 | ． 04 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 06 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 0.488 | ． 28 | ． 19 | ． 03 | ． 08 | ． 07 | ． 00 | ${ }^{(3)}$ | ． 01 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | ． 01 | （8） | （8） | ． 01 |
    | 6 60\％－990－ | .19 | ． 17 | ． 02 | ． 10 | ． 08 | ． 05 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． 02 |
    | 1，000－1，409 | ． 24 | ． 21 | ． 03 | ． 15 | ． 09 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 02 | （8） | ． 08 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 04 |
    | 1，500－1，999 | ． 27 | ． 24 | ． 02 | ． 11 | ． 08 | ． 04 | ． 01 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 05 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 03 |
    | 2，000－2，499 | ． 27 | ． 26 | ． 01 | ． 12 | ． 07 | ． 04 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 05 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 09 |
    | 2，500－2，989． | ． 35 | ． 33 | ． 02 | ． 17 | ． 08 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 09 | ． 08 | ． 01 | ． 08 |
    | 3，000－4，099 | ． 39 | ． 36 | ． 03 | ． 14 | ． 06 | ． 03 | ． 02 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 08 | ． 02 | ． 01 | ． 05 |
    | 5，000－9，989 | ． 34 | .31 | ． 03 | ． 16 | ． 05 | ． 02 | ． 02 | ． 01 | ． 00 | ． 11 | ． 04 | ． 01 | ． 06 |
    | sthal nospary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All ctasieas | ． 31 | ． 29 | ． 02 | ． 18 | ． 33 | ． 09 | ． 03 | ． 01 | ${ }^{(6)}$ | ． 00 | ． 01 | （3） | ． 05 |
    | 0－499 | ． 21 | ． 19 | ． 02 | ． 13 | ． 10 | ． 08 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 00 | ． 03 | （8） | （8） | ． 08 |
    | $500-993$ | ． 33 | ． 30 | ． 03 | ． 20 | ． 14 | ． 11 | ． 02 | ， 01 | ． 00 | ． 06 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 05 |
    | 1，000－1．499． | ． 30 | ． 29 | ． 01 | ． 22 | ． 14 | ． 11 | ． 03 | （8） | ． 00 | ． 08 | ． 03 | （6） | ． 05 |
    | 1，500－1，989 | ． 35 | ． 33 | ． 02 | ． 19 | ． 12 | ． 07 | ． 03 | ． 02 | ． 00 | ． 07 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 05 |
    | 2，000－2，993－ | ． 39 | ． 36 | ． 03 | ． 19 | .11 | ． 07 | ． 04 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | （8） | ． 08 | ． 02 | ． 00 | ． 08 |
    | 3，000 or over | ． 35 | ． 31 | ． 04 | ． 23 | ． 13 | ． 08 | ． 03 | （8） | ． 00 | ． 12 | ． 04 | ． 01 | ． 07 |
    | remal marm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All clabseas ${ }^{5}$－ | ． 82 | ． 48 | ． 04 | ． 21 | ． 15 | ． 10 | ． 02 | ． 02 | ，0） | ． 0 A | ． 02 | （8） | ． 04 |
    | 0－499． | ． 59 | .54 .45 | ． 05 | － 20 | ${ }_{.}^{16}$ | ． 12 | ． 01 | ． 021 | （8） 01 | ． 04 | ． 01 | ． 01 | ． 02 |
    | $1.000-1,409$ | ． 61 | ． 56 | ． 02 | ． 24 | .13 | ． 11 | ． 01 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 09 | ． 03 | （8） | ． 03 |
    | 1，500－1，999．－．．．．．． | ． 6.5 | ． 57 | ． 08 | ． 18 | ． 11 | .07 | ． 04 | （8） | ． 00 | ． 05 | ． 01 | （8） | ． 05 |
    | 2，000－2，899． | ． 53 | ． 49 | ． 04 | ． 21 | ， 14 | ． 09 | ． 04 | ． 01 | ． 00 | ． 07 | ． 02 | ． 00 | －05 |
    | 3，000 or over．．．．．－ | ． 38 | ． 35 | ． 03 | ． 13 | ． 09 | ． 07 | ． 02 | （8） | （8） | ． 04 | ． 02 | ． 00 | ． 02 |

    See footnotes at end of table．

    Table 23.-Potatoee, sweetpotatoes and diy beans and peas, nute: Average quantity and money value of potatoes rooeetpotatoes, $d r y$ beans and peas, and nufs consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the Unityd Slates, spring 194 2 $^{1}$-Continued
    
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 23.-Potatoes, sweetpotatoes and dry beans and peas, yuts: Average quantity and money value of potaloes, swectpotatoes, dry beans and peas, and nuts consumet at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming. by type of community and annual net money income class, hausekeeping families and singie persons in the United States, spring 19.4. 1-Continued
    

    1 See table 2ly, fnotnote 1.
    $\because$ Inchdes canned, boiled potatoes, bat exeludes commerciaily prepared potato chips, canaed shoestring and fried potatoes, wtich arp entered with canned and cooked food mistures (table 28 ).
    $\therefore$ 1relades the weight of dry beans-not canned, peas, lentils, and corn added to 40 percent of the weight of canned dry treans.
    i [ron!ades the weight of shelled nuts and peanut butter added to $8 C$ percent of the weight of nuts-in sthell.
    ar Irclades families with negative incomes, not showen separateiy.
    6 Ireludes families with ineomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately.

    - $0.64130!11$. or less.

    8 Ese.0050 or less.

    - 0.50 percent or less.

    Table 24．－Green and yellow vegetables and tomatoes，crtrus fruit：Average quantity and money value of green and yellow vegetables and tomatoes，citrus fruit consumed at home per household per week，and percentage of households consuming，by type of community and annual net money income class，housekeeping families and single persons in the United Slates，spring $194 \%{ }^{1}$

    | Type of community and annual net money income class（dollars） <br> （1） | Green and yellow vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | （3） | Fresh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  | Leafy green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other than leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  | （1） | 旡 | 뜬 ¢ 己 （6） |  | （8） |  | 宕 | C－ | （12） | 岛 号 （13） | 管 |  <br> （15） | （16） |  | 节 岛 ¢ （18） | 雼 （19） | 器 号 （20） | 品 <br> 商 <br> 0 <br> （21） |  | （23） |
    |  | Average quantity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | United states | Lb． 7.23 | Lb． 5.78 | $L b$. 3.75 | Lb． 1.76 | $L 6$. 0.02 | $L b$. 0.13 | $L b$. 0.04 | $L b$. 0.16 | Lb． 0.40 | Lb． 0.21 | $L b$. $0.93$ | $L b$. $0.10$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 2.03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.52 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.04 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.33 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.06 \end{gathered}$ | Lb． <br> （4） | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.26 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} L b . \\ 0.05 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & L b . \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ |
    | 0－499 | 5.57 | 4.54 | 3.65 | 1.72 | ． 02 | ． 12 | ． 01 | ． 34 | .12 | ． 43 | ． 64 | ． 25 |  | ． 16 | $\stackrel{4}{4})_{03}$ | ． 21 | ． 01 | $0_{0.01}^{(4)}$ | .25 .17 | .23 .49 | ． 02 | ． 01 |
    | 500－999 | 6.15 | 4.84 | 3.56 | 1.81 | （4） 04 | ． 07 | ． 04 | ． 21 | .26 .35 | ． 35 | ． 67 | ． 11 | 1.28 1.42 | ． 28 | ． 03 | ． 24 | ． 02 | ${ }_{\text {（4）}}^{0.01}$ | ． 17 | ． 49 | ． 024 | （4） |
    | 1，000－1，499 | 6.60 6.81 | 4.96 5.18 | 3.54 | 1.87 1.78 | ${ }^{(4)}$ | ． 07 | ． 07 | ． 13 | ． 35 | ． 14 | ．83 | ． 08 | 1.42 1.74 | ． 34 | ． 02 | ． 22 | ． 02 | ${ }^{(4)}$ | ． 13 | ． 68 | ． 04 | ${ }^{.01}$ |
    | 1，500－1，999 | 8.81 | 5.18 6.46 | 3.44 | 1.78 1.68 | ． 02 | ． 23 | ． 03 | ． 12 | ． 58 | .11 | 1.04 | ． 05 | 2.60 | ． 68 | ． 05 | ． 38 | ． 09 | ． 01 | ． 24 | 1.05 | ． 07 | ． 03 |
    | 3，000 or over | 9.21 | 7.68 | 4.09 | 1.74 | ． 00 | .16 | ． 04 | ． 04 | ． 67 | ． 07 | 1.28 | ． 09 | 3.59 | 1.05 | ． 07 | ． 57 | ． 12 | （4） | ． 50 | 1.12 | ． 12 | ． 04 |
    |  | 7.12 | 5.72 | 3.55 | 1.66 | ． 01 | ． 13 | ． 04 | ． 12 | ． 45 | ． 13 | ． 93 | ． 08 | 2.17 | ． 55 | ． 04 | ． 36 | ． 07 | $\left.{ }^{4}\right)$ | ． 25 | ． 82 | ． 00 | ． 02 |
    | 0－499 | 3.83 | 3.21 | 2.58 | 1.28 | （4） | ． 10 | ． 02 | ． 24 | ． 09 | ． 21 | ． 46 | ． 18 | ． 63 | ． 15 | （4） | ． 17 | ． 01 | （4） | ． 07 | ． 21 | ． 01 | ． 01 |
    | 500－999 | 5.78 | 4.59 | 3.21 | 1.61 | ． 02 | ． 08 | ． 04 | ． 20 | .29 | ． 31 | ． 60 | ． 06 | 1.38 | ． 26 | ． 03 | ． 30 | ． 04 | （4） | ． 16 | ． 54 | ． 03 | （4） |
    | 1，000－1，499 | 6.45 | 4.88 | 3.44 | 1.83 | （4） | ． 06 | ． 05 | ． 12 | ． 38 | ． 12 | ． 80 | ． 08 | 1.45 | ． 31 | ． 02 | ． 22 | ． 02 | （4） | .14 | ． 69 | ． 05 | ${ }^{(4)}$ |
    | 1，500－1，999 | 9.67 | 5.08 | 3.34 | 1.70 | ． 04 | ． 06 | ． 06 | ． 09 | ． 33 | ． 05 | ． 96 | ． 05 | 1.74 | ． 36 | ． 03 | ． 30 | ． 06 | ${ }^{(4)}$ | .16 | $\begin{array}{r}.78 \\ \hline 109\end{array}$ | ． 04 | ． 03 |
    | 2，000－2，999． | 8.09 | 6.53 | 3.85 | 1.66 | ． 02 | ． 22 | ． 03 | ． 12 | ． 61 | ． 08 | 1.06 | ． 05 | 2.68 | ． 70 | ． 05 | ． 38 | ． 09 | （4） 01 | ． 26 | 1.09 1.14 | ． 12 | ． 03 |
    | 3，000 or over． | 9.36 | 7.85 | 4.15 | 1.75 | ． 00 | ． 14 | ． 04 | ． 04 | ． 70 | ． 07 | 1.31 | ． 10 | 3.70 | 1.07 | ． 08 | ． 60 | ． 12 | $\left.{ }^{4}\right)$ | ． 53 | 1.14 | ． 12 | ． 04 |

    


    
     money income class, housekeeping families atul single persons in the Unitcd States, spring $10481 . C O n t i n u e d$
    
    

    | Type of community and annual net money income class（dollars） | Green and yellow vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Fresh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | （2） | 岕 | Leafy green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other than leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  | （4） | （5） |  <br> （6） | （7） | （8） | （9） |  <br> （10） | 题荡 <br> （11） |  <br> （12） |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{y}{6}$ | 芘 | 䓪 | 皆 | 亳 |
    | （1） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | （14） | （15） | （16） | （17） | （18） | （19） | （20） | （21） | （22） | （23） |
    | URBAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | urban <br> All classes ${ }^{5}$ | 95 | 92 | 88 | 44 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 25 | 4 | 71 | 4 | 71 | 24 | 3 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 14 | 54 | 4 | 3 |
    | 0－499． | 75 | 72 | 65 | 25 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 31 | 2 | 33 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 1 |
    | 500－999 | 93 | 84 | 78 | 44 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 9 | 51 | 4 | 58 | 13 | 2 | 22 | 4 | 1 | ${ }^{9}$ | 37 | 3 4 | 2 1 |
    | 1，000－1，499－ | 93 | 90 | 86 | 48 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 64 | 7 | 58 | 14 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 43 | 4 | 1 |
    | 1，500－1，999 | 96 | 92 | 89 | 45 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 19 | $\stackrel{2}{5}$ | 76 | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | 67 78 | 16 29 | 1 | 21 | 5 5 | 1 | 8 13 | 61 | 4 6 | 2 |
    | 2，000－2，499 | 97 | 95 | 90 | 43 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 29 | 5 | 78 | 2 | 78 82 | 29 30 | 4 | 21 28 | 5 | 0 2 | 15 | 66 | 2 | 2 |
    | 2，500－2，999 | 100 | 99 | 95 | 54 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 3 3 | 83 85 | 3 6 | 82 86 | 30 33 | 4 | 38 | ${ }_{10}^{5}$ | $(7)$ | 21 | 66 | 6 | 5 |
    | $3,000-4,999$ $5,000-9,999$ | 99 98 | 98 97 | 94 93 | 45 37 | 0 | 3 3 | 1 | 1 | 28 36 | 3 2 | 85 81 | 6 8 | 86 86 | 33 47 | 5 | 30 42 | 10 5 | ${ }_{0}$ | 34 | 66 66 | 3 | 2 |
    | 5，000－9，999 | 98 | 97 | 93 | 37 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 36 | 2 | 81 | 8 | 80 | 47 | 10 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{\text {ratal }}$ NONFARM | 92 | 86 | 82 | 42 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 59 | 5 | 45 | 14 | 2 | 9 | 3 | （7） | 7 | 32 | 2 | 1 |
    | 0－499 | 84 | 78 | 74 | 33 | （7） | 4 | 1 | 16 | 4 | 9 | 41 | 8 | 27 | 9 | （7） | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 1 |
    | 500－999 | 91 | 79 | 76 | 38 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 6 | 11 | 49 | 4 | 38 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 1 |
    | 1，000－1，499． | 94 | 86 | 83 | 46 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 65 | 5 | 44 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | ${ }_{0}$ | 33 | 2 | 1 |
    | 1，500－1，999 | 97 | 93 | 87 | 46 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 68 | 5 | 53 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 0 | $\stackrel{9}{11}$ | 37 51 | 1 | 2 |
    | 2，000－2，999． | 99 | 95 | 91 | 45 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 5 | ${ }_{24}^{17}$ | ${ }_{11}$ | 75 76 | 4 | 68 71 | 22 36 | 2 4 | 10 15 | 6 3 | 0 | 119 | 51 57 | 11 | 3 |
    | 3，000 or over | 97 | 94 | 90 | 58 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 24 | 11 | 76 | 6 | 71 | 36 | 4 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 19 | b | 1 |  |
    | rural farm <br> All classes ${ }^{3}$ | 93 | 84 | 82 | 42 | （7） | 5 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 54 | 6 | 37 | 12 | 1 | 6 | （7） | （7） | 9 | 19 | 1 | 1 |
    | 0－499 | 93 | 86 | 82 | 40 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 18 | 44 | 8 | 33 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | （7） | 1 |
    | 500－999 | 95 | 85 | 81 | 39 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 12 | 52 | 11 | 24 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 2 |
    | 1，000－1，499． | 90 | 82 | 82 | 47 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 62 | 3 | 30 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
    | 1，500－1，999． | 92 | 85 | 85 | 56 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 67 | 2 | 60 | 23 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 37 | 4 | 0 |
    | 2，000－2，999 | 94 | 80 | 76 | 41 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 51 | 6 | 37 | 14 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
    | 3，000 or over－ | 96 | 92 | 86 | 45 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 73 | 2 | 59 | 29 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 47 | 0 |  |

     ind tomatoes, cilrus fruit conswmed at home por houschold per week, and percontage of homseholds consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeepring families and single persons in the United States, spring ittio -Continued
    

    Table 24,-Green and yellow vegetables and tomatofs, citrus fritit Avetage quartity and money value of green and yellow vegetables money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1042 1-Continued
    
    

    Table 24.-Green and yellow vegetables and tomatoles, citros fedt: Average quantily and money value of green and yellow vegelables and tomatoes, citrus fruit consumed al home per houschold per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19;2 1 —Continued
    
    


     and tomatoes, citrus fruit ronsumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households comsuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, howstkeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19421 —Continued
    
    
     the (Vnited Stutes, siming 1942'
    

    Tanle 25.-Othen vigitables and fhoit: Average quantity and money value of other vegetables and fruit consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of houstholds consuming, by type of community and annual net money intome class, housekeepring families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 - Continued
    
    

    TABLE 25.-OTHER VEGRTABLES AND FRUTY: Average quantity and money value of other vegetables and frut consumed at home per householi per reek, and percentage of households conswming, by type of community and anmal not money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{1}-$ Continued
    
    

    Table 25.-OTheh vegetables and prutr: Average quantity and money value of other vegetables and fruit consumed at home per household per
     the United States, spring 1942 1-Continued
    
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 25.-Other vegetables and frotit: Average quantity and money value of other vegetables and fruit consumed at home per household per
     the Inited States, spring 1948 -Continued
    

