



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A389
M34R

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LIBRARY



BOOK NUMBER

954150

A389
M34R

United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Marketing Service
Washington, D. C.

THE RELATION OF FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS OF THE SOUTH
TO NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN MARKETING 1/

In this paper I shall consider the theme of this session - "new developments in marketing" - as these developments are reflected in and affected by food consumption patterns of the South. Fortunately, we soon shall have a regional publication for the South 2/ - now at the Government Printing Office - which contains a great mass of data on food consumption patterns of house-keeping families in the spring of 1955. Three other regional reports are in print, and Report No. 1, for the United States as a whole, has already been released. Although most of you who are at this meeting know much more about marketing developments in the South than I do, I will venture to review with you what the new regional data on household food consumption tell us about current marketing changes, and what they may portend for the future.

Relation to Which New Developments in Marketing?

Using a broad definition of marketing, we consider changes in all operations and agencies performing them which are involved in the movement of foods and other farm products from the farm to the final consumer, that is, at all steps from the farm gate to the consumer's kitchen door. Let me enumerate the areas of new developments: (1) Changes in producing areas; (2) shifts from home production to purchases; (3) changes in assembly and transportation; (4) shifts from fresh to processed foods; (5) changes in methods of processing, both those that affect the forms in which foods are purchased, and those that do not; (6) changes in packaging; (7) changes in retail store handling; (8) changes in consuming areas including the development of suburbia, farm to nonfarm shifts, and regional movements.

The 1955 household food consumption data cast light on the relative levels of food consumption in the South, and their relationship to income and urbanization and on these four areas of marketing changes - the shift from home production to purchases, from fresh to processed items, from canned to frozen items, and changes in consuming areas.

Preview of Marketing Developments in the South and of their
Significance to the Entire Country

The South accounted for about a fourth of total U. S. outlays for food for home use and of meals and snacks away from home in the spring of 1955 and includes a third of the U. S. housekeeping population. Urban families buy

1/ Paper by Marguerite C. Burk, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, presented before Marketing Section of Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, at Birmingham, Ala. February 5, 1957.

2/ Food Consumption of Households in the South, Food Consumption Survey Report No. 4, U. S. Dept. Agriculture, December 1956.

more of their food than do farm families, of course, so it is not surprising to find that urban households in the spring of 1955 accounted for 55 percent of the food market of the South compared with 46 percent of the population of the area. Rural nonfarm and farm households bought 34 percent and 11 percent, respectively, of the food and meals of the South. They accounted for 35 percent and 19 percent of the population, respectively.

It is often said that the South has lagged behind the rest of the country in food marketing changes. Brief study of data from the 1954 Census of Business revealed that the sales volume of grocery stores in the South averaged substantially smaller than in the rest of the country. In fact, the volume of sales averaged two-thirds higher per store in the North and West than in the South. Another way of putting it, each grocery store outside of the South served 40 percent more people than the average store in the South in 1954.

Supermarkets appear to symbolize modern food marketing. If we define supermarkets as grocery stores with sales over a half million dollars per year, in 1954 there were 3,452 in the South (from Texas through Delaware and Maryland), serving about 50 million people, with an average of one per 14,400 people. Outside the South, in 1954 there were 10,297 supermarkets serving 111 million people, with an average of one per 10,800 people.

Recent changes in the purchase of particular commodities give us one clue to the cause of lags in marketing developments in the South. Data collected by the Market Research Corporation of America (table 1) from their

Table 1.- Purchases of frozen and canned orange juice by housekeeping families in MRCA panel in South and in U. S., April-June 1/

Item	Unit	Purchases per 1,000 people in April-June quarter						
		1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Frozen concentrated orange juice								
South	:Gallons:	9.0	12.3	30.2	44.3	51.4	52.7	53.7
U. S.	:Gallons:	26.6	39.2	78.3	81.1	92.8	101.1	97.9
Canned orange juice (single strength)								
South	: Cases :							
	:No. 2's:	24.9	24.0	40.3	38.3	31.1	28.1	25.3
U. S.	: Cases :							
	:No. 2's:	32.4	28.8	37.3	28.7	24.7	24.3	19.7

1/ From series "Consumer Purchases of Selected Fruits and Juices." Quarterly reports. Processed. AMS, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

panel of households reveal that the April-June 1956 rate of purchases of canned orange juice in the South was equal to the U. S. rate of two years earlier. The U. S. rate has declined since then, as many people have shifted from canned to frozen concentrated orange juice. For frozen concentrated orange juice, the April-June 1956 rate of purchases for the South averaged 54 gallons per thousand people while the U. S. rate was 98 gallons. In fact, the rate for the South last spring was about equal to the rate of late 1951 for the U. S. as a whole.