    SURAL NONYAFR
    

    | . 29 | . 08 | . 04 | . 08 | 8) | (B) | (8) | (6) | (6) | . 01 | (6) | . 03 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 14 | . $0 \stackrel{\square}{5}$ | . 113 | . 04 | (10) | . 04 | (6) | 00 | . 001 | . 0 (0) | . 00 | . 02 |
    | . 15 | . 13 | . 06 | .104 | . 10 | . 00 | . 014 | . 60 | . 00 | . 01 | . 00 | 01 |
    | 23 | . 0 | . 08 | . 0.4 | (5) | , (0) | . 00 | .00 | (6) | (6) | (6) | . 04 |
    | . 35 | . 12 | . 10 | . 10 | . 010 | (6) | . 00 | (E) | (6) | (6) | (6) | . 03 |
    | . 36 | . 11 | . 10 | . 08 | . 10 | . 00 | . 00 | . 01 | (6) | . 01 | . 00 | . 07 |
    | . 53 | . 013 | .13 | . 23 | (in) | . 00 | .00 | (5) | (6) | . 04 | .00 | . 03 |
    | . 22 | . 07 | . 67 | . 05 | . 00 | (8) | (6) | (8) | (5) | (3) | (6) | . 03 |
    | . 16 | . 06 | . 35 | . 03 | . 00 | (6) | (5) | (6) | (6) | (b) | (6) | . 02 |
    | .23 | . 67 | . 06 | . 06 | . 00 | (6) | . 90 | (c) | . 00 | (B) | (6) | . 03 |
    | . 36 | . 11 | . 04 | . 07 | . 00 | (c) | . 00 | . 00 | (i) | (6) | +00 | . 09 |
    | . 40 | . 14 | . 13 | . 10 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | (6) | , 00 | . 03 |
    | . 34 | . 08 | .13 | . 08 | . 00 | (6) | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | .01 | (6) | . 04 |
    | . 33 | .30 | . 09 | . 09 | .00 | ( 6 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | (5) | . 00 | . 04 |


    | , 00 | . 27 | (6) | . 02 | . 12 | . 03 | . 03 | . 02 | . 01 | . 04 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | . 00 | . 00 | . 21 | . 02 | . 11 | . 03 | . 01 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | (b) | . 04 |
    | . 00 | (6) | . 27 | . 62 | . 12 | . 03 | . 02 | . 04 | (c) | . 04 |
    | . 61 | . 01 | . 31 | . 03 | . 13 | . 03 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | . 0 ¢ |
    | . 00 | . 00 | . 31 | . 62 | . 14 | . 04 | . 03 | . 02 | . 01 | . 03 |
    | . 00 | .00 | . 34 | . 01 | .13 | . 03 | . 06 | . 03 | . 03 | . 05 |
    | .00 | . 01 | . 38 | . 03 | . 10 | . 03 | . 06 | . 05 | . 02 | . 14 |
    | . 00 | (c) | . 44 | . 04 | . 19 | . 06 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | . 11 |
    | . 00 | (6) | . 45 | . 03 | . 19 | . 06 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | . 11 |
    | . 00 | . 00 | . 55 | . 06 | . 21 | . 08 | . 02 | . 02 | (b) | . 18 |
    | . 00 | . 00 | . 61 | . 06 | . 22 | . 09 | . 04 | . 01 | . 01 | . 18 |
    | . 00 | . 00 | . 45 | . 04 | . 21 | . 06 | . 03 | . 02 | . 01 | . 08 |
    | . 01 | . 00 | . 39 | . 03 | . 17 | . 07 | . 03 | . 01 | . 01 | . 07 |
    | . 00 | (6) | . 36 | . 01 | . 12 | . 05 | . 05 | . 01 | . 03 | . 09 |

    Percentare of househoids

    | Lenten states |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Alt clabsey ${ }^{3}$ | 71 | 39 | 34 | 27 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 | ( ${ }^{\text {( })}$ | 1 | 61 | 10 | 34 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 13 |
    | 0-499. | 45 | 22 | 17 | 30 | 0 |  | ( ${ }^{7}$ | (7) | (7) |  |  | 9 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 12 | 32 | 8 | 5 | 3 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 14 |
    | 500-999. | 61 | 36 | 24 | 14 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{1} 1$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 | (7) | 57 | 13 | 33 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 73 | 40 | 33 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | (3) | 11 | 0 | 2 | 62 | 10 | 34 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 14 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 77 | 42 | 38 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 13 | $\pm$ | 1 | 59 | 8 | 32 | 14 | $\pm 5$ | ${ }^{8}$ | 7 | 12 |
    | 2,000-2,989 | 82 | 48 | 43 | 31 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 14 | ( ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 67 | 7 | 35 | 15 | ${ }_{23}^{21}$ | 13 | 10 | 12 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 86 | 47 | 46 | 47 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | (J) | 2 | 72 | 8 | 36 | 18 | 23 | 17 | 13 |  |
    | All classer ${ }^{\text {a }}$------------- | 74 | 42 | 36 | 28 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | ( ${ }^{7}$ | 1 | 60 | 8 | 31 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 8 | 12 |
    | $0-499$ | 45 | 23 | 10 | 10 | 0 |  | (7) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 7 | 25 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
    | $500-989$. | 60 | 36 | 23 | 14 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | (1) | 52 | 11 | 27 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 73 | 42 | 33 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | (7) | 9 | 0 | 2 | 59 | 8 | 32 | 6 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 13 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 76 | 42 | 38 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 58 | 7 | 30 | 13 | 16 | 8 | $\begin{array}{r}8 \\ 11 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 12 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 82 | 49 | 43 | 32 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 67 | 7 | 34 | 15 | 22 | 14 | 13 |  |
    | 3,600 or over | 80 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 12 | (7) | 2 | 72 | 9 | 35 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 13 | 14 |

    Table 25.-Othet vegetables and fritit: Average quantity and money value of other vegetables and fruit consumed at home per household per week, and percentoge of households consuming. by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $194 \mathbf{N B}^{1}$-Continued
    
    

    1 See tabie 22, footrote 1
    2 Includes the weight of fresh and canned products added to four times ine weight of dried fruit.
    3 Includes families with negative incomes, not shown separately.
    < 0.0050 jb . or less.
    Includes famidies witi incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shown separately 030.0050 or lebs.
    70.50 percent or less.

    Table 26.-Meat, poulithy, fish and eggs: Average quantity and money value of meat, poultry, fish and eggs consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19f2 ${ }^{1}$
    

    Meat, poultry, fish

    Aversge quantity
    .21
    
    MISC. PUB. 050 , U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Pable 26 ,-Meat, pouithy, yish and eggs: Avetage quantify and money value of meat, poultry, fish and eggs consumed al home per household
    per week, and percentage of households consuming. by type of community and annual nel money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 19.22 ${ }^{1}$-Continued
    

    | bural noyfarm All classes 6....-........- | 1.80 | . 63 | . 14 | . 05 | . 12 | . 08 | . 06 | . 13 | . 03 | . 01 | . 01 | . 03 | . 03 | (9) | . 46 | . 11 | . 03 | . 07 | . 02 |  |  | . 04 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | $0 \cdot 499$ | . 75 | . 23 | . 07 | . 02 | . 01 | . 03 | . 04 | . 05 | . 01 | ${ }^{9}$ ) | (9) | . 01 | . 01 | (9) | . 18 | . 04 | . 00 | . 04 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 01 | . 08 | . 01 |
    | 500-999 | 1.54 | . 50 | . 11 | . 05 | . 09 | . 05 | . 07 | . 10 | . 02 | . 01 | (9) | . 02 | . 02 | (9) | . 38 | . 09 | . 02 | . 08 | . 01 | . 02 | .10 | 07 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 1.73 | . 62 | . 11 | . 03 | . 09 | . 12 | . 09 | . 12 | . 03 | . 02 | . 01 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | . 46 | . 10 | . 05 | . 06 | . 03 | . 07 | . 10 | . 05 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 2.29 | . 76 | 18 | . 04 | . 15 | . 08 | . 08 | .16 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 05 | . 05 | (9) | . 62 | . 17 | . 05 | . 09 | . 01 | . 04 | . 22 | . 04 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 2.83 | . 92 | . 21 | . 09 | . 15 | . 11 | . 03 | . 24 | . 05 | . 02 | . 02 | . 07 | . 06 | . 01 | . 78 | . 20 | . 10 | . 10 | . 02 | . 13 | . 21 | . 02 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 3.32 | 1.43 | . 37 | . 14 | . 44 | . 12 | . 06 | . 20 | . 07 | . 02 | . 01 | . 11 | . 11 | . 00 | . 73 | . 20 | $\left({ }^{9}\right)$ | . 09 | . 02 | . 10 | . 27 | . 05 |
    | All classes ${ }^{6}$ | 2.22 | . 53 | . 14 | . 04 | . 09 | . 07 | . 08 | . 08 | . 01 | . 01 | . 01 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | . 79 | . 06 | . 04 | . 11 | . 02 | . 03 | . 41 | . 12 |
    | 0-499. | 1.65 | . 32 | . 07 | . 01 | . 05 | . 06 | . 06 | . 05 | . 00 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 02 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | . 49 | . 03 | . 03 | . 08 | . 01 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 29 | . 05 |
    | 500-999. | 2.08 | . 42 | . 14 | (9) | . 08 | . 05 | . 08 | . 06 | . 00 | . 00 | . 01 | . 01 | . 01 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 77 | . 07 | . 04 | . 12 | . 04 | . 05 | . 42 | . 03 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 2.70 | . 62 | . 18 | . 08 | . 07 | . 07 | . 07 | . 08 | . 04 | . 02 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 1.18 | . 04 | . 03 | .16 | . 03 | . 02 | . 78 | . 12 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 2.97 | . 92 | . 24 | . 04 | . 11 | . 20 | . 14 | . 11 | . 04 | . 04 | . 00 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | 1.16 | . 14 | . 09 | . 15 | . 01 | . 09 | . 53 | . 15 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 3.36 | . 83 | . 32 | . 03 | .17 | . 02 | . 09 | . 14 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | . 08 | . 08 | . 00 | 1.29 | . 16 | . 05 | .15 | . 02 | . 17 | . 60 | . 14 |
    | 3,000 or over- | 3.37 | 1.18 | . 31 | . 22 | . 31 | . 09 | . 12 | . 11 | (9) | . 02 | . 00 | . 06 | . 01 | . 05 | . 68 | . 17 | . 03 | . 12 | . 02 | . 09 | . 21 | . 04 |
    | united states | Percentage of households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes 6 | 95 | 73 | 28 | 16 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 33 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 3 | 60 | 28 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 5 |
    | 0-499 | 81 | 38 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | (10) | 40 | 10 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 6 |
    | 500-999 | 95 | 63 | 23 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 55 | 19 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 6 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 97 | 72 | 27 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 30 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 62 | 27 | 6 | 21 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 6 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 99 | 85 | 32 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 40 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 16 | 4 | 65 | 36 | 6 | 21 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 3 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 99 | 88 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 20 | 19 | 44 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 18 | 17 | 3 | 66 | 37 | 8 | 21 | 5 | 17 | 12 | 3 |
    | 3,000 or over | 100 | 89 | 37 | 26 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 43 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 22 | 19 | 4 | 68 | 36 | 8 | 21 | 5 | 18 | 12 | 4 |
    | All classes 6 | 96 | 79 | 31 | 18 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 37 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 13 | 3 | 60 | 31 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 13 | 8 | 4 |
    | 0-499 | 79 | 43 | 11 | 0 | , | 3 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | (10) | 36 | 13 | (10) | 16 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
    | 500-999 | 96 | 69 | 26 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 27 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 54 | 22 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 6 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 97 | 76 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 32 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 61 | 30 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 5 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 99 | 86 | 32 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 41 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 17 | 4 | 64 | 38 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 3 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 99 | 89 | 37 | 25 | 11 | 21 | 20 | 46 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 19 | 17 | 4 | 66 | 38 | 8 | 20 | 5 | 17 | 10 | 2 |
    | 3,000 or over | 100 | 90 | 38 | 26 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 45 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 23 | 21 | 4 | 68 | 36 | 8 | 20 | 5 | 18 | 11 | 4 |
    | All classes 8-- | 98 | 84 | 33 | 22 | 11 | 15 | 18 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 16 | 4 | 64 | 35 | 7 | 20 | 6 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
    | 0-499. | 84 | 52 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 17 | 1 | 21 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
    | 500-999 | 99 | 74 | 29 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 29 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 57 | 24 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 6 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 97 | 80 | 34 | 18 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 33 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 66 | 35 | 7 | 23 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 5 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 99 | 89 | 34 | 20 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 43 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 25 | 20 | 5 | 66 | 40 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 14 | 5 | 2 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | 99 | 90 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 26 | 23 | 50 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 21 | 18 | 3 | 69 | 42 | 11 | 21 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 2 |
    | 2,500-2,999. | 99 | 91 | 39 | 23 | 15 | 16 | 20 | 41 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 21 | 20 | 5 | 61 | 37 | 4 | 16 | 6 | 18 | 11 | 2 |
    | 3,000-4,999 | 100 | 88 | 35 | 26 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 48 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 23 | 20 | 3 | 69 | 38 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 20 | 12 | 4 |
    | 5,000-9,999.. | 100 | 95 | 39 | 27 | 30 | 15 | 14 | 46 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 27 | 24 | 8 | 69 | 41 | 10 | 27 | 7 | 19 | 7 | 3 |

    
     sons in the Unites States, spring 10/2 $1 .$. Continued
    

    Table 26.-Meat, pooltry, fish and eggs: Average quandify and money value of meat, poultry, fish and eggs consamed at home per household per ueck, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekecping familics and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 1 -Continued
    

    Tablef 26.-Meat, poultry, fish and fggs: Average guantily and money value of meot, poultry, fish aud eggs consumed at home per household per week, and percentoge of households consuming, by type of community and annual nel money inc ine class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{1}$-Continued
    
    

    Table 26.-Meat, poujthy, hish and eges: Average quantify and money value of meat, poulty, fish and eggs consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by iype of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 L-Continued

    Mest, poultry, fixh-continued

    Type of community and annua! net money income class (dollars)
    
    
    

    Table 26.-Meat, poulthy, fise and eggs: Average quantity and money value of meat, pioultry, fish and eggs consumed at home pet household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by typc of community and annual nel money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{\text {- }}$-Continued
    

    Table 27.-Grain producte and vats, olls: Avetege quanfily and money value of grain products and fats, oils consumed at home per household per weck, and perceniage of households consuming, by type of communty and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spming 19/2 ${ }^{1}$ $\qquad$ . $\qquad$ Grain produets

    Type of community and sinual net imoney sacone class (dolafs)

    E'HTED 8TATES
    0 d

    | $L b$. |
    | :---: |
    | 12.54 |
    | 14.70 |
    | 13.78 |
    | 12.43 |
    | 10.76 |
    | 11.10 |
    | 11.21 |
    |  |
    |  |
    | 10.98 |
    | 10.71 |
    | 11.92 |
    | 11.56 |
    | 10.16 |
    | 10.70 |

    Bee footnotes at end of table.

    Flouri, meal, ecreals, pastes
    Cerealk, pastes

    | Total <br> (Cols. <br> $1326)$ | Honitty grits | Rice | Rolled orats | Other anicooked cureals | Cornflakes | Other reaslytoreat cereals | Macaroni, spsghetti | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg } \\ \text { noodles } \end{gathered}$ | Other ${ }^{3}$ |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (26) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |

    Table 27.-Grain products and fats, ols: Average quantity and money value of grain products and fats, oils consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persoms in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{-}$Continued
    