Most of the lags in marketing developments in the South probably resulted from a level of income lower than that of the country, as a whole, shortage of capital for expanding and improving marketing facilities, and the highest proportion of farm population of any region in the country. In terms of family consumption patterns, the rates of consumption of marketing services bought with food are influenced by family income, by the extent of home-produced supplies, and by the availability of marketing services.

Let us turn now to the 1955 survey for pertinent information on southern food consumption patterns in the spring of 1955.

What Are the Current Food Consumption Patterns of the South that Are Significant to the Analysis of Changes in Marketing?

Even cursory review of the patterns of food consumption in the South reveals the pervading influence of lower incomes and the greater proportion of people living on farms in the South than in other regions of the country. Obvious examples are the lower rates of meat consumption, the use of cheaper cuts and grades of meats, and the emphasis on less expensive cereal products. These mean less demand for commercial farm inputs and for marketing services. One wonders if the cumulative effect over past decades of lower incomes and large rural population in the South are not the underlying reasons for some of the apparent peculiarities in southern food patterns, such as the relatively heavy use of cereals at even the higher levels of incomes. Another element in this particular pattern may be the greater supply of domestic help to do home baking.

Here in brief are the highlights of my preliminary study of the patterns of consumption for groups of households, comparable in income and in urbanization, in the South and in the United States as a whole (table 2):

(1) The value of all meat, poultry, and fish consumed per household is probably lower in the South than in the United States principally because of cheaper beef. Fat pork consumption in farm households of the South runs twice as high as the U. S. average.

(2) Southern consumption rates are higher for fresh vegetables but lower for potatoes and sweetpotatoes combined. This is partly due to seasonal differences between the South and the rest of the country, but it may

Table 2.- Per person rates of consumption and money value of groups of foods, by selected groups of households of 2 or more in South and U. S., in a week, spring 1955 ^{1/}

Food group and area	Quantities consumed				Money value of all quantities consumed			
	Urban income group 2/		Rural nonfarm, \$2-3,000 income group 2/	Farm, \$3-4,000 income group 2/	Urban income group 2/		Rural nonfarm, \$2-3,000 income group 2/	Farm, \$3-4,000 income group 2/
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
Milk and dairy products ^{3/}								
Milk fat solids - South	0.45	0.37	0.36	0.43	1.32	1.05	0.98	1.24
U. S.	.46	.44	.39	.53	1.29	1.20	1.00	1.35
Nonfat solids - South	.91	.78	.79	.98				
U. S.	.90	.87	.82	1.04				
Fats and oils - South	.94	.93	.98	1.13	.31	.29	.30	.35
U. S.	.83	.79	.91	1.06	.33	.30	.30	.36
Flour and other cereal products - South	1.28	1.69	2.68	3.80	.24	.28	.33	.42
U. S.	1.09	1.20	2.01	2.98	.23	.25	.31	.38
Bakery products - South	2.28	1.93	2.04	1.20	.58	.48	.48	.26
U. S.	2.46	2.21	2.09	1.56	.64	.55	.48	.35
Meats, poultry, fish - South	4.52	4.08	3.49	3.57	2.69	2.27	1.77	1.68
U. S.	4.74	4.21	3.55	3.94	3.04	2.54	1.88	1.94
Eggs - South	.67	.65	.70	.69	.34	.33	.32	.26
U. S.	.60	.55	.63	.75	.33	.30	.29	.28
Sugar, sweets - South	1.35	1.36	1.54	1.82	.29	.23	.37	.27
U. S.	1.10	1.05	1.38	1.82	.25	.21	.30	.29
Potatoes, sweetpotatoes - South	1.40	1.59	1.91	1.85	.13	.15	.15	.15
U. S.	1.79	1.76	2.15	2.43	.17	.16	.17	.17
Fresh vegetables, excluding potatoes - South	3.23	3.01	3.10	3.19	.49	.44	.44	.46
U. S.	2.75	2.55	2.45	2.73	.48	.41	.38	.43
Fresh fruits - South	3.28	2.57	2.36	2.51	.39	.30	.28	.31
U. S.	3.16	2.71	2.73	3.12	.41	.35	.35	.42
Commercially frozen fruits and vegetables ^{4/} - South	.28	.32	.10	.02	.11	.12	.04	.01
U. S.	.29	.22	.12	.04	.10	.08	.05	.01
Commercially canned fruits and vegetables ^{4/} - South	1.61	1.22	1.07	.74	.34	.25	.21	.14
U. S.	1.48	1.36	1.18	.82	.31	.28	.23	.16
Fruit and vegetable juices, fresh, canned, frozen - South	1.30	.93	.63	.46	.13	.10	.06	.04
U. S.	1.45	1.26	.75	.62	.15	.13	.08	.06
Dried fruits and vegetables - South	.13	.21	.28	.36	.03	.04	.05	.07
U. S.	.12	.11	.20	.26	.03	.03	.04	.05

^{1/} Derived from the Household Food Consumption Survey 1955 Report No. 1, Food Consumption of Households in the United States and Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

^{2/} 1954 money income after income taxes.