    | RURAL FARL | 19.94 | 17.34 | 15.71 | 10.47 | 12 | , 02 | . 04 | 4.94 | .12 | 1.63 | . 00 | . 29 | . 46 | . 08 | . 22 | .20 | . 23 | . 04 | . 02 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 0-499. | 21.21 | 19.49 | 18.10 | 11.49 | . 11 | .0) | . 02 | 6.37 | . 10 | 1.38 | . 07 | . 34 | . 42 | . 06 | . 17 | . 14 | . 14 | . 04 | . 01 |
    | $500-990$ | 21.59 | 19.37 | 17.62 | 11.85 | .13 | . 05 | . 04 | 5.46 | . 09 | 1.75 | . 07 | . 26 | . 63 | . 12 | . 23 | . 18 | . 24 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 18.33 | 15,07 | 13.07 | 10.30 | .11 | . 01 | . 21 | 2.35 | . 09 | 2.00 | . 08 | . 31 | . 50 | . 08 | . 28 | . 30 | . 43 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 16.81 | 11.69 | 9.76 | 7.62 | .00 | .00 | .10 | 1.78 | . 26 | 1.83 | . 11 | . 26 | . 45 | .17 | . 26 | . 27 | . 31 | . 07 | . 03 |
    | 2,000-2,099. | 17.31 | 13.58 | 11.39 | 9.47 | . 08 | . 00 | . 00 | 1.67 | . 17 | 2.19 | . 17 | . 33 | . 57 | . 09 | . 32 | . 38 | . 27 | . 06 | (b) |
    | 3,000 or over. | 13.40 | 9.13 | 7.37 | 6.60 | . 35 | . 06 | . 03 | . 28 | . 05 | 3.76 | . 05 | . 17 | . 39 | .12 | . 28 | . 36 | . 21 | . 12 | . 06 |
    |  | Average money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | ll classes 4. | \$1.29 | 50.46 | \$0.27 | \$0. 22 | (1) | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) | \$0.05 | (7) | 80.18 | (7) | 50.02 | \$0.03 | 50.02 | \$0.03 | 0.04 | \$0.04 | \$0.01 | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
    | 0-499 | . 90 | . 58 | . 45 | . 33 | \$0.01 | (5) | (7) | .11 | ${ }^{7}$ ) | .13 | (7) | . 02 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 01 | (7) |
    | 500-999 | 1.04 | . 52 | . 36 | . 30 | (7) | (7) | (3) | . 06 | (7) | .16 | \$0.01 | . 03 | . 04 | .01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | (7) | (7) |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.26 | . 51 | . 31 | . 26 | (7) | (7) | (i) | . 04 | \$0.01 | . 20 | ( 01 | . 02 | . 03 | . 02 | . 03 | . 04 | . 04 | . 01 | (7) |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 1.28 | . 36 | . 17 | . 15 | (7) | (T) | (7) | . 62 | (7) | . 19 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 04 | . 04 | . 01 | $\$ 0.01$ |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 1.47 | . 41 | . 17 | . 15 | (3) | (7) | (1) | . 02 | (7) | . 24 | (7) | . 03 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 05 | . 06 | . 02 | (7) |
    | 3,000 or over | 1.68 | . 38 | . 15 | .14 | (7) | (7) | (7) | . 01 | (7) | . 23 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 05 | . 05 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | ALIL NONFARM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes 4 | 1.31 | . 39 | . 21 | . 18 | (7) | (7) | (3) | . 03 | (7) | . 18 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 04 | . 04 | . 01 | (7) |
    | 0-499. | . 77 | . 44 | . 31 | . 24 | (7) | \$0.00 | ( 7 ) | . 07 | (7) | . 13 | (7) | . 02 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | (0) 01 |  |
    | 500-9999 | . 98 | . 44 | . 29 | . 25 | (7) | (7) | (7) | . 04 | (7) | . 15 | . 01 | . 03 | .63 | . 01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | (7) | (7) |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1.23 | . 46 | . 27 | . 23 | ${ }^{7}$ | (0) | (7) | . 04 | (7) | .19 | (1)1 | . 02 | . 03 | . 02 | - 02 | . 04 | . 04 | . 01 | (7) |
    | 1,500 1,999 | 1.27 | . 35 | . 16 | . 14 | (7) | (7) | (5) | . 02 | (7) | . 19 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 04 | .04 | . 01 | 01 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 1.47 | . 39 | . 15 | . 14 | (7) | (7) | (7) | (b) | (7) | . 24 | (T) | . 03 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 05 | . 06 | . 02 | (3) |
    | 3,000 or over | 1.72 | . 36 | .13 | .13 | (7) | (7) | (i) | () | (7) | . 23 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 05 | . 05 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | All classes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.33 | . 30 | . 11 | . 10 | ( ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | (7) | (7) | . 01 | (7) | . 19 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 04 | . 05 | . 01 | (7) |
    | 500-999. ${ }^{1,000-1,499}$ | .84 1.14 | $\bigcirc{ }^{.27} \times$ | .13 | . 13 | . 00 | -00 | (3) | ${ }^{(7)} .03$ | (1) | . 14 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 01 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | $\stackrel{(7)}{.01}$ | (7) |
    | $1,000-1,499$ $1.500-1,999$. | 1.14 | . 34 | . 17 | . 14 | . 00 | (7) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | (7) | . 01 | ( | . 17 | (7) | .02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 04 | . 04 | .01 | 01 |
    | 2,000-2,499. | 1.42 | .34 | . 12 | . 11 | (T) | . 00 | (3) | , 01 | (3) | . 22 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 04 | . 06 | . 02 | (7) |
    | 2,500-2,089 | 1.52 | . 32 | . 07 | . 07 | . 00 | ( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | (3) | (7) | (7) | . 25 | (7) | . 03 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 06 | . 08 | . 02 | $\left.{ }^{7}\right)$ |
    | 3,000-4,999 | 1.74 | . 35 | .15 | . 11 | (T) | (7) | (7) | (7) | (7) | . 24 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 02 | . 03 | . 05 | . 06 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | 5,000-0,099. | 1.88 | . 33 | . 11 | . 11 | (7) | $\left.{ }^{7}\right)$ | (7) | (1) | (7) | . 22 | (7) | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 | . 06 | . 05 | . 02 | . 01 |

    Table 27.-Ghain prodocts and fats, olis: Average guantity and money value of grain products and fats, oils consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of households consumong, by type of community and annual net money incone class, housekeeping families and single per sons in the United States, sjring $194 \mathbb{R}^{1}$-Continued
    
    

    Table 27.-Grain prodvets and fats, onls: Avetage quantity and money value of grain products and fats, oils consumed al home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single per-
    
    
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 27.-Ghain phodocis and fate, olis: Aterage quantity and money valuo of grain products and fals, oils consumed at home per household per week, and percentage of househohls consuming, by type of communily and annual net money income chas, househeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 1 - Continued
    
    

    Cable 27.-Guain products and fats, oils: Average quantity and money value of grain products and fats, oils consumed at home per household per week, ond percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual nel money incomie class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 1- Continued
    

    | All ciasses ${ }^{\text {remal }}$............ | 73 | 38 | 19 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 37 | 12 | 19 | 99 | 88 | 83 | 5 | 3 | 62 | 44 | 24 | 74 | 12 | 4 | 17 | 6 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 0-498 | 57 | 27 | 11 | 7 | 3 |  | 28 | 7 | 12 | 88 | 84 | 80 | 6 | 1 | 59 | 35 | 29 | 72 | 12 | 2 | 11 | 4 |
    | 500-9089 | 84 | 46 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 43 | 13 | 14 | 88 | 01 | 80 | 5 | 6 | 61 | 41 | 24 | 77 | 6 | 3 |  | 5 |
    | $1,000-1,499$ | 82 | 40 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 52 | 12 | 22 | 90 | 90 | 84 | 5 | 5 | 49 | 42 | 19 | 77 | 7 | 4 | 25 | 12 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 87 | 44 | 42 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 50 | 25 | 33 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 2 | 10 | 65 | 62 | 12 | 65 | 17 | 2 | 31 | 12 |
    | 2,000-2,009 | 88 | 55 | 27 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 41 | 20 | 35 | 100 | 84 | 86 | 6 | 4 | 65 | 49 | 18 | 69 | 12 | 8 | 25 | ${ }^{6}$ |
    | 3,000 or over. | 90 | 47 | 35 | 22 | 12 | 10 | 48 | 22 | 35 | 100 | 88 | 86 | 2 | 0 | 69 | 65 | 10 | 80 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 12 |

    1 Sec table 22, faotnele 1
    I Ineludes the weight of hours. meal, and eereals added to two-thirds of the weight of commerially baked paous.
    8 Includes buckwhest grite, mrenared flours (cake, biscuit, pancate) and popeorn.
    4 Inchudce lamiljes with negative incomes, rot shown sepsrately
    0.0050 lb , or less
    
    780.0050 or less.

    B 0.50 percent or lesa.

    T'ABLE 28.-SUGARS, SWEETS, AND MISCELiANEOUS FOODS: Average quantily and money value of sugars, sweets and miscellaneous foods consumed at home jer housthold jer veel, and prrartage of houspholds consuming, by lype of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the Unitcd States, spring 1048:
    
    

    ## See footnotes at end of tsble.

    Thale 28.-Sygars, swebts, and misceidaneocs roods: Average quantity and money value of supars, sweets and miscellaneous foods constumed at home per household per week, and percontage of houscholds consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 1-Continued

    \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{Type of community and abhal nel morey income class (dollarg)} \& \multicolumn{13}{|c|}{Sugars, sweets} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Miscellaneous foods} \\
    \hline \& \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Total (Cols. 3. 77 \\
    (2)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Sugars} \& \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Sweets} \& \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Csnned, cooked food milxtures \({ }^{2}\) \\
    (13)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Solt drinks \\
    (16)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Packaged des. serta \({ }^{3}\) \\
    (17)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Other propyietary foods 6 \\
    (18)
    \end{tabular}} \\
    \hline \& \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Total (Cols. 4-b)
    (3)} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Brown \\
    (4)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Grano-
    lsied} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Other
    (6)} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Total \\
    (Cols. 8-147 \\
    (7)
    \end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Mo.
    lasses

    (8)} \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Sirup} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Jellices.

    j8ms} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
    Freserves <br>
    (12)

    } \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{

    Candy <br>
    (13)

    } \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{

    Other <br>
    (14)
    \end{tabular}} \& \& \& \& <br>

    \hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Corn \& Other \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
    \hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& (3) \& (10) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
    \hline \& \multicolumn{17}{|c|}{Average money value} <br>
    \hline \multicolumn{18}{|l|}{} <br>
    \hline 0-499, \& . 22 \& . 69 \& . 01 \& . 08 \& ( ${ }^{4}$ ) \& . 13 \& . 03 \& . 02 \& (8) \& . 04 \& . 02 \& . 02 \& (8) \& . 02 \& . 02 \& (b) \& . 00 <br>
    \hline 500-999. \& . 28 \& . 12 \& . 01 \& . 11 \& (3) \& . 16 \& . 01 \& . 02 \& (8) \& . 07 \& . 02 \& . 03 \& . 01 \& . 04 \& . 05 \& . 02 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 1,000-1,400. \& . 35 \& .14 \& . 01 \& . 13 \& (8) \& . 21 \& . 01 \& . 02 \& . 01 \& . 07 \& . 02 \& . 07 \& . 01 \& . 04 \& . 09 \& . 03 \& .01 <br>
    \hline 1,600-1.999. \& . 32 \& . 13 \& . 01 \& .12 \& (8) \& . 19 \& . 01 \& .01 \& (8) \& . 07 \& . 02 \& . 08 \& (3) \& . 04 \& +12 \& . 05 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 2,000-2,999 $\ldots$ \& . 39 \& . 14 \& . 01 \& . 13 \& (8) \& . 25 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& . 07 \& . 08 \& . 12 \& . 0 t \& . 07 \& . 18 \& . 05 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 3.600 or oves \& . 43 \& . 14 \& . 01 \& +13 \& (3) \& . 29 \& . 01 \& , 1 \& . 01 \& . 09 \& . 03 \& . 13 \& . 01 \& . 07 \& . 25 \& . 06 \& . 03 <br>
    \hline Alf dasees ${ }^{5}$.... \& . 32 \& . 12 \& . 01 \& . 11 \& ( ${ }^{\text {) }}$ \& . 20 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& ( ${ }^{\text {r }}$ \& . 06 \& . 02 \& . 09 \& . 01 \& . 06 \& .16 \& . 04 \& . 08 <br>
    \hline 0-499. \& . 25 \& . 06 \& . 01 \& . 05 \& (8) \& . 09 \& . 02 \& . 01 \& ( ${ }^{4}$ \& . 02 \& . 01 \& . 02 \& . 01 \& . 03 \& . 02 \& . 01 \& . 00 <br>
    \hline 500-999. \& .21 \& . 09 \& .01 \& . 08 \& (8) \& . 12 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& (8) \& . 05 \& . 01 \& .03 \& . 01 \& . 04 \& . 04 \& . 02 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 1,000-1,489. \& . 29 \& . 12 \& . 01 \& . 11 \& (8) \& . 17 \& 01 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& . 05 \& . 02 \& . 06 \& . 08 \& . 05 \& . 11 \& . 03 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 1,500-1.999 \& . 26 \& .11 \& , 01 \& .10 \& (8) \& . 15 \& (8) \& . 01 \& (a) \& . 05 \& . 02 \& . 07 \& (a) \& . 04 \& .11 \& . 05 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 2,000-2,499 \& . 39 \& . 14 \& . 01 \& , 13 \& ${ }^{(8)}$ \& . 25 \& . 01 \& .ot \& (8) \& . 07 \& . 02 \& . 13 \& . 08 \& . 07 \& . 17 \& . 05 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 2,500-2,998 \& . 32 \& .13 \& . 01 \& .12 \& (8) \& . 19 \& (8) \& .01 \& . 01 \& . 08 \& . 01 \& . 10 \& . 01 \& +08 \& . 21 \& . 05 \& . 01 <br>
    \hline 3,000-4,999. \& . 41 \& . 13 \& . 01 \& . 12 \& ${ }^{8}{ }^{8}$ \& . 28 \& (8) \& . 01 \& . 01 \& +08 \& . 03 \& . 14 \& . 01 \& . 08 \& . 20 \& . 06 \& (8) <br>
    \hline $5,000-9,909$. \& . 47 \& . 15 \& . 02 \& . 13 \& ${ }^{(8)}$ \& . 32 \& . 02 \& . 01 \& . 01 \& . 12 \& . 01 \& . 13 \& . 02 \& . 05 \& . 46 \& . 05 \& ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br>
    \hline
    \end{tabular}

    | Atl classes 5.............. | . 41 | . 15 | . 01 | . 14 | (8) | . 26 | . 02 | . 03 | . 01 | . 09 | . 03 | . 07 | . 01 | . 03 | . 08 | . 03 | (8) |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 0-499 | . 26 | . 11 | . 01 | . 10 | (8) | . 15 | . 03 | . 03 | ${ }^{8}$ ) | . 05 | . 02 | . 02 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | . 02 | . 02 | (8) | . 00 |
    | $500-999$ | . 44 | . 18 | . 02 | . 16 | (8) | . 26 | . 02 | . 04 | . 01 | . 10 | . 03 | . 04 | . 02 | . 03 | . 06 | . 03 | (8) |
    | 1,000-1,499 | . 48 | . 17 | . 01 | . 16 | (8) | . 31 | . 02 | . 03 | . 01 | . 11 | . 03 | . 09 | . 02 | . 02 | . 06 | . 02 | ( |
    | 1,500-1,999 | . 49 | . 17 | . 01 | . 16 | (8) | . 32 | . 02 | . 02 | . 01 | . 14 | . 03 | . 10 | (8) | . 03 | . 13 | . 04 | . 00 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | . 53 | . 19 | . 02 | . 17 | $\left.{ }^{8}\right)$ | . 34 | . 01 | . 03 | . 01 | . 12 | . 05 | .11 |  | . 05 | . 14 | . 04 | . 01 |
    | 3,000 or over.-.--.... | . 51 | . 18 | . 01 | . 16 | . 01 | . 33 | . 02 | . 01 | (8) | .10 | . 04 | .16 | (8) | . 05 |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{5}$ | . 59 | . 21 | . 02 | . 19 | (8) | . 38 | . 05 | . 04 | . 02 | . 14 | . 05 | . 06 | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 | . 03 | (8) |
    | 0-499 | . 52 | . 19 | . 01 | . 18 | (8) | . 33 | . 08 | . 03 | . 02 | . 09 | . 06 | . 04 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 02 | . 00 |
    | 500-999 | . 74 | . 24 | . 03 | . 21 | (8) | . 50 | . 07 | . 05 | (8) | . 19 | . 09 | . 07 | . 03 | . 02 | . 04 | . 02 |  |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 73 | . 22 | . 02 | . 20 | $\left.{ }^{8}\right)$ | . 51 | . 03 | . 05 | . 01 | . 28 | . 05 | . 08 | . 01 | . 04 | . 09 | . 02 | . 00 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | . 57 | . 24 | . 02 | . 22 | . 00 | . 33 | . 02 | . 02 | . 07 | . 10 | . 04 | . 05 | . 03 | . 05 | . 04 | . 05 | -00 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 83 | . 24 | . 01 | . 21 | . 02 | . 59 | . 03 | . 08 | . 02 | . 34 | . 04 | . 08 | (8) | . 02 | . 11 | . 04 | (8) |
    | 3,000 or over | . 60 | . 19 | . 02 | . 16 | . 01 | . 41 | . 02 | . 03 | . 02 | . 16 | . 06 | . 10 |  | . 09 | . 01 |  |  |
    |  | Percentage of households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{5}$ | 95 | 89 | 13 | 83 | 4 | 72 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 41 | 10 | 30 | 4 | 16 | 28 | 26 | 2 |
    | 0-499 | 92 | 87 | 11 | 80 | 2 | 68 | 19 | 17 | 4 | 29 | 10 | 18 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 0 |
    | 500-999 | 96 | 90 | 15 | 81 | 4 | 63 | 12 | 17 | 4 | 35 | 9 | 21 | 3 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 2 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 96 | 92 | 12 | 89 | 5 | 79 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 46 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 15 | 28 | 25 | 2 |
    | 1,500-1.999 | 94 | 87 | 11 | 84 | 2 | 72 | 7 | 14 | 5 | 41 | 9 | 34 | 3 | 18 | 32 | 31 | 1 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 95 | 89 | 14 | 82 | 6 | 74 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 41 | 11 | 36 | 6 | 22 | 37 | 34 | 3 |
    | 3,000 or over | 96 | 88 | 13 | 84 | 5 | 73 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 48 | 11 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 42 | 38 | 4 |
    | all nonfarm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{5}$ | 94 | 88 | 12 | 82 | 4 | 70 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 40 | 9 | 30 | 4 | 18 | 31 | 28 | 2 |
    |  | 89 |  |  | 75 |  | 60 | 14 | 16 | 2 | 26 |  | 14 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 0 |
    | 500-990 | 96 | 90 | 14 | 80 | 4 | 59 | 9 | 15 | 3 | 32 | 8 | 19 | 3 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 2 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 95 | 92 | 11 | 89 | 6 | 78 | 9 | 15 | 4 | 45 | 10 | 29 | 5 | 15 | 30 | 25 | 2 |
    | 1,500-1,909 | 94 | 86 | 11 | 83 | 3 | 71 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 41 | 9 | 35 | 2 | 19 | 33 | 32 | 1 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 94 | 88 | 14 | 82 | 6 | 73 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 39 | 11 | 36 | ${ }_{5}^{6}$ | 21 | 37 | ${ }_{37}$ |  |
    | 3,000 or over ------ | 95 | 88 | 12 | 83 | 5 | 72 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 48 | 10 | 35 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 37 |  |

    Table 28.-SUGARs, sWeets, and miscellaneous foods: Average quantity and money value of sugars, sweets and miscellaneous foods consumed families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{1}$-Continued
    

    | rotal fark <br> All clazaes 5 $\qquad$ | 08 | 83 | 17 | B8 | 5 | 82 | 24 | 24 | 7 | 45 | 15 | 28 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 17 | (9) |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 11 |  |
    | 0-400. | ${ }_{97} 96$ |  | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | 88 87 | 5 | 82 83 | ${ }_{25}^{28}$ | ${ }_{29}^{18}$ | 6 | ${ }_{4}^{85}$ | 17 | 32 | 6 | 7 | 43 | 12 | 1 |
    | 500-999 | 97 | 94 96 | ${ }_{16}^{21}$ | ${ }_{88}^{87}$ | 3 3 | 83 86 | 12 | 28 37 | 7 | 53 | 12 | 34 | 7 | 11 | 18 | 21 | 0 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 29 98 | ${ }_{96}^{96}$ | 13 | ${ }_{96}$ | 0 | 83 | 12 | 21 | 12 | 46 | 15 | 25 | 6 | 15 | 19 | 27 | 0 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 100 | 98 | 20 | 92 | 18 | 84 | 14 | 37 | 10 | 63 | 16 | 35 | ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 10 | 20 | $\stackrel{25}{4}$ | 0 |
    | 3,000 or over.. | 100 | 96 | 24 | 90 | 6 | 86 | 22 | 20 | 4 | 53 | 16 | 37 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 41 | 2 |

    1 See table 22, footnote 1.
    2 Includes canned lood mixtures and mixed foods purchased cooked, such as scoups, mineemeat, obicken and noodles, corned beé hash, apaghetti with tornato anuce, commercially prepared potato chips, salads, and deviled orabs. Eixcludes mixed fruit, bsiked goods, and baked beaps.
    ${ }^{3}$ Includes dry prepared fisvoringa for drinks, such as orargeade and maited milt.

    - Not apecifiod eisewhere. Inciudes products suoh as prepared mixtures for infants' formulas.

    I Includes families with negative incomes, not shown separately.

    - Includes familiea with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ of over, not shoma sepsarately.

    50 lb . or less
    $8 \$ 0.0050$ or lest

    - 0.50 p arcent or jass.

    Table 29.-Food accessories: Average expenditures per household per week and percentage of households purchasing food accessories, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $19422^{2}$
    

    See footnotes at end of table.

    Table 29.-Food accessories: Average expenditures per household per week and percentage of households purchasing food accessories, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 L-Continued
    

    Table 30,-Home-phoddced food, by fuod items: Average quantily and money value of specified items of home-produced food consumed at home

    | Type of community and <br>  class (doliars) <br> (1) | Home-produced food consumed at howe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Milk, cream, cheese ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Potatoer, sweetpotatios |  | Dry beans and peas, nuts ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | Milk |  |  | Cream |  | Cheese |  | Potatoes | Swectpotatoes, yams | Dry beans and peas |  |  |  | Nuts |  |
    |  | Whole | Buttermills | Skim | Sweet | Sour | Collage | American |  |  | Beans |  | Peas, Jentils | Corn | Shelled | $\operatorname{In}_{\text {shell }}$ |
    |  |  |  |  | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (10) | Not canmed (i1) | Canned (mmuist weight) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) |
    | Average quantity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | bural momithe | Qt. | Qt. | Qt. | Lb. | L.b. | Lb, | I.b. | Lb. | Lb. | $2 b$. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. |
    | All classeg ${ }^{\text {T. }}$ | 3.83 | 0.76 | 0.32 | 0.29 | 0.01 | 0.08 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | 1.90 | 0.07 | 0.03 | ${ }^{(8)}$ | 0.02 | ${ }^{8}{ }^{8}$ | (9) | ${ }^{(8)}$ |
    | 0-499. | 3.33 | 1.05 | . 34 | . 25 | . 00 | . 03 | 0.00 | 1.73 | . 04 | . 04 | 0.00 | . 02 | 0.00 | (8) | (3) |
    | 500-899. ${ }^{1} 0000$ | 4.06 3.88 | 1.38 | .11 | .19 | . 01 | . 08 | . 00 | 1.84 | . 25 | . 01 | . 02 | . 03 | . 000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 4.80 | . 77 | . 47 | .56 | .03 | .11 | (8) | 1.80 | . 07 | . 05 | . 00 | . 02 | .00 | (8) | ${ }^{.03}$ |
    | $2.000-2,999$ | 4.30 | .19 | . 40 | .31 | . 010 | . 07 | . 00 | 2.87 | . 00 | .03 | . 00 | .00 | . 01 | . 00 | .00 |
    | 3,000 or over.. | 3.42 | . 81 | . 00 | . 34 | . 00 | . 01 | . 00 | ${ }^{\text {. }} 83$ | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | .00 | . 03 | . 00 |
    | All clasees ${ }^{7}$-- | 15.65 | 4.02 | . 71 | 1.48 | . 14 | . 26 | . 01 | 8.03 | . 72 | . 20 | . 02 | . 14 | . 05 | . 02 | . 02 |
    | 0-498. | 14.07 | 4.89 | . 29 | 1.04 | . 11 | . 31 | . 01 | 6.58 | . 97 | . 21 | . 02 | . 17 | . 12 | . 02 | . 03 |
    | 500-989. | 14.99 | 4.22 | 1.01 | 1.22 | . 14 | . 14 | . 03 | 10.13 | . 22 | . 14 | . 02 | . 09 | . 03 | . 02 | , 85 |
    | 1.000-1,499 | 17.00 | 2.81 | 1.49 | 2.06 | .47 | . 25 | . 00 | 12.08 | . 62 | . 34 | .00 | . 08 | .01 | . 010 | (8) |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 17.14 | 3.06 | . 77 | 1.42 | . 30 | . 20 | . 04 | 7.07 | 1.72 | . 10 | . 00 | . 09 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 18.01 | .98 | . 14 | 1.97 | . 09 | 47 | . 02 | 11.95 | . 15 | . 29 | . 00 | . 03 | . 00 | (8) | . 60 |
    | 3.000 or over...-.-....... | 15.83 | 1.15 | 1.08 | 2.13 | . 14 | . 24 | . 00 | 9.31 | . 10 | . 12 | . 00 | . 00 | . 01 | . 01 | . 00 |

    

    Table: 30--Home-ynodeced food, by yood items: Average quantity and money value of specified items of home-produced food consumed at home pet household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{1}$-Continued

    Home-produced food cobsumed at bowe-continued

    Green sud yellow vegetables ${ }^{2}$
    
    

    Table 30.-HOME-pRODUCED FOOD, BY FOOD ITEMS: Aberage quantify and money value of specified items of home-produced food consumed al home per household per week, and percentage of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 194\% ${ }^{1}$-Continued
    

    |  | Aversge money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Aly classes ${ }^{7}$ | \$0.01 | \$0.05 | +0,02 | ${ }^{9}$ ) | ( ${ }^{(1)}$ | ( ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | ( ${ }^{(9)}$ | \$0.00 | \$0.03 | (9) | (9) | \$0.01 | \$0.01 | \$0.05 | (1) |
    | 0-489 | . 01 | . 04 | . 01 | (8) | (9) | (9) | (0) | . 00 | . 03 | (9) | (9) | (9) | . 01 | . 03 | (2) |
    | 500-899 | . 03 | . 03 | . 02 | (5) | (9) | (9) | (9) | . 00 | . 03 | \$0.00 | $\$ 0.01$ | . 01 | . 01 | . 05 | 30.01 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 01 | . 07 | . 02 | 50.01 | (9) | 50.00 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 00 | . 03 | (9) | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 01 | . 02 | . 06 | . 01 |
    | 1,300-1.399. | (9) | . 06 | . 02 | (9) | \$0.01 | (8) | ( ${ }^{\text {9 }}$ | . 00 | . 02 | (9) | . 01 | . 01 | . 02 | . 04 | +00 |
    | 2,000-2,899 | . 00 | . 03 | . 03 | . 00 | . 00 | (9) | (7) | . 00 | . 02 | . 00 | (9) | . 01 | . 91 | . 04 | . 00 |
    | 3,000 or over. | . 01 | . 02 | . 01 | .00 | . 03 | . 00 | \$0.00 | . 00 | . 01 | (9) | .00 | . 01 | . 01 | . 03 | . 00 |
    | All clubsea ${ }^{\text {², }}$ | . 03 | .11 | . 03 | . 01 | . 01 | (9) | . 01 | $\left.{ }^{9}\right)$ | . 06 | ${ }^{(3)}$ | . 01 | . 03 | . 04 | . 08 | (9) |
    | 0-499. | . 02 | . 09 | . 01 | . 02 | (9) | ( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$ | . 01 | (9) | .06 | (9) | . 01 | . 02 | . 03 | .05 | (9) |
    | $500 \cdot 699$ | . 01 | . 15 | . 02 | (9) | (9) | . 00 | 00 | . 00 | . 08 | 01 | . 01 | . 05 | . 03 | .11 | . 01 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 06 | . 18 | . 03 | . 01 | . 00 | (90) | (9) | . 00 | . 13 | (9) | (9) | . 03 | . 07 | +18 | . 00 |
    | 1,500-1,909 | . 20 | . 08 | . 04 | . 06 | . 05 | (9) | . 02 | . 00 | . 02 | . 00 | . 01 | . 02 | . 04 | . 13 | (0) |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 04 | . 19 | . 06 | . 03 | . 01 | . 00 | ${ }^{9}$ ) | (9) | .07 | . 01 | (1) | . 03 | . 05 | . 08 | (9) |
    | 3,000 or over. | . 00 | . 11 | . $0 \bar{i}$ | . 00 | . 00 | $\cdots$ | (9) | . 00 | . 02 | (8) | . 01 | . 02 | . 03 | . 10 | . 00 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | rcentage | f bouseh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classea 7. | 2 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 18 | 1 |
    | 0-490- | 3 | 14 | 5 | (10) | (10) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 23 | (0) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | I |
    | 500-989. | 5 | 14 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 1 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 2 |
    | 1,500-1,498 | 1 | 22 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 20 | 0 |
    | 2.000-2,099 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | ${ }_{0}$ | 1 | 6 | 4 | 17 | 0 |
    | 3.000 or over. | 3 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 0 |
    | All classes ${ }^{7}$... | 4 | 32 | 8 | 1 | 1 | (10) | 3 | 1 | 32 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 34 | 1 |
    | $0-499$. $500-959$ | 3 | 29 37 | 5 | (10) | (10) 1 | (10) 0 | 4 | (10) | 33 37 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 13 | 30 39 | 1 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 7 | 42 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 23 | 4 H | 0 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 10 | 23 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 21 | 38 | 0 |
    | 2,000-2,989. | 6 | 37 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 29 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 14 | 25 | 2 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 0 | 43 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 41 | 0 |

    ## See footpotes at end of table.

     per household per wech, and percentagr of households conswming, by type of communtily and annual net money income class, housekeeping familiex and single persons in the Inited States, spring 1042:-Continued
    

    | gepat monfuen | Average money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | All clabees ${ }^{7}$. | ( ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$ | (9) | (9) | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) | \$0.01 | ${ }^{(3)}$ | (9) | 50.003 | $\$ 0.02$ | \$0.02 | \$0.08 | \$0.02 | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 80,03 |
    | $0-409$ | \$0.00 | (9) | \$0.00 | (3) | (9) | . 02 | 50.00 | 80.00 | . 06 | . 02 | . 02 | . 08 | . 02 | (9) | \$0.00 | . 03 |
    | 500-999. | (9) | 50.00 | (9) | \$0.00 | (9) | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | .00 | . 01 | . 02 | . 08 | . 02 | \$0.92 | (9) | . 03 |
    | 1.000-1.490 | 9 | (9) | . 60 | 0.01 | (3) | .01 | .00 | . 60 | . 00 | . 03 | . 02 | . 08 | . 02 | . 00 | . 01 | . 05 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | .ab | . 00 | . 00 | (8) | 50.01 | . 02 | (-) | . 00 | . 00 | . 02 | . 62 | . 10 | . 03 | (\%) | +00 | . 08 |
    | 2,000-2.939. | . 00 | . 00 | . 09 | . 00 | . 00 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 06 | . 01 | . 07 | . $\mathrm{DL}^{1}$ | (9) | . 00 | . 04 |
    | 3,000 or over .- | .00 | .00 | . 00 | (9) | . 20 | . 00 | . 00 | (9) | .00 | . 02 | . 01 | . 09 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 02 |
    | All clases?. | . 01 | ( ${ }^{9}$ | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) | . 02 | . 02 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ${ }^{( }{ }^{9}$ | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 03 | . 04 | . 17 | . 08 | .61 | (9) | . 10 |
    | (0) 499. | (91) | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ${ }^{9} 90$ | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 02 | +02 | (9) | (9) | (9) | . 02 | . 05 | . 18 | . 06 | . 61 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | .10 .16 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | .00 | . 00 | . 00 | (3) | . 06 | . 03 | (3) | . 0 | 00 | .08 | .05 | .20 | . 09 | (9) | (9) | . 18 |
    | 1,5006-1,999. | .00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | (9) | . 03 | . 00 | . 00 | . 09 | . 03 | . 64 | . 17 | . 05 | .01 | .6B | . 08 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 00 | , 00 | .60 | . 02 | . 02 | .01 | . 00 | . 00 | (9) | . 04 | . 03 | . 16 | . 07 | . 01 | . 00 | . 06 |
    | 3.000 or over --. . | .00 | .00 | (9) | (3) | . 03 | . 00 | (3) | . 00 | . 00 | . 03 | . 01 | . 11 | . 05 | 01 | . 02 | . 08 |
    | RURis noxfsrx Percentage of households | Percentage of households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{7}$ - | (10) | (10) | (10) | (19) | 1 | 4 | (10) | (10) | 0 | 11 | 8 | 21 | 7 | 1 | (10) | 0 |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 0-499 \\ & 500-909 . \end{aligned}$ | 1 2 | (20) | 0 1 | ${ }_{(10)}^{0}$ | 1 | 5 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{9}{7}$ | 19 | 20 | 8 | 1 | 9 1 | 8 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 7 | 0 | I | 13 |
    | 1.500-1.999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
    | 2.900-2,999 | 9 | 0 | (1) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
    | $3,0 \mathrm{OC}$ or over_ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
    | All classes ${ }^{7}$. | 2 | (10) | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 | (10) | (10) | 13 | 17 | 40 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 18 |
    | 0-499 | 3 | (10) | (10) | 2 | 7 | 4 | (10) | 1 | (10) | 9 | 19 | 40 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 18 |
    | 500-999 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 22 | 51 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 22 |
    | 1,000-1,490. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 18 | 33 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 23 |
    | $\pm .500-1,998$. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 13 | 37 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 12 | 37 | 20 | 2 | ${ }_{8}$ | 18 |
    | 3,000 or over... | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 4 ? | 16 | 2 | $B$ | 84 |

    Table 30--Home-prodeces food, by food items: Average quantity and money value of specified ilems of home-produced fond consumed at home per household per week, and perceriape of households consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942 \pm$ Continued
    
    
     per houschold per week, and percentage of houscholds consuming, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 -Continued
    

    | gURAL SONFARM | Average moncy vatue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Alh classes ? .---..-- | (9) | (9) | \$0.01 | ${ }^{(\theta)}$ | 80.00 | \$0.07 | 80.02 | \$0,00 | 50.00 | (9) | \$0.04 | \$0.00 | 50.09 | \$0.02 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | \$0.35 |
    | 0-499-. | (9) | 50.00 .00 | $\left.{ }^{6} \mathrm{l}\right) 1$ | 50,00 .00 | . 000 | . 08 | . 01 | . 00 | .00 .00 | ${ }^{(40} 0.00$ | . 04 | .00 .00 | .09 .13 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | 50.01 .00 | .26 .36 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 50.00 | .00) | . 01 | (9) | . 00 | . 06 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 02 | . 010 | . 05 | .01 | . 00 | . 34 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | (9) | .00 | (9) | . 00 | . 00 | .07 | . 03 | . 00 | .00 | , 010 | . 06 | . 00 | . 05 | . 03 | (9) | . 37 |
    | 2,000-2,998. | . 00 | . 01 | .02 | .00 | .00 | . 08 | . 01 | . 00 | . 010 | . 02 | . 01 | . 00 | . 18 | . 02 | . 00 | .45 |
    | 3,000 or over. | . 00 | . 00 | (9) | . 00 | . 00 | . 02 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 05 | . 00 | . 13 | . 0 | . 00 | . 35 |
    | All classes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 03 | . 03 | . 07 | .01 | , 01 | . 39 | .15 | . 01 | (9) | . 01 | . 17 | . 01 | .39 | . 03 | (9) | . 80 |
    | 0-499 | . 01 | . 02 | . 05 | . 01 | . 00 | . 28 | . 05 | . 00 | . 00 | .01 | . 14 | . 02 | . 42 | . 02 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 63 |
    | 500-989 | . 03 | . 04 | . 08 | . 02 | . 04 | . 40 | . 03 | . 00 | . 00 | (5) | . 20 | (9) | . 43 | . 04 | (9) | . 67 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 03 | . 03 | . 09 | . 00 | . 00 | . 78 | . 10 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 17 | (9) | .35 | . 03 | . 00 | . 87 |
    | 1,500-1,989. | . 08 | . 06 | . 09 | . 00 | . 05 | . 30 | . 13 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 13 | . 00 | .15 | . 02 | . 00 | 1.14 |
    | 2,000-2,989. | . 07 | . 05 | . 08 | 02 | . 12 | . 57 | . 13 | . 04 | . 00 | . 01 | . 36 | . 00 | . 50 | . 08 | . 00 | 1.53 |
    | 3,000 or over | .14 | . 03 | . 05 | .01 | . 03 | . 20 | . 04 | . 07 | . 03 | .00 | . 26 | . 00 | . 58 | . 05 | .01 | . 85 |
    | RURAL sonfshm Perceotage of households | Percentage of houspholds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{\text {? }}$ | (10) | (10) | 1 | (10) | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | (10) | 3 | 0 | 7 | 2 | (19) | 40 |
    | 0-499 | (10) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | (10) | 4 | 0 |  | 1 | ( ${ }^{10}$ ) | 45 |
    | 500-989.... | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 44 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 1 | 0 0 | 1 | 1 0 | 1 0 | 5 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 40 |
    | 2,000-2,999. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 38 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
    | All clusses ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | 4 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 10 | (10) | (10) | 1 | 14 | 1 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 91 |
    | 0-499 | 1 | 1 | 6 | , | 0 | 23 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | (10) | 21 | 3 | ${ }^{(10)}$ | 91 |
    | 500-999. | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 29 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 23 | 5 | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | 92 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 34 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 93 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | 10 | 6 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 88 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | 6 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 29 | 10 | 0 | 92 |
    | 3,060 or over...-. | 14 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 27 | 4 | 2 | 92. |