^{3/} Excludes butter.

^{4/} Excludes juices, pickles and relishes, catsup, etc.

also be due, in part, to greater availability of fresh vegetables near major producing areas. In contrast are the somewhat lower rates of use of canned fruits and vegetables in the South.

(3) The most striking differences in the consumption patterns in the South from those of other areas apparently are related to higher rates of home baking but also influenced by recent farm to city migrations. These are reflected in greater consumption of eggs, fats, flour, cornmeal, sugar, and corn and cane syrup. But less purchased bread and other bakery products are consumed.

Comparison of Southern and
North Central Urban Patterns
by Income for Spring 1955

In order to be more specific, I shall comment on comparisons of the per person consumption patterns of several urban income groups in the South with the same groups in the North Central Region (table 3). But I shall not take time to point out the marketing implications of each - they will be evident to you as I discuss them. The generally lower rate of fluid whole milk use in the South has long been recognized, but I found that the rate of consumption of the \$8 - 10,000 income group there approximated that of the same group in the North Central Region. Substantially more buttermilk and condensed and evaporated milk were used across the whole income range. This may be partly due to more home baking. It may also be further evidence of the residual effect of limited supplies of fresh milk, lack of refrigeration, and low incomes for many years in the South.

Flour use in the South was noticeably higher in each income level up to the \$8 - 10,000 group. (The figures on flour exclude flour content of purchased baked goods for example.) The use of prepared mixes ran generally lower in the South than in the North Central Region. Use of purchased bread and other baked goods in the South was below rates for comparable households in the North Central Region up to the \$8 - 10,000 income level. Sugar and sirup, eggs, and fats were consumed in larger quantities than in the North Central region all across the income range in the South. But it should be noted that these figures on these items include only the eggs purchased in the form of eggs, and exclude the consumption of eggs purchased in baked goods and other prepared foods. We have not yet had time to calculate this "invisible" usage.

As mentioned above, southern households use more fresh vegetables than in the North Central region. (By the way, the fresh vegetable figures in the 1955 reports include use of purchased vegetables processed by canning or freezing in the home). In contrast to the relationship for fresh vegetables, North Central households consumed more potatoes and more processed vegetables in a number of the income groups than comparable southern households.

Table 3.- Per person consumption rates for selected foods in urban households, South and North Central Region, by income, in a week, spring 1955 1/