    
     and single perwons in the Vmited Ntutas, spring 19 rif 1 Continued
    

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | verage | oney $\mathrm{\Sigma}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | ( ${ }^{1}$ ) | (9) | ${ }^{(9)}$ | (9) | \$0.13 | \$0.03 | 80.01 | $\$ 0.03$ | (9) | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ( ${ }^{9}$ | \$0.07 | 50.02 | (9) | ( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$ |
    | $0-199$. | 50.00 | \$0.01 | 80.00 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | .12 | . 02 | . 01 | . 03 | (9) | (9) | 30.00 | 80.00 | . 04 | . 02 | 50.01 | (9) |
    | 500-4998. | . 01 | . 01 | (9) | 80.100 | .14 | +03 | (01 | .03 | (9) | (9) | (9) | . 00 | . 08 | . 02 | \$0.01 | (9) 00 |
    | 1,000-1,498 | . 00 | - 00 | (9) | . 00 | . 10 | . 03 | ${ }^{(\theta)}$ | . 03 | (9) | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 00 | . 67 | . 02 | . 00 | \$0.00 |
    | 1,500-1,999. | . 00 | ${ }^{9}$ ) | . 00 | . 00 | .14 | . 03 | . 01 | . 02 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | \$0.01 | . 00 | (10) | . 11 | . 02 | . 00 | . 01 |
    | 2,000-2,998. | . 00 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | +00 | . 00 | . 15 | . 106 | . 01 | ( 05 | \$0.00 | . 00 | .00 | ${ }^{(9)}$ | . 08 | . 04 | .00 | . 00 |
    | 3 ,000 or over. | . 00 | (9) | . 60 | . 00 | . 09 | . 01 | . 01 | (v) | \$0.00 | . 00 | . 00 | ( | . 0 | - |  |  |
    | All classeg ${ }^{7}$... | . 05 | . 07 | (9) | (9) | . 52 | . 19 | . 07 | . 16 | . 01 | . 02 | (9) | . 01 | . 13 | . 05 | . 01 | . 01 |
    | 0-490 | . 06 | . 09 | (s) | ${ }^{9}$ ) | .54 | .14 | . 08 | . 15 | .01 | . 03 | (9) | 0.01 | . 08 |  | . 01 | . 01 |
    | 500-999 | . 07 | . 07 | . 00 | (9) | . 51 | . 23 | . 05 | . 18 | . 01 | +03 | (9) | $\left({ }^{9}\right)$ | . 18 | . 08 | (1)3 | . 01 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | . 02 | . 04 | . 01 | . 010 | . 54 | . 19 | . 08 | . 18 | . 01 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 27 | . 05 | (1) | . 01 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | . 03 | . 03 | . 00 | . 00 | . 41 | . 27 | . 03 | . 15 | . 02 | . 00 | (9) | . 01 | . 08 | . 03 | 00 | . 00 |
    | 2,000-2,990 | . 01 | . 02 | (9) | (9) | . 37 | . 28 | . 01 | . 15 | . 02 | . 01 | . 01 | . 01 | .30 | . 04 | ${ }^{9}$ ) | . 00 |
    | 3,000 or over. | . 05 | . 01 | . 00 | . 00 | . 31 | .25 | . 04 | . 15 | . 01 | (3) | . 00 | . 01 | . 15 | . 06 | . 01 | . 00 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Perc | tage of | ansehold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classus ${ }^{\text {T}}$ | (10) | 2 | (10) | (10) | 13 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | (10) | ( ${ }^{(0)}$ | 20 | 8 | (10) | 1 |
    | 0-490. | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 8 | (10) | (10) |
    | 500-999. | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
    | 1,000-1,494 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
    | 1,000-1,999. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 2 |
    | 2,000-2,098. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
    | 3,000 or over. . . . | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
    | All elnases ${ }^{7}$ | 9 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 54 | 27 | 15 | 45 | 4 | 8 | I | 3 | 39 | 14 | 2 | 2 |
    | 0-409. | 11 | 22 |  | 1 |  | 22 | 17 | 41 |  |  |  | 2 | 33 | 14 | 2 | 2 |
    | 500-989 | 11 | 17 | 0 |  | 51 | 24 | 15 | 50 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 43 | 15 | 4 | 3 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 51 | 27 | 12 | 48 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4y | 12 | 3 | 1 |
    | 1,600-1,999 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 42 | 10 | 44 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 35 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
    | 2,000-2,900. | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 35 | 31 | 10 | 69 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 55 | 16 | 2 | 0 |
    | 3,000 or over | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 39 | 10 | 51 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 47 | 16 | 2 | 0 |

    1 See table 22, footnote 1 .
    2 Excludes items that less than 0.5 percent of the families congumed. See tables 22 through 28 for itcmas excluded is each food group.
    I Inoludes tomato sauce, catsup, tomato paste, and cbili esuce.
    4 Includes brains, beart, kjdney, sweetbreads, tongue, and tripe.
    5 Inoludes ground ment ioixtures and apecial mast products as tripe, tougua, kidney, sud other of gans when if was nol kjown whether they were beai, veal, pork, or lamb.

    6 Includes canned food mixtures and mixed, cooked foods such as soups and minconeat. Exxsludes mixed fruit and baked beana.
    7 Includas fanilies with negative incomms, not sbown separately
    80.0050 lb . or less.
    9.00 .0050 or lass.
    100.50 percent or lass.
     food consumed at home per household per wack, by type of community and annual net money intome class, houschecping familics and single perions
    

    | St monfatis | dverage money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | to. 58 | 50. 50 | 50.07 | \$0.05 | 50.06 | (13) | (13) | (13) | \$0.19 | \$0.13 | \$0.09 | 50.04 | \$0.06 | 80.08 | 50.08 | ${ }^{(13)}$ | 80.28 | \%0.03 | 50.07 | (13) | 50.03 | \$0.15 |
    | 0-409 | . 48 | . 42 | . 06 | ${ }_{(13)}^{01}$ | . 05 | (13) | (13) ${ }^{(13)}$ | ${ }_{50}{ }^{[33} 009$ | . 18 | . 13 | . 110 | .05 | . 05 | . 108 | . 06 | (13) | .26 .31 | . 03 | . 04 | ${ }_{\substack{13,(15 i)}}$ | . 04 | . 15 |
    | 500-999 | . 57 | . 52 | . 04 | . 01 | . 07 | \$0.01 | ( a ) | \%0.093 | . 18 | .118 | . 08 | . 03 | . 07 | .11 | .10 | \$0.01 | .37 | . 03 | . 10 | \$0.01 | . 04 | .19 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | . 77 | . 61 | . 14 | . 02 | . 05 |  | (2,4 | . 01 | .15 | . 99 | . 18 | . 03 | . 08 | .198 | . 08 | 01 | . 33 | . 33 | . 07 | (13) | . 05 | . 18 |
    | 2,000-2,993. | . 6.5 | . 50 ¢0 | . 08 | 01 | . 09 | (13) | (13) | . 00 | . 21 | . 14 | . 09 | . 05 | . 07 | . 06 | . 06 | (13) | . 28 | . 02. | . 06 | . 00 | . 07 | . 13 |
    | 3,000 or over | . 58 | . 48 | . 10 | (13) | . 03 | . 01 | \$0.00 | . 01 | . 11 | . 05 | .03 | . 02 | . 06 | . 07 | . 04 | . 03 | . 21 | . 01 | . 05 | (13) | - 02 | . 13 |
    | mural park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classos ${ }^{11}$ | 2.51 | 2.01 | . 47 | . 03 | . 33 | . 05 | . 03 | . 02 | . 37 | . 25 | . 17 | . 08 | . 12 | . 19 | . 17 | . 02 | . 70 | . 08 | . 16 | . 01 | . 07 | . 38 |
    | 0-499 | 2.21 | 1.76 |  | . 02 | . 38 | . 06 | . 04 | . 02 | . 44 | . 31 | . 22 | . 08 | . 13 | . 44 | . 12 | . 02 | . 66 | . 08 | . 10 | . 01 | . 06 | . 41 |
    | 500-999. | 2.53 | 2.12 | . 38 | . 38 | . 34 | . 05 | . 02 | 03 | . 33 | . 22 | . 18 | . 06 | . 11 | . 18 | . 18 | (13) | . 90 | . 10 | . 20 | . 01 | -10 | . 49 |
    | 1,000-1,499. | 3.13 | 2.19 | . 83 | . 11 | . 41 | . 04 | . 04 | (13) | . 36 | . 18 | . 14 | . 04 | . 18 | . 28 | . 27 | . 01 | 1.11 | . 13 | . 28 | $(131)$ | . 17 | . 53 |
    | 1,500-1,989 | 2.84 | 2.26 | . 54 | . 04 | . 34 | . 01 | . 01 | (0) | . 23 | . 13 | . 05 | . 08 | . 10 | . 43 | . 32 | . 11 | . 65 | . 05 | . 18 | . 00 | . 06 | . 35 |
    | 2,090-2,999 | 3.35 | 2.34 | . 78 | . 11 | . 37 | . 02 | . 02 | (13) | . 23 | . 13 | . 11 | . 05 | . 10. | ${ }^{33}$ | . 29 | . 04 | . 6.6 | . 08 | . 15 | (63) | . 076 | . 28 |
    | 3.000 or over | 2.77 | 1.95 | . 88 | . 04 | . 22 | . 01 | . 01 | (13) | . 23 | . 13 | . 69 | . 04 | . 61 | . 18 | . 18 | . 0 | . 52 | . 03 | . 15 | (3) | . 66 | 28 |


    
     in the United Stades, spring $194^{2}{ }^{2}$-Continued
    

    |  | Average money value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | All classea 11 | 30.25 | (13) | (13) | \$0.10 | \$0.00 | 50.04 | \$0.08 | \$5.02 | \$0.35 | (18) | (13) | (13) | \$0.20 | 80.00 | 50.00 | \$0.09 | (13) |
    | 0-489 | . 33 | (13) | \$0.00 | . 09 | . 00 | . 04 | . 05 | . 01 | . 26 | \$0.01 | \$0.01 | ${ }^{(12)}$ | . 18 | . 08 | . 00 | . 05 | (13) |
    | 500-989 | . 38 | 50.02 | . 01 | . 15 | . 00 | . 05 | .13 | . 02 | . 36 | . 02 | . 09 | (18) | . 21 | . 11 | . 00 | . 11 | (13) |
    | 1,000-1,499. | . 16 | (13) | (13) | . 08 | .00 | . 62 | . 05 | .01 | . 34 | (13) | (13) | \$0.003 | . 18 | . 09 | . 0 | . 69 | \$0.00 |
    | 5,500-1,989 | . 24 | . 00 | . 0 | .10 | . 00 | . 06 | . 05 | . 03 | . 37 | (13) | (13) | . 00 | . 20 | .14 | . 00 | .14 | . 01 |
    | 2,006-2,999. | . 28 | . 03 | . 00 | . 12 | . 60 | . 03 | . 08 | . 02 | . 73 | (13) | (15) | . 00 | . 27 | .13 | .00 | . 13 | . 00 |
    | 3,000 or over-.... | . 21 | . 00 | . 00 | . 03 | .00 | . 05 | .13 | , 00 | . 35 | ${ }^{(38)}$ | (13) | . 00 | . 11 | . 11 | .00 | .11 | . 00 |
    | mokil fary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{11}$ | 1.42 | . 14 | . 01 | . 65 | . 01 | . 19 | . 32 | . 03 | . 30 | . 12 | . 12 | (13) | . 95 | . 22 | (13) | . 22 | . 01 |
    | 0-499 | 1.10 | . 05 | . 02 | . 42 | . 06 | . 17 | . 42 | . 02 | . 63 | . 16 | . 18 | (13) | . 97 | . 19 | (3) | . 19 | . Ol |
    | 500-989 | 1.43 | .12 | . 09 | . 64 | .00 | . 20 | . 43 | . 04 | . 67 | . 14 | +14 | (13) | . 38 | , 32 | . 00 | .32 | . 01 |
    | 1,070-1,499 | 1.85 | . 28 | +09 | 1.03 | . 00 | . 17 | . 36 | . 03 | . 87 | . 08 | . 08 | . 00 | 1.00 | . 33 | (0) | . 33 | . 01 |
    | 1,500-1,999 | 1.26 | . 15 | .09) | . 77 | . 00 | . 13 | . 19 | . 02 | 1.14 | . 06 | . 06 | (0) | . 88 | . 12 | (13) | . 12 | . 00 |
    | 2,000-2,989 | 2.24 | . 27 | . 03 | 1.04 | . 04 | . 28 | . 50 | . 78 | 1.53 | . 03 | . 03 | (13) | . 88 | . 37 | (13) | . 37 | . 50 |
    | 3,000 or over. | 2.06 | . 52 | . 04 | . 50 | .10 | . 26 | . 58 | . 08 | . 85 | . 06 | . 08 | . 00 | . 76 | . 23 | . 00 | . 23 | . 00 |

    I For delailed food iteme see table 30.
    2 See table 22, footrote 1.

    * Approximately the quantity of fluid milk to shich the various dairy producta inoluded here are equasient hamerals and protein. (See footnote 9, p. 6, for the factors used to convert pounds 4 Iacludes the dey weirht of fuid whole mills.)
    the weight of cansed diry beans
    5 Includes the meight of shis. in sheli.
    \% Ineludes the weight of fresh and canned products added to four tirnes the weight of dried fruit.
    7 Excludes bacon and salt pork.
    a Includes fiver, game, canned meat, bologna, ground-meat mixtures and specisl meat products as tripe, tongue, kidrey, and other organs when it was not known whether they were beef, veal, pork or lamb.
    ingol Inciudes bacon and salt pork,
    ${ }^{2} 10$ Includes off drinks and canned ford mixtures and mised, cooked loods such as root beer, soupe and mincemeat. Fxcludes mixed fruit and baked beans.
    11 Includes families with negstive incomes, not shown separately.
    120.0050 lb or
    120.0000 lb or les

    Table 32.-Nutritive valee of diets per person: Average nutitive value pet person per day of food brought into the kitchen, by type of community and annual net money incone class, housekeeping frmities and single persons in the United States, spring $1942^{1}$
    

    Table 33.-Notrifive valde of diets per notrition cnit: Average nutritive value per nutrition unit per day of food brought into the kitchen, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 194:
    

    Table 34.-Hocsehold siza: Average household size in equivalent persons and in equivalent nutrition units, by type of community and annual net money income cluss, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring 1942 ${ }^{1}$

    | Type of community and ancuai <br> net trolleg income sitis $\langle$ doilitre; |  | Areage fowsehold cize in equivalent mutrition units 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Feol eqers: | I'rotein | ! Caicium! | Iron | Yitamin | Ascorbic | Thin- | Ritho. Havin | Niacin |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  | A faltie |  |  |  |  |
    | (I) | (2) | (3) | (f) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (3) | (9) | (10) | (11! |
    | Caited states | Namber | $\mathrm{s}^{\text {umber }}$ | Number | Number | Number itimber |  | , Mumber | Number : Number |  | Iumber |
    | Al1 classes ${ }^{3}$ | 3.41 | 3.05 | 3.17 | 3.88 | 3.33 | 3.13 | 3.18 | 3.79 | 2.74 | 2.79 |
    | 0-499. | 3.03 | 2.77 | 2.78 | 3.46 | 2.98 | 2.74 | 2.81 | 2.51 | 2.47 | 2.51 |
    | 500-599. | 3.16 | 2.83 | 2.93 | 3.62 | 3.69 | 2.88 | 2.84 | 2.58 | 2.55 | 2.58 |
    | 1,000-1.499 | 3.37 | 2.94 | 3.08 | 3.82 | 3.24 | 3.02 | 3.10 | 2.71 | 2.66 | 2.71 |
    | $1.500-1.919$ | 3.29 | 2.89 | 3.02 | 3.70 | 3.19 | 3.10 | 3.03 | 2.66 | 2.61 | 2.68 |
    | $2.000-2.999$. | 3.44 | 3.01 | 3.18 | 3.80 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 3.19 | 2.76 | 2.72 | 2.76 |
    | 3,000 or over | 3.80 | 3.47 | 3.64 | 4.38 | 3.83 | 3.61 | 3.66 | 3.18 | 3.12 | 3.18 |
    | atil nomparm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Alf classes ${ }^{3}$ | 3.23 | 2.82 | 3.00 | 3.66 | 3.16 | 2.98 | 3.02 | 2.59 | 2.55 | 2,59 |
    | 0-499. | 2.30 | 1.99 | 2.11 | 2.55 | 2.23 | 2.12 | 2.14 | 1.85 | 1.82 | 1.85 |
    | 5001998 | 2.81 | 2.50 | 2.68 | 3.31 | 2.83 | 2.125 | 2.69 | 2.30 | 2.88 | 2.30 |
    | 1,000 1, 498 | 3.23 | 2.73 | 2.93 | 3.64 | 3.08 | 2.88 | 2.94 | 2.53 | 2.48 | 2.5 . |
    | 1.500-1.999 | 3.20 | 2.75 | 2.92 | 3.69 | 3.09 | 2.91 | 2.93 | 2.54 | 2.49 | 2.54 |
    | 2,000-2,949. | 3.39 | 2.93 | 3.12 | 3.81 | 3.29 | 3.09 | 3.14 | 2.69 | 2.65 | 2.69 |
    | 3,000 or over | 3.79 | 3.43 | 3.63 | 4.37 | 3.82 | 3.60 | 3.65 | 3.14 | 3.04 | 3.14 |
    | trbay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Alt classes ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 3.13 | 2.76 | 2.84 | 3.59 | 3.12 | 2.93 | 2.97 | 2.54 | 2.50 | 2.54 |
    | 0-499. | 1.77 | 1.52 | 1.62 | t. 93 | 1.73 | 1.65 | 1.66 | 1.43 | 1.41 | 1.43 |
    | 500-999 | 2.45 | 2.12 | 2.23 | 2.76 | 2.41 | 2.27 | 2.30 | 1.96 | 1.94 | 1.96 |
    | 1,000-1,400....... | 2.95 | 2.49 | 2.67 | 3.27 | 2.81 | 2.64 | 2.68 | 2.33 | 2.29 | 2.33 |
    | $1.5000-1.499$ | 3.00 | 2.57 | 2.73 | 3.35 | 2.90 | 2.74 | 2.74 | 2.38 | 2.33 | 2.38 |
    | 2,000-8.199 | 3.28 | 2.83 | 3.00 | 3.66 | 3.17 | 2.99 | 3.02 | 2.60 | 2.56 | 2.60 |
    | 2,400-3,499 | 3.24 | 2.31 | 2.18 | 3.63 | 3.14 | 2.96 | 3.00 | 2.58 | 2.56 | 2.59 |
    | $2.500-2.159 .19$ | 3.30 | 2.85 | 3.03 | 3.64 | 3.20 | 3.03 | 3.05 | 2.62 | 2.57 | 2.62 |
    | 3,040 or neer ${ }^{4}$ | 3.76 | 3.43 | 3.63 | $\pm .36$ | 3.82 | 3.60 | 3.64 | 3.14 | 3.08 | 3.14 |
    | 3,000-4. 0.1097 | 3.60 | 3.28 | 4.47 | 4.16 | 3.64 | 3.44 | 3.47 | 3.00 | 2.94 | 3.00 |
    | 5,000-0.999 | 4.15 | 3.74 | 3.95 | 4.74 | 4.19 | 3.04 | 4.01 | 3.45 | 3.35 | 3.45 |
    | murel coxpsam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All clanses ${ }^{8}$ | 3.52 | 3.05 | 3.26 | 4.06 | 3.41 | 3.18 | 3.25 | 2.86 | 2.72 | 2.76 |
    | 0-499. | 2.6 | 2.34 | 2.46 | 2.09 | 2.88 | 2.45 | 2.48 | 2.14 | 2,11 | 2.14 |
    | 500-999. | 3.73 | 3.18 | 3.43 | 4.60 | 3.54 | 3.33 | 3.40 | 2.11 | 2.88 | 2.01 |
    | 1.000-1.493 | 3.72 | 台. 15 | 3.38 | 4.23 | 3.36 | 3.29 | 3.40 | 2.89 | 2.85 | 2.89 |
    | 1,500-1,599 | 3.78 | 3.35 | 3.48 | 4.31 | 3.155 | 3.49 | 3.48 | 2.44 | 2.95 | 2.09 |
    | $2.000-2.599$. | 4.08 | 3.54 | 3.80 | 4.31 | 4.01 | 3.71 | 3.81 | 3.21 | 3.16 | 3.21 |
    | 3,000 or over------ | 3.85 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.45 | 3.85 | 3.60 | 3.68 | 3.13 | 3.09 | 8.13 |
    | rLhal fagy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | All classes ${ }^{3}$--- | 4.23 | 4.13 | 4.60 | 4.98 | 4.15 | 3.85 | 3.98 | 3.73 | 3.65 | 3.73 |
    | (1-499. | 4,21 | 4.05 | 3.49 | 4.43 | 4.07 | 3.76 | 3.59 | 3.60 |  |  |
    | $500-991$ | 4.21 | 4.19\% | 3.118 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 3.86 | -9.99 | 3.35 | 3.58 | 3.75 |
    | 1, $0060-1,499$ | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.13 | 5.03 | 4.31 | 4.02 | 4.14 | 3.88 | 3, $3^{4}$ | 3.88 |
    | 1,540-1.999 | 4.13 | 4.30 | 4.02 | 4.77 | 4.17 | 3.93 | 4.08 | 3.85 | 3.77 | 3.85 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | $4 . \pm 0$ | 4.37 | 4.12 | 5.09 | 4.26 | 3.97 | 4.10 | 3.40 | 3.81 | 3.90 |
    | 3,090 0: 04 er .-....- | 3.95 | 4.12 | 3.81 | 4.53 | 3.95 | 3.76 | 3.84 | 3.73 | 3.65 | 3.73 |

    Table 35.-Contribution of food groups to nutamtive value of diets: Average percentage of each nutirient contributed by specified food groups, by type of community, housekeeping families and single persons in the United Slates, spring 1942 ${ }^{1}$
    


    ## Appendix B. Methodology

    The general scope of the study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime--sampling procedures, collection of schedules, and other aspects-have been described in Rural Family Spending and Saving in Wartime, Tnited States Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication 520, and in Income Spending and Saving of American Families, United States Bureau of Labor Statisties Bulletio iIn press].

    Although the sample taken in connection with the family spending and saving study made by the Department of Agriculture was small, it is shown in the publications of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the general characteristics of the data secured in the atudy eheck very well with the data from the C.S. Census of Population, Housing, and Agriculture for 1940. Emphasis is giveri in this publication to methods that are esperially important for the analysis of data on food consumption.

    ## Sampling Procedure

    The study was planned to cover a representative cross section of all housekeeping families and single consumers living in the Cinited States. It did not include certain population groups, namely, the inmatcs of institutions, residents of military camps and posts, or persons in labor camps.
    In addition to information on income and expenditures for the year 1941 and the first quarter of 1942, a food schedule was filled out for one week in the spring of 1942 for earh unattached person or family that cooperated in the study, with the following exceptions:

    1. One-person economic families (and possibly larger families, too) that usually did not prepare at least one meal a day at home.
    2. Two or more economic families living and cooking together that shared such expenses. In a case of this kind, a single food schedule combining food consumption data for both families was filled in.
    The percentage of the total civilian noninstitutional population represented by housekeeping families and single persons was estimated as follows: United States, 91.7 ; urban. 88.5 ; rural nonfarm, 94.9 ; rural farm, 100.0 . It was expected, therefore, that fewer food schedules than income and expenditure schedules would be obtained. Table 36 shows the number of food schedules collected as a percentage of the number of income and expenditure schedules collected, by type of community and annual net money income class.

    The smaller number of food reports was not entirely due to nonhousekeeping consumer units, however. A few schedules were rejected because of incorisistent, unreliable, or incomplete data which could not be revised or supplied from notes made by the field agent or other information reported by the family.

    The bases for rejection of schedules follow:

    1. Lnusually high food consumption reported throughout the schedule or quantities impossible of consumption reported for one or more items; for example. 50 pounds of sugar for a family of four.
    2. Extremely low food consumption reported throughout the schedule or no entry under an important food class such as grain products or tats on a schedule that did not carry an explanatory note.
    3. Price-quantity data too incomplete to determine quantity consumed.
    4. The number of meals caten from home lood supply by a household member not stated.

    ## Income Distribution of the Sample

    The distribution of housekecping families and single persons supplying acceptable food schedules by net money income class in the first quarter of 1942 is given in tahle 2.

    The population weights used with the unsmoothed data to estimate the consumption of all families in the United States are presented in table 1. The national estimates in this report are applicable only to the housekeeping fanilies and single persons in the civilian noninstitutional population during the spring of 1942.

    Attention is drawn to the fact that the farm families have relatively low incomes and therefore have a decidedly heavier weight in the lower than in the higher net money income classes. Sinee their money incomes are supplemented by relatively large nonmoney incomes, the consumption patterns of lower income farm families are usually nore comparable with higher income groups of urban families. This is true especially of food consumption patterns because most of the nonmoney income is likely to be in the form of home-produced food.

    Table 36.-Relation of food schedules to income and expenditure schedoles: The number of food schedules as a percentage of the number of income and cxpenditure schedules, by type of community and annual net money income class
    

    ## Regional Composition of the Sample

    The data collected in this survey have not been tabulated by regions. When the sample was constructed, it was not intended that a regional analysis of the data be made. By confining the study to analysis by income it was possible to use a much smaller sample than analysis by both region and income would bave necessitated.

    ## Collection of Schedules

    The field work was carried out by local residents of the counties or cities selected in the sample. They were selected and trained by supervisors from the Washington office. Each field agent had a set of written instructions giving detailed explanations of every schedule entry and computation; these were used in training and held by the field agent for reference during the collection period.

    Each bousekeeping consumer unit interviewed was requested to give detailed food information for the previous week as well as the information on income and expenditures for all goods and services for the calendar year 1941 and for the first quarter of 1942. Giving the information was entirely voluntary and no payments were made to the householde participating.
    A facsimile of the food schedule used is shown on page 147. For the 177 food items listed on the form (exclusive of subject headings, totals, etc. which bring the total number to 248 ) the following information was requested:
    a) Food bought during the last 7 days, quantity and price.
    b) Food eaten during the last 7 days, quantity (specified whether home-produced, bought, or other), and price.
    For an additional 21 items (accessories, alcoholic beverages, and food eaten away from home) expense only was obtained.
    A record was made of the sex, age at last birthday, and number of meals furnished from home food supplies in the 7 days covered by the food schedule for each family member, boarder, guest, or paid helper in the household.

    ## Tabulation of the Data

    ## Classification by Type of Community

    Separate tabulations were made for each of the population groups-urban, rural nonfarm, and farm. Estimates of the consumption of all families and single persons in the United States were derived by applying appropriate weights to the averages from each population group. Urban and rural nonfarm averages have been combined to give estimates of the consumption of nonfarm families.

    ## Classification by Income

    Within each population proup the schedules were classified by net money income in the first quarter of 1942 into nine income classes for urban schedules and six classes for rural schedules. It seemed useful to present income classes in terms of annual rates rather than quarterly income.

    Since data on income were not obtained from the families for the perind covered by the food schedule, records were classified according to the net money income of the family in the first quarter of 1942 . Since this was a period of rising income the result
    of the ciassification may be a slight underestimate of income for the period coverad by the food schedules. For farm families there is the additional question as to whether seasonal factors affect the income classification. For the purposes of this report, bowever incomc data for the first quarter of 1942 are distinctly better than income data for the vear 1041. In the first quater of 1942, 19 percent of the farm families from whom food schedules were obtained showed a negative income; they were either fiving on past income or on borrowings to be paid out of expected income. Less than 1 percent of rural nonfarm fanilies showed a negative income for the same period. Data from such families were tabulated separately in a "negative income class."
    Tanle 37.-Distribetion of farm famlies by money income: Fafm families in specified net money ircome classes, winter 194, distributed by net money income, year 19.4

    | Ansual net moserer income class itu wiutur 1942 (coilars) <br> (1) | an <br> families | ] ercentuge of famibes in apecifiend ref morey incore chassts in 1941 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  |  | Necuitive trnome | $\begin{aligned} & 50- \\ & 8499 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.790- \\ 3909 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3:, 000- \\ \$ 1,499 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,500- \\ & \$ 1,099 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2,000 \\ & \$ 2,990 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,000 \text { or } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
    |  | (3) | (3) | (4) | (5) | i6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
    | Sprative | 100 | 10 | 44 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
    | 0-479 | 100 | 0 | 58 | $\underline{21}$ | 9 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
    | 590 - 9040 | 100 | 0 | 2 t | 41 | 15 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
    | 1,060-1,40. | 100 | 0 | 10 | 32 | 34 | 14 | 5 | 5 |
    | 1,500-1, 999 | 100 | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | 2 | 10 | 33 | 19 | 21 | 4 |
    | 2,6013-2, 599. | 100 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 29 | 21 | 13 |
    | 3,600 or or'er | 100 | $\underline{2}$ | 4 | 10 | 4 | 18 | 27 | 35 |

    ## Reliability of the Data

    The method used in this study to obtain food consumption data is, of course, subject to some error. It is not expected that the homemaker can recall with great precision the exact quantities of each of the kinds of food consumed. There may be some understatement and some overstatement that is not compensated for within a single sehedule. However, it is believed that in the averages for fairly large groups of fanilies these are compensating errors, Darticularly for items consumed by most families. A study of the trends in consumption with income lends support to this belief. For iterrs consumed in very small quantity or by only a few families, averages, of course, are le:s reliable. Nevertheless, the data presented in this report are unsmoothed averages cxcept for 3 few items in which adjustments have been made to bring figures on consumption into line with those on quantities purchased.

    These adjustmente were considered to be necessary because the schedule used in the study asked two separate questions, one on food purchased during the period, the other on food consumed during the period. There may have been some misunderstanding of the questions, resulting in onission of food consumed during the period that had been bought previous to the period.

    It may be assumed that for a larse group of families guantities purchased should equal quantities consumed. A careful study of the figures on consumption compared with the figures on purchase, however showed that for 28 of the 177 items the consumption figures might be considered underestimates becatse of the type of products they were and because of the repetition of the diserepancy in most of the income classes.
    Some of the food items for which purchases reported were sisnificantly higher than consumption reported are used a little at a time, perhaps only a small piece a slice, or a spoonful or two at a time. Hence, they may easily have been overlooked in reporting consumption. Such items include for exan:ple, flour for thickening, corn meal for dipping fish before baking, shortening or oil for frying that is reclaimed for reuse, dressing on salads, spreads for sandwiches, and onion or lemon for flavoring. Other foods that were reported as purchased in larger quantities than were consumed are foods that fumily members may help themselves to without the knowledge of the homenaker; for cxample, crackers and soft drinks. For still others, like potatoes, beans, and bacon there seems no obvious cxplanation. It is recognized that there nay have been some advance buying of such items as four, fat, and evaporated wilk, particularly among families that remembered the shortages of the last World War. But to what extent families were building up home stock piles, large or small, in the spring of 1942 could not be determined.

    It was decided, therefore, to adjust these 28 items on the bisis of the purchase figures. The firures presented in the text and appendix tables of this volume are ad-
    justed figures. For the use of readers who prefer to rely upon the reported data, averages of the quantities consumed of these items as reported by the families and their average money values per family per week before adjustment, are shown in table 38. No adjustment has been made in the percentage of families consuming eachlof the'foods.

    ## Seasonality of the Data

    The food schedule furnished a report of the household's consumption and purchases of food during the 7 -day period just preceding the interview. The beginning dates of the week covered varied from March 19 to Jume 25, 1942; the closing dates were 7 days later. For a distribution of schedules by week of collection, see table 39 .

    The data compiled from the schedules, therefore, show consumption in the spring season only. No attempt has been made to adjust the figures for seasonality. This needs to be done, however, should the data in this report be used to make an estimate for the entire year 1942; in addition, consideration must be given to the fact that 1942 was a period of rising prices and rising incomes; that food shortages began in that year; and that the food shortages were more severe in some areas than in others.

    ## Measurement of Household Size

    ## Household Size in Equivalent Persons

    Table 40 shows average household size in equivalent persons for housekeeping families and individuals giving acceptable food schedules, by type of community and by income class.

    It was necessary to determine the size of the households represented in the food study since comparisons of family food consumption from one income group to another are affected by the size of the families included. The size of family from the point of view of food consumption is not merely a count of persons, but a count of meals consumed by the persons in the family.

    To reduce all families to a cormmon unit or measure, 21 meals have been considered to represent one person, since in this country it is the usual number served to each person. Therefore, the total number of meals served to all persons in the family during the reported week was divided by 21 and the resulting figure has been considered the size of the family. Vicals for an entire week were counted as 21, even though the food was apportioned into more than 21 servings for infants and invalids, or fesser than 21 for persons habitually not eating breakfast or lunch. Lunches purchased and caten away from home were not counted as family meals but were recorded separately. This procedure made it possible to adjust for meals eaten sway 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 roeals, each individual, regardless of sex, age, or activity, was considered equally important insofar as food consumption was concermed.

    The chief use made of household size computed in terms of equivalent persons was in determining the average consumption per person of various articles or groups of food. These averages were obtained by dividing aggregate consumption for the week by the number of equivalent persons comprising the group of households. Data on the consumption of food on a per person basis are satisfactory for comparisons between large population groups composed of similar proportions of children and adults or of men and women in which the average degree of occupational activity of the adults is similar. For groups dissinular in any of these respects, such fgures are not comparable when they refer to commodities that are consumed more largely by persons in some age, sex, or occupational activity groups than in others. 'This fact shonld be kept in mind in interpreting the comparisons made throughout the text between per capita consumption of farm and urban groups. Actually, the nonfarm groups, urban and rural nonfarm, include a smaller proportion of children and men and a higher proportion of women than the farm group. The physical activity of the nonfarm adults, moreover, is less than that of the farm adulte.

    ## Household Size in Equivalent Nutrition Units

    Houschold size in nutrition unita refers to the requircments of a particular houschold in terms of specific nutrients, such as protein, calcium, or vitamin A.

    The relatives used in this study for determining housebold size in terms of equivalent nutrition units are given in table 41. The average size of households in equivalent nutrition units is shown by type of community and net money income class in table 34.
     sumed at home por family per week, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping fanilies and single persons in the Ifited States, spring 19/2 $2^{2}$
    

    | teral gatm All clarges ${ }^{7}$.... | . 43 | . 33 | . 23 |  | 12.21 |  |  | 21 | 15 | . 24 | 24 | 1.02 | 1.38 | . 32 | . 39 | 9.01 | 4.65 | . 08 \% | 07 | . 06 | . 92 | . 58 | 1.64 | 17 | .$^{.02}$ | . 12 | $\frac{.04}{03}$ | - 30 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 0499 | . 23 | . 35 | .13; | . 11 | 9.89 | 1.18 | 1.31 | .28 | $11)$ | 18 | .14 | - Rei | $1.03{ }^{1}$ | . 25 | . 27 | 9.90 | 6.109 | . 06 | . 08 | . 03 | 1.71 | . 73 | 1.74 1.851 | 19 | . 02 | ${ }^{.07}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 03 | .18 .30 |
    | 500-999 | . 40 | . 18 | . 231 | . 02 | 13.32 | . 40 | 1.26 | 14 | . 19 | . 25 | .14 | 1.05 | 1.35 | . 28 | . 50 | 10.21 | 5.13 | . 12 | . 12 | . 13 | 1. 88 | . 47 | 1.89 | ${ }_{08}^{07}$ | .05 | . 14 | . 10 | . 58 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | . 55 | . 30 | . 30 |  | 16.97 | . 88 | 1.63 | . 11 | . 16 | . 23 | -41 | 1.34 | 2.59 | . 38 | . 61 | 8.72 | 2.22 <br> 1.69 | .17 | . 12 | . 28 | 1.82 | . 19 | 1.69 | 22 | .01 | . 23 | .13 | . 49 |
    | $1.500-1,999$ | 1.20 | . 25 | . 40 |  | 13.86 | 1.97 | . 79 | . 02 | . 22 | . 44 | . 25 | . 74 | 1.43 | ${ }^{4} 48$ | . 59 | ${ }_{6}^{6.53}$ | 1.68 | . 17 | . 18 | 23 | 1.24 1.14 | . 45 | 1.28 | 23 | 031 | 22 | . 04 | 88 |
    | 2,090-2,999 | . 14 | . 50 | . 49 |  | 15.70 | . 70 | . 98 | . 11 | . 25 | . 43 | . 34 | . 89 | 1. 68 | -18 | . 40 | 7.98 5.771 | 1.35: | . 12 | . 18 | . 010 | 1.14 | . 21 | 1.23: | . 08 | . 06 : | . 17 | . 05 | 18 |
    | 3,000 or over | . 17 | . 39 | -45, |  | 14,46 | .311. | . 68 [ | .51 | .08, | . 31. | . 631 | . 3.3 |  | . 62 | . 44 | 5.77 | .271 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | Averaze moner valie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | mewn | $003 .$ | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dot. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dui. | Dot. | Wol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dot. | Dol. | Dol. | Dal. | Dol. | Dol. | Vol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Doi. | Dot. |
    | ill clasges ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 0.11 | 0.045 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.114 | 0.047: | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.17 ! | (1.06 | 0.081 | 0.01 | 0.101 | 0.01 | 6. 02 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0,06: | $0.0{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |  | 1, 13 |
    |  | . 10 | 01 | . 05 | 01. | .17 | . 02 | 04 |  | . 01 | . 01. | (t) | ${ }^{6} 1$ | 0 | .04 | 03 | 02 | . 02 | (3) | . 01 | . 02 | , 13 | . 03 | . 08 | . 01 | (b) | (3) | ${ }^{(8)}$ | 02 |
    | 500.909 | .14 | . 01 | .06 | . 02 | . 15 | . 22 | 04 | , 01 | -62 | . 22 | 113 | . 04 | (1) | . 08 | 04 | .11 | ( ${ }^{\text {) }}$ | . 095 | . 0. | . 04 | 12 | . 06 | . 08. | . 02 | . 01 | . 14 | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) | 03 |
    | 1,000-1.498 | . 12 | . 02 | . 11 | . 03 | . 19 | . 22 | . 041 | . ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | . 03 | . 04 | .f94 | . 05 | 03 | 15 | 04 | ${ }^{11}$ | . 031 | . 01 | . 02 | . 03 | 16 | . 04 | 08 | 06 | .031 | (1) | 01 | 10 |
    | 1.500-1,989 | . 12 | . 04 | .11 | . 04 | , 291 | . 22 | . 03 | . 01 | . 03 | . 03 | . 06 | . 07 | 05 | . 16 | . 07 | 06 | . 01 | . 01 | . 01 | . 21 | 17 | . 02 | .08 | . 04 | . 131 | . 0 | 1 | 10 |
    | 2,000-2,999 | . 08 | . 04 | . 10 | . 04 | . 26 | 01 | . 03 | . 011 | . 03 | . 05 | . 08 | . 06 | 14 | . 14 | 08 | . 07 | . 01 | -02! | . 01 | . 03 | 2 | 02 | .06 | 05 | 10 | . 06 | 01 | . 15 |
    | 2,000-2,499 | . 08. | . 04 | . 10 | . 07 | . 23 | . 01 | . 03 | . 01 | . 03 | . 05 | .08 | 06 | 12 | 18 | . 08 | . 08 | (8) ${ }^{01}$ | . 02 | 01 | . 0 | 19. | . 02 | 05 | ${ }_{06}^{05}$ | 10 | .06 | (8) | +14 |
    | 2.500-2,999 | . 08 | . 04 | . 09 | . 65 | . 30 | . 02 | . 04 | 01 | . 04 | . 04 | .188 | ${ }^{0}$ | 17 | 21 .23 | . 09 | ${ }_{0}^{06}$ | (8) | . 021 | . 01 | . 015 | . 23 | . 02 | . 05 | .07 | .97 | ${ }^{07}$ | . 01. | + 22 |
    | 3.000 ar over ${ }^{5}$ | +109 | . 06 | . 14. | . 09 | . 31. | . 02 | 02 | .01 | . 04 | . 05 | . 68 | ${ }_{6}^{1}$ | 2.24 | . 23 | . 06 | (19) | (s) | . 01 | . 01 | .01 | . 21 | .01 | . 05 | . 09 | . 071 | . 96 | . 011 | . 17 |
    | 3,000-4,999 | . 19 | . 05 | , 13 | . 11 | . 32 | .$^{02}$ | 02 | ${ }^{0} 01$ | . 104 | 04 | 08 10 | 07 09 | . 11 | . 23.3 | 07 | ${ }_{08}$ | (s) | . 01 | 01 | (*) | . 28 | .01 | . 05 | 0 | . 07 | . 00 | . 01 | . 38 |
    | $5,000-9,984$. | . 12 | . 08 | 17 | . 11 | . 28 | . 03 | 02 | . 011 | . 194 | 0 | 10 | 09 | 11 | . 23 | 67 | 08 | (a) | . 01 | . 0 | (*) | . 28 | . 1 | . |  |  |  |  |  |
    | ROHAE nonpark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 06 |  | 14 | 05 | 25 | . 06. |  | 5 | 01 | 21 | 06 | . 17 | 05 | . 3 | . 04 | 01 | 07 |
    | claskek | 14 | . 63 | . 69 | , 0 | . 2. | . |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
    | 0-499 | 13 | . 11 | . 04 | . 01 | . 19 | . 02 | OR | . 01 | . 02 | . 01 | ${ }^{01}$ | . 04 | . 081 | 97 | . 04 | . 24 | . 08 | .017 | .05 | 01 | 16 | 68 | .191 | 02 | ${ }^{8}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 01 | 01 | . 02 |
    | 500-999. | . 15 | . 02 | . 07 | . 01 | . 27 | .03 | 16. | (s) 01 | . 01 | . 01 | . 02 | . 08 | . 10 | 11 | . 05 | 33 | . 6 | . 01 | $0{ }^{08}$ | 01 | . 22 | 0 | 16 | . 05 | . 01 | 04 | 01 | . 06 |
    | 1,000-1,499 | 16 | . 06 | +12 | 01 | . 28 | . 01 | 10 | (s) | . 05 | 02 | .$^{03}$ | . 06 | 19 | - 3 | . 06 | 23 23 | . 04 | . 01 | . 07 | . 01 | . 22 | . 04 | . 16 | 07 | . 01 | 07 | 01 | 12 |
    | 1.500-1.990 | . 14 | . 04 | . 14 | . 01 | . 29 | . 02 | . 07 | (8) $^{02}$ | . 05 | ${ }^{0.3}$ | . 08 | . 06 | . 191 | . 24 | . 06 | 26 | 05 | . 02 | .05 | . 01 | . 28 | . 03 | 17 | 05 | . 12 | . 07 | . 08 | . 14 |
    | $2.000-2.949$ | . 16 | . 08 | +11 | . 02 | . 38 | 03 | .07 | (6) | . 00 | +06 | . 08 | . 07 | . 23 | . 12 | . 06 | . 20 | . 04 | . 02 | . 02 | . 00 | . 25 | . 04 | . 06 | . 08 | . 03 | . 09 | . 122 | .13 |
    | 3.000 | . 10 | . 04 | 13 | . 03 | . 28 | . 03 | .07 |  | . 66 | . 05 | . 08 | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | RORAL yaby |  |  |  |  |  | 04 | 004 | 02 | . 0.4 | 02 | . 03 | . 08 | d | . 08 | 06 | . 31 | 14 | .01 | 02 | 01 | 27 | 11 | 281 | 03 | . 01 | . 03 | .01 | 03 |
    | claciera | . 04 | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | $0 \times 489$. | . 03 | . 03 | . 04 | (8) | . 45 | . 05 | . 11 | . 02 | . 62 | . 02 | . 02 | .07 | . 29 | 06 | . 04 | .43 .46 | .18 .15 | 01 | . 02 | ${ }^{(6)}$. 02 | . 191 | .14 | . 30 | $.03$ | ${ }^{(3)}$ | . 02 | . 01 | . 02 |
    | 5006098 | . 04 | . 03 | . 08 | . 01 | -4.5. | .02] | .10 | . 03 | . 03 | .$^{02}$ | ${ }^{0} 0$ | . 29 | . 78 | . 679 | . 07 | . 40 | . 07 | . 01 | .03 | . 01 | .24 | . 11 | 26 | .02 | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 | . 67 |
    | 1.000-1.490 | . 06 | . 12 | .11. | . 024 | . 415 | . 08 |  |  | . 05 | -02 | . 02 | . 05 | -. 53 | . 13 | . 09 | . 26 | . 05 | 0103 | 01 | . 04 | . 36 | . 05 | . 21 | . 05 | (8) | . 06 | . 02 | . 04 |
    | $1,500-1.899$ $2000-2989$ | . 11 | . 11 | . 13. | . 02 | . 48 | . 08 | . 68 | ( 01 | . 05 | . 04 | . 04 | . 08 | . 60 | . 05 | .06 | . 35 | . 04 | . 02 | . 0.5 | . 01 | . 37 | .07 | 22 | 05 | . 01 | . 05 | (3) | . 08 |
    | $2,000-2,899$. 3.000 or over | . 02 | . 08 | .16 | . 03 | . 35 | . 08 | ,081 | (8) | . 02 | . 03 | . 07 | . 05 | .211 | . 15 | . 08 | . 231 | . 02 | . 62 | . 01 | (0) | . 34 | . 04 | 22 | . 02 | . 02 | .041 | . 11 | . 1 |

    1 See Methodology, Relisbility of the Dats, for basis of adjust ments p. 136. See tabies 22 through 28 for sdjusted dsta.
    ${ }_{2}$ Seet tsible 3, footrote :
    3 See table 23 , footnote 2.
    5 includes families with incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or over, not shotran separately.

    4 Sec table 26 , foatrote 5.

    Table 39.-Dates or rollection: Distribution of food feports by weel of collection, by type of community and antural net money income class, housekeepiag families ond single persoms in the Vnited States, spiny 194e'
    

    Table 40.-Honsehold composition: Average household size in equivalent persons and petcentage distribution of persons in specifed sex-ageactivity groups, by type of community and annual net money income class, housekeeping families and single persons in the United States, spring $1942{ }^{1}$
    

    Table 41.--Equivalent nutrition ontts by sex-age-activity classtfication: Scale of relatives for determining household size in terms of equivalent nutition units :
    
    : Based on National Research Councips recommended daily allowances for speeific nutrienta.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Methodology, Measurement of Kousehold Size in Equivalent Nutrition Units, page 137.
    The scales of relatives have been derived from the daily allowances for calories and the specific nutrients recormended by the Food and Nutrition Board of the Yational Research Council, May 1941 (table 42). The dietary nceds of the moderately active man were considered equal to one nutrition unit; the needs of the other sex-age-activity groups are expressed in relation to those of the moderately active man. Table 40 shows the composition of the average houschold by sex-age-activity groups.

    The consumption of population groups dissimilar in composition with respect to age, sex, or occupational activity can be compared when the data on nutritive value of the diets of groups in the comparison are presented on a per-nutrition unit basis.

    A fuller explanation of household size measured in nutrition units can be found in the three earlier publications of the Cinited States Department of Agriculture listed below:
    Circular 507, Diets of Employed Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Cities
    Misellaneous Publication 405, Family Food Consumption and Dietary Levels, Farm Series
    Miscellaneous Publication 452, Family Food Consumption and Dietary Levels, Urban and Village Series

    ## Classification of Foods

    All the foods for which families reported consumption were classified into 13 food groups. The classification of the items into groups is indicated by their arrangement in tables 22 to 28 .

    Table 42.-Recommended dietary allowances: ${ }^{1}$ Dielary allowances per day for persons of specified sex, age, and activity, recommended by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council, May 1941
    


    ## Method of Estimating the Proportion of Families Having Diets Unsatisfactory in Dietary Essentials

    As pointed out earlier, data obtained from the food reports collected in this survey are not intended for individual analysis family by family. Just as the food consumption data are presented as group averages, so are the estimates of nutritive value of diets presented as averages for groups of families. However, sverage nutritive value alone only begins to tell the story about the adequacy of family diets in the Tnited States during the spring of 1942, and some indiction of the proportion of families that failed to meet the nutrient recommendations of the National Research Council is needed. A method of estimating the distribution of families was, therefore, devised for the purposes of this report.

    In the Consumer Purchases Study of 1936, information on tood consumption was obtained by means of food records as well as from estimates (check lists). The food records were carefully kept accounts (by weight) of the food inventories on hand at the beginning and close of the period covered by the food record and of the food brought into the home for family consumption. The nutritive value of the week's diet of each farmily was analyzed individually for its content in respect to the various nutrients. Estimates were then made of the percentage of families that had dicts unsatisfactory in each of the nutrients. A family diet was considered unsatisfactory in a nutrient if the average value per nutrition unit did not meet or exceed the allowance recommended for a moderately active man.

    In the present study a rough estimate has been made of the proportion of families that had diets in the spring of 1942 which falled to mect the recommendations of the National Research Council. This was done by relating the average nutritive value of diets in that period to both the average nutritive value of diets in 1936 and the proportion of families that fell short of the recommended allowances in 1936.

    Basic to this was the assumption that for a single nutrient a relationship exists between the average nutritive value of the diets of a group of families and the percentage with diets failing to meet the recommended allowances. A scatter diagram based on data from the Consumer Purchases Study was made for each of the following: Food energy, protein, calcium, iron, vitamin A, ascotbic acid, thiamine, and riboflavin. (Analysis of the diets in respect to niacin was not made in the Consumer Purchases Study.) On each diagram there were 80 dots representing groups of families. The families were classified into homogeneous groups by type of community, region, and level of money value of food. Each dot represented the relation between the average value per nutrition unit of the nutrient under consideration for a homogeneous group ( $x$-axis) and the percentage of families in that group with diets unsatisfactory in respect to that nutrient ( $y$-axis). A single smoothed curve was drawn to represent the dots.

    It was assumed also that:
    a. The relationship which existed between average nutritive value and percentage of families with unsatisfactory diets in 1936 would be similar in spring 1942; and that,
    b. A curve fitted to the dots for the described averages and percentages for families grouped by level of money value of food would be similar for families grouped by level of money income.
    By marking on the $x$-axis the average value per nutrition unit for each population group studied in spring 1942, the probable percentage of families having unsatisfactory diets in respect to the specific nutrient was read off the $y$-axis. These percentages were then used to estimate the proportion of all the families in the United States that had diets unsatisfactory in respect to single nutrients.

    ## Comparison of Populations Covered in Consumer Purchases Study and Study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime

    The food data from the Consumer Purchases Study and those from the survey of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime are comparable in that both cover housekeeping families in the civilian, noninstitutional population only.

    The food data from the two studies are not strictly comparable for the following reasons: The earlier study extended over a full year, a higher proportion of the schedules having been collected in the summer and fall than in the winter and spring; the later study covered the spring months only. The 1936 study covered only nonrelief families of two or more persons that included a husband and wife, both native-born. Moreover, schedules were taken from white families only, except in the southeast where schedules were obtained from Negro families as well as white. The 1942 study included single persons and families of any size, or any color, whether they received relief or not, as they were found in the sample.

    ## Comparison of Food Consumption Data from Dietary Studies With "Disappearance" Data

    ## Average Quanfities of Food

    Estimates of average food consumption in the Tnited States can be made in two ways. The first method involves the use of family dietary surveys such as the one reported in this volume. Data from individual families representative of various population groups are put together with suitable weighting, to give average figures for the country as a whole. Under the second method, average consumption data are derived from statistics of production, imports, exports, and stocks on hand at the beginning and end of the year. These so-called "disappearance" Ggures, which show the quantities of food disappearing into consumption channels, are commonly used in dealing with the total food supply. Suitable adjustments are made, of course, to convert the quantities of major food products as they "disappear" in primary trade channels to corresponding quantities of food as it enters the family litchen; for example, bushels of wheat are converted to pounds of flour.

    The question naturally arises as to how well the two sets of figures may be expected to agree. Both methods are subject to a certain amount of error. In dietary surveys there may be errors inherent in the sample as well as in the information reported by the families. The fact that "disappearance" figures are really residuals is an indication of their approximate nature. Also, the steps in converting farm production
    figures to quantities actually sold for retail consumption involve many potential sources of error. Aside from the possible errors, there are a few basic differences in the character of the data that need to he recognized in comparing resuts of the two methods.
    "Disappearance" fgures include the food used in restaurants, institutions, and at refreshment stands as well as food purchased for home consumption. Although the estimated quantity of home-produced food in rural communities is taken into account, no attempt is made to include the products of city gardens.

    Family food consumption figures include only the foods consumed in the home, whether purchased or home-produced. They exclude food, candy, soft drinks, and other refreshment eaten away from home.

    The family, moreover, reports the consumption of foods in the forms in which they are purchased-including such items as ready-made bread, canned fruit, salad dressing, and the like. These and other foods on the market that are mixtures of two or more ingredients are usually reported under one food group. For example, bread would be reported under grain products but no account would be taken of the possible milk in the bread. In "disappearance" figures, on the other hand, a figure for milk would include milk for all purposes. Similarly, the apparent consumption of sugar ("disappearance" basis) would include that which went into candy, chewing gum, soft drinks, canned fruit, and other products.

    Table 43 compares the consumption of food groups in 1936 and 1942 as indicated by "disappearance" data and by data from family dietary surveys. In the data from the food consumption survey of 1936, which were adjusted for food consumed sway from home, there was fairly good agreement (within 10 percent) in figures covering 6 of the 11 food groups. The larger differences probably are explainsble for the reasons already discussed. The dietary stady figures make no allowance for milk used in baked goods, candy, and other products; for nuts used in candy; and for sugar in purchased canned fruit, baked goods, and similar foods. The higher meat figure in the "disappearance" data may be related to a higher average consumption in restaurant meals than in home meals or may be due to a discrepancy between retail weights computed from wholesale or production figures and those reported as purchased by families.
    Table 43.-Food Conscmption from dietary suryexs and "disappearance" data: Comparison of average quantity of specified groups of food consumed per person per year computed from dietary surveys with thal from "disappearance" ${ }^{1}$ data, 1986 and 1942

    \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Food group

    (1)} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1936} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1942} <br>
    \hline \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average quantity per person per year} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Relative (Conswmer Purchasers Study $=$ 100)} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Average quantity per yerson jer year} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Relative (Sutvey of Family Spending and Saving $=$ 100)} <br>

    \hline \& | Consumer |
    | :--- |
    | Purchasea |
    | Stedy | \& Dissppearanice data \& \& Survey of Family Spending and Saving \& \[

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { Dissppeat- } \\
    & \text { suce } \\
    & \text { dats }
    \end{aligned}
    $$
    \] \& <br>

    \hline \& (2) \& (3) \& (4) \& (5) \& (6) \& (7) <br>
    \hline Milk ${ }^{2}$ \& 177 gt \& 208 gth \& 118 \& 222 qt. \& $238 \mathrm{gt}$. \& 107 <br>
    \hline Potatoes, swetpotstoes...-- \& 127 lb . \& 139 lb . \& 109 \& 148 lb . \& 1331 b \& 90 <br>
    \hline Dry beang and peas, nuts ${ }^{3}$. \& 31 lb. \& 16 lb . \& 145 \& 19 lb . \& 16 lb . \& 84 <br>
    \hline Green and yellow vegetables \& 69 lb. \& 73 lb . \& 108 \& 110 lb . \& 90 lb . \& 82 <br>
    \hline Tomatoes, citrus fruit...... \& 87 ib . \& 73 lb . \& 84 \& 139 db . \& 87 b \& 63 <br>
    \hline Other vegetables and fruit 4 \& 203 lb . \& 186 lb . \& 92 \& $1661 \%$ \& 183 lb . \& 114 <br>
    \hline Meat, poultry, fish ${ }^{5}$--..... \& 123 lb. \& 13816. \& 112 \& 122 lb \& 149 lb . \& 122 <br>
    \hline Eg88,------- \& 23 dos . \& 23 dos. \& 100 \& 34 dea. \& 25 don. \& 74 <br>
    \hline Grain products ${ }^{6}$ \& 196 bb . \& 202 lb . \& 103 \& 181 lb. \& 209 ib. \& 108 <br>
    \hline Fats, oils ; \& 62 lb . \& 65 lb . \& 105 \& 62 lb . \& 68 lb . \& 110 <br>
    \hline Sugars, sweets_ \& 71 lb . \& 107 lb . \& 151 \& 54 lb . \& 107 lb . \& 198 <br>
    \hline
    \end{tabular}

    For 1942 there was less agrecment heiween "disappearanec" figures and those based upon the dictary study here reported, as would be expected. The chief reason is that the figures based upon the dietary study reler to the spring scason only and to some extent because they were not adiusted for food away from liome. It would not be surprising to find a higher consumption of egge, of citrus fruit, and of green vegetables in the spring months than for the year as a whole. The figures for the 1942 dietary study bear this out. For certain other focds like fats, frain products, and milk which are less affected by season, difierenees between the two sets of Gigures जere within 10 percent.

    The discrepancy beween the two 1942 estimates of sugar consumption are explained in part by the busic differences in the nature of the data and also by the fact that sugar rationing became efiective during the conse of the dietary survey. This fact undouhtedly exerted a rextraining influence on its purchase and also on the use of sugar on hand during the period of the study.

    ## Average Nutritive Values of Foad

    When food consumption data from the two sources are reduced to messurements of nutritive value, there is remarkably close agreement betmeen the evaluation based on dietary surveys and that from estimates of "disappearance" (table 44). This is particularly true in the 1936 eomparison in which the factor of seasonality does not play a part. The higber figure for calories in the over-all food supply reflects for one thing, the larger quantity of sugar, which alone adds an average of 180 calories a day to the food energy valuc of the diet. The larger quantity of meat in the "disappearance" figures contributes to the higher calories and to the apparently more liberal supplies of thitmiae, riboflavin, and niacin.

    Table 44.-Nctritive valce of difts, from diftairy suryeys and "disappearance" data: Comparison of acerage nutrilive adue per pereon per day of diels computed from dictary survegs with that jom "disomperarance" I data, 1938 and 1942
    

    1 see table 40 , iostocte $i$.
    
    In the 1942 comparison, differences exist in caiories, which again are related chicfly to sugar, and in niacin which refect dieferences in quantities oi meat; and in addition, in vitamin $A$ and ascomic acid values which result from the larger quantities of green vegctables und citrus fruit reported on food schedules taken in the spring.

    It is possible that further refinement of "disappearance" figures and greater accuracy in data from dietary surveys might result in cren closer conformity between the results of the two methods. "Disappearance" figures are useful in giving an over-all picture of average-per-capita food supplies at any one time and in following trends in consumption orer a poriod of years. Data from dietary studies are needed to interpret the averages-to show variations with income, region, and other factors, and to indicate the exient of dietary deficiencies.

    ## Appendix C. Facsimile of Food Schedule

    

    Page 1

    | $\lambda$ |  | * |  |  | A |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | I6am Inem Item |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 19. TOWHTOES, CITRCS FRUIT.............. |  | क) OTHEA VECETAREES. <br> 70. Freth: <br> Detts........... |  | 114. ECis. . . . . . . . . . . . |  |
    |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 116.4 \\ & 116 . \end{aligned}$ | AT, FOLITRY, FTSH. Det: |
    | 30. | Tomereni Froah.. |  |  | 71. | Caulislaret... |  | Stesk: Round.. |
    | 3 n | Conmed: Pulp. | 72. | Criery | 117. | Oiner. |
    | 12. | Juice prere. | 73. | Cotrs on cot.. | $11 \%$. | Rentt: Rib.... |
    | 33. | Subtota 1...... | 74. Cutimberi ..... |  | 119. | other. <br> moitinc.Etering |
    |  |  | 75. | Cnions . . . . . . . | 120. |  |
    | 34. | Crangra: Freah, . | $76$ | Rytpieger. Turnigs | t11. | Ground. . . . . . |
    | 35. | Canced, duice |  |  | 112. | Cotred beef... |
    | 36. | Grapelpoit: trath | 77. | Other | $12]$. | Dries betr... |
    | 37. | Conned: Pulp. | 78. | Subintal. | 124. | Other teff |
    | 38. | yuice....... | 79. | Cunrud: |  | (tyenpt lives |
    | 39. | Lemons. |  | Bretis. | 125. | Sutridetal... |
    | 40. | Tanerrinta....... | 88. | Corn. Other | 126. | Veal: Cutiet. shope. ratat. |
    | 41. | 5ubeotal...... | 82 | Pickras, ridiather | 127. | Steme ather.. |
    | 42. <br> 43. | LEAFY, CREEN, nellow vegetables. | $\begin{aligned} & 83 . \\ & 84 . \end{aligned}$ | 01ive*.......... | 128. | Kach: Croote, (lain. rib)... |
    |  | Fraht |  | Subratal...... | 129. | 1ra........... |
    |  | Cabberv......... | 85. Ofreer mert. . . . . . |  | 130. | Other......... |
    | 45. | Collatis....... | 16. | Frenh; Applet........... | 131. | Pork: Freth: Cboge (loin, rib) |
    | 45. | Dendelition turent......... | 87. |  | 132. | Loin reatl. . . |
    | 46. |  | 88. | Eerrita. . . . . . . | 133. | Snuxate....... <br> Other. Trinh... |
    | 4 \%. | Uutard areane. | 89. | Cantalsupe.... | 134. |  |
    | 48. | Splnach......... | $90 .$ | Cherrien....... | 175. | Smolied or cured: |
    | 49. | Turnip eretrit. | $92 .$ | Grppr. <br> Penchen. | 136. | Hanalited (inncolited). . . |
    | 50. | Latture......... |  | Peprt.......... |  |  |
    | 51. | Dthar greens... | 93. | Peprit......... ${ }^{\text {Plouppple. }}$, . | 137. | Hen, mhole ot APII |
    | \$2. | Subretal...... | 95. | Plume | 13. | Shouliter butt. Subtotal.... |
    | 53. |  | 96. | Rhubert........ | 139. |  |
    | 34. | Brame , Iima.... | 47. | Weterpatom..... | Liver(sfacify) | Other atet: <br> Liver(sftcify) |
    | 55. | beans, smap.... | 98. Other . . . . . . . . . |  |  |  |
    | 56. | Rirocsoit........ | 99.5 5ublotal..... |  | 144. | Canserf. cooked met........... |
    | 57. | micre............ | 100. | Cannod: Applen.......... | $\begin{aligned} & 142 . \\ & 143 . \end{aligned}$ | Gme......... |
    | 58. | Pear............ |  |  |  | Bolofna, ollher Sqbetot. $1 . .$. |
    | 59. | Carrota....... | 101. | Peacher-1...... | $\begin{aligned} & 143 . \\ & 144 . \end{aligned}$ |  |
    | 60. | Squist.......... | 102. | Pinvepple. . . . . | $\begin{aligned} & 144 . \\ & 145 . \end{aligned}$ | Foultry: Chicken |
    | 61. | Dther, ........., | 103. |  | $146 .$ |  |
    | 62. | Sublotat...... | $\begin{aligned} & 104 . \\ & 105 . \end{aligned}$ | Fruit fuicen... Hined fturti... | $14 \%$. | Turiey.otrar..Subiotal $1 . .$. |
    | 63. | Conned: | $\begin{aligned} & 106 . \\ & 107 . \end{aligned}$ | Other . . . . . . . . . | $149 .$ |  |
    |  | Fist............ |  | Subtetal. . . . . |  | Fiant fetan.... |
    | 6 | Asperegus. . . . . . | 108. | Dried: <br> Aoricote....... | 150. | Canmed cuted.... |
    | 63. 68. | Sment, trab.... | 109. | Penrtrs........ | 152. |  |
    |  | Fears. [im <br>  | $110 .$ |  | 153. | Detrer canned fhat |
    | $\begin{aligned} & 67, \\ & 60 . \end{aligned}$ | Other.......... | 111. | Other <br> Subsotal | 154. | Sea fourl (not tishy: Cament. |
    |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 112 . \\ & 12.5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  | 155. | Fresh. <br> Subnotal |
    |  |  |  |  | 158 |  |
    |  |  |  |  | 157. | Eacay a salt fenk. |
    |  |  |  |  | 138. | Taran.... |
    |  |  |  |  | $15 \%$. | Sale prot....... |
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    ## Appendix D. Nutritive Value of One Pound of Food Materials

    The food composition table (table 45) was prepared for computing the nutritive values of family diets in this study. The figures in the table are based on values in other compilations, on original data in the literature, and on results of analyses made in the laboratories of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics.

    In compiling the table an attempt was made to select values that might be considered typical of foods as they are purchased. However, individual analysis of any food resulting in higher or lower values is to be expected, depending on such factors as variety, season, length and conditions of storage.

    In some cases where no data were found it was considered better to assign imputed values for some of the nutrients, than to assume a value of gero. Parentheses are used to show which figures are computed from the ingredients of a recipe or are imputed. The imputed values were obtained in numerous ways-sometimes from data on the same food in another form-as canned food from fresh food, and sometimes from values for other foods which might be expected to contain similar quantities. In some instances values were obtained by a proportion, relating the undetermined value to appropriate ones that were availsble; for example, the B-vitamins in salt pork were derived from the figures for bacon on a protein-to-vitamin ratio and the vitamin A values for some of the milk products were derived by relating their fat content to the fat-vitamin A ratio in whole milk. When information permitted, adjustments were made for losses in commercial processing and marketing. Dashes are used to indicate that no suitable values were found and (0) to indicate that values are probably so small as to be considered negligible.

    Although the values shown in table 45 seemed to be the best for the purpose at the time they were compiled (March 1943) and may continue for a time to be suitable for making over-all estimates of the nutritive value of diets, too much reliance should not be placed on values for any one item, eyen when these values are shown without parentheses. As more data on the composition of different foods become available, many of the values presented here, particularly those for vitamins, may need revision. The most pronounced changes may be expected for the niacin values as most of the figures given are based on few determinations or are imputed. Since detailed data on consumption of foods are included in this report, it will be possible for any one who wishes to estimate how the use of different values might affect the averages given.
    
    

    Table 45.--Nutritive value of 1 pound of food matcrials-Continued
    
    

    Table 45.-Nutritive value of 1 pound of food materials.- Continued

    \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
    \hline Food item \&  \& ${ }_{\text {Protin }}^{\text {(3) }}$ \& $\mathrm{P}_{4}$
    (0) \&  \& ${ }_{\text {Calainm }}^{\text {(6) }}$ \& , arve \& ${ }_{\text {(800 }}^{\text {(8) }}$ \&  \& ( Searlibe \& ${ }^{\text {Thismine }}$ (1) \& ${ }^{\text {Rilomatain }}$ (12) \& ${ }_{\text {Niasin }}^{\text {(13) }}$ <br>
    \hline soorrat, mas - C \& Calarice \& Grams \& Gram, \& $G_{\text {crams }}$ \& Miliopant \& Nilitram \& 3ifligems \&  \& Milligems \& Siscorams \& Sicrosemis \& mifiorams <br>
    \hline  \& ${ }^{(1,2005)}$ \&  \& (18) \& (10) \& (6) \&  \& ${ }_{\text {(19) }}^{\text {(1) }}$ ) \& (10) \& (\%) \& ${ }_{(230)}^{(230)}$ \& ${ }_{(255)}^{(235)}$ \& ${ }^{(6,5)}$ <br>
    \hline ${ }_{\text {cosem }}^{125}$ \&  \& (\%) \&  \& (9) \& (tic \& (12,28 \& ¢ ${ }_{\text {4, }}$ \&  \&  \& $\xrightarrow{490}$ \& (eam) \&  <br>
    \hline  \& (20) \& 碞 \& ${ }_{\text {(3) }}^{(3)}$ \& (19) \& $\underset{\substack{\text { (254) } \\(88)}}{(8)}$ \& (1890) \& (28) \& $\xrightarrow{\text { (980) }}$ \&  \& ${ }^{1,022}$ \& (680) \& ${ }_{\text {cta }}^{(4,5)}$ <br>
    \hline 130. ECCS................ \& ${ }^{335}$ \& 52 \& 46 \& 3 \& 218 \& ${ }_{88}^{88}$ \& 10.9 \& ${ }^{1,040}$ \& (9) \& 835 \& ${ }^{(2,220)}$ \& . 2 <br>
    \hline Ster \& , \& ${ }^{46}$ \& , \& \& ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{1.388}$ \&  \& (en \& \& \& \& \& <br>
    \hline  \& ${ }^{\text {a }}$ \& (it) \& (8) \& (ist \& (15) \& cisiz \& (s. 5 \& 湤) \& $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & 0 \\
    & 0
    \end{aligned}
    $$ \&  \& \% \& ${ }_{\text {che }}^{\text {[5.0) }}$ <br>
    \hline con \& ${ }_{1,655}$ \& ${ }^{37}$ \& \% \& \& ${ }_{45}^{45}$ \& $\underset{\substack{65 \\ 635}}{ }$ \& $4^{4} 3$ \& 500 \& $\bigcirc$ \& \& \& <br>
    \hline ation feste: \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
    \hline  \& \& ${ }^{3}$ \& ${ }^{4}$ \& cis \&  \&  \&  \& (9) \& : \& \& \& <br>
    \hline ane \& 1, 1.80 \& ${ }^{3} 8$ \& ${ }_{3}^{4}$ \&  \& ${ }_{98}^{98}$ \& cise \& ${ }^{9} 12.2$ \& (\%) \& (i) \& (380) \& cis \& $\stackrel{9.0}{2.3}$ <br>
    \hline 14. ${ }^{\text {14. }}$ \& ${ }^{\text {a }}$ \&  \& -6 \& \(\substack{\begin{subarray}{c}{3,5 <br> 3.35 <br> 1.25} }