Food item and region	Households of 2 or more with 1954 money income after income taxes										
	All households	1-person households	Under \$10,000 and over								Not classified
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	
Fluid whole milk - South	4.47	3.89	4.50	2.44	3.99	5.56	6.46	6.67	4.60	5.40	
North Central	7.22	5.35	7.27	5.44	7.06	7.38	7.89	6.64	7.45	7.06	
Buttermilk - South	.57	.41	.58	.57	.53	.59	.61	.59	1.15	.63	
North Central	.17	.24	.17	.25	.12	.22	.17	.06	.08	.18	
Evaporated and condensed milk - South	.46	.44	.46	.47	.55	.45	.30	.12	.43	.41	
North Central	.16	.17	.16	.32	.25	.15	.14	.04	.02	.16	
Dry milk - South	.03	.07	.03	.03	.03	.02	.07	.01	.02	.02	
North Central	.02	.03	.02	.12	.01	.02	.01	.04	.04	.02	
Flour, all - South	.79	.70	.79	1.00	.84	.72	.46	.38	.46	.94	
North Central	.39	.48	.38	.37	.43	.46	.32	.39	.16	.33	
Prepared mixes - South	.15	.12	.15	.07	.14	.19	.23	.15	.12	.14	
North Central	.22	.15	.22	.23	.22	.23	.21	.29	.22	.22	
Bread - South	1.28	1.34	1.28	1.06	1.21	1.34	1.48	2.03	1.55	1.37	
North Central	1.65	1.83	1.64	1.60	1.64	1.66	1.72	1.50	1.57	1.62	
Other baked goods - South	.57	.66	.56	.39	.50	.65	.81	.80	.99	.49	
North Central	.71	.70	.71	.61	.60	.69	.84	.77	.85	.68	
Sugar - South	.87	.93	.87	.80	.89	.89	.86	.70	.94	.96	
North Central	.73	.79	.73	1.00	.82	.74	.72	.73	.45	.62	
Sirups, molasses, honey - South	.16	.19	.16	.18	.18	.15	.11	.11	.10	.18	
North Central	.08	.06	.08	.05	.09	.08	.09	.05	.09	.04	
Fresh vegetables - South	2.84	5.48	2.76	2.28	2.47	3.09	3.23	2.70	4.35	3.41	
North Central	2.58	3.73	2.55	2.75	2.48	2.31	2.35	2.91	3.32	2.98	
Processed vegetables - fresh equivalent 2/											
- South	1.80	1.78	1.82	1.32	1.63	2.03	2.39	2.38	2.85	2.06	
North Central	2.42	2.41	2.42	1.86	2.28	2.23	2.45	2.90	2.75	3.03	
Canned vegetables 3/ - South	.68	.58	.69	.59	.71	.68	.78	.60	.68	.74	
North Central	.81	.86	.81	.76	.87	.81	.86	.94	.59	.76	
Canned vegetable juices - South	.12	.19	.12	.07	.07	.15	.20	.29	.35	.20	
North Central	.24	.26	.24	.12	.21	.21	.17	.30	.32	.52	
Frozen vegetables 4/ - South	.14	.13	.14	.04	.09	.21	.24	.29	.37	.12	
North Central	.18	.11	.18	.10	.10	.13	.24	.23	.44	.18	
Fresh citrus - South	1.11	1.50	1.10	.78	1.01	1.10	1.30	1.54	2.71	1.41	
North Central	1.48	2.62	1.45	1.56	1.30	1.44	1.32	1.25	2.06	1.49	
Fresh deciduous fruits and melons											
- South	1.48	3.33	1.42	1.36	1.20	1.59	1.99	1.06	1.50	1.60	
North Central	1.72	2.38	1.71	1.61	1.57	1.54	1.73	1.86	2.14	2.14	
Processed fruits - fresh equivalent 5/											
- South	2.02	3.56	1.92	1.20	1.64	2.16	3.05	3.31	4.40	1.68	
North Central	2.84	4.20	2.79	2.42	2.14	2.57	3.00	4.30	3.72	2.80	
Canned fruits - South	.37	.50	.36	.28	.30	.37	.67	.48	.85	.30	
North Central	.57	.81	.57	.36	.46	.55	.62	.71	.74	.55	
Canned citrus juices - South	.30	.73	.29	.23	.24	.34	.32	.29	.82	.27	
North Central	.31	.91	.29	.32	.29	.29	.37	.39	.12	.23	
Other canned fruit juices - South	.15	.36	.14	.09	.12	.17	.19	.30	.29	.10	
North Central	.17	.35	.17	.06	.15	.13	.18	.22	.20	.34	
Frozen fruits - South	.03	.02	.03	6/	.01	.06	.05	.08	.07	.04	
North Central	.05	.02	.05	.03	.04	.06	.05	.08	.04	.05	
Frozen concentrated fruit juices											
- South	.08	.07	.08	.02	.07	.08	.17	.23	.15	.06	
North Central	.17	.10	.17	.15	.08	.15	.17	.33	.33	.17	
Dried fruit - South	.06	.14	.05	.04	.05	.06	.06	.06	.08	.06	
North Central	.05	.06	.05	.08	.07	.04	.04	.06	.06	.02	

1/ Derived from the Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, Report No. 3, Food Consumption of Households in the North Central Region, and Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 2/ Includes frozen vegetables, canned vegetable juices, and canned vegetables. 3/ Excludes pickles and relishes, catsup etc. 4/ Excludes frozen potatoes. 5/ Includes frozen, canned, and dried fruits and canned and frozen fruit juices. 6/ Less than 0.005 pounds.

Consumption rates for fruits show clearly the dependence of rates of consumption on levels of income. The consumption of fruits purchased fresh by southern households increased with income except for the \$8 - 10,000 group. Frozen concentrate has sharp income relationships. The rates for commercially canned fruits kept rising with income up to the \$8 - 10,000 level, but the consumption of canned fruit juices increased with income only up to the middle area, and then leveled off.

Comparison of Southern and North
Central Patterns by Urbanization

Consider now what variations in food consumption patterns by urbanization (table 4) are significant to new developments in marketing. Seeking comparability in total incomes, I studied the per capita rates of urban households with money incomes between \$4,000 and \$5,000, the two groups of rural nonfarm households with money incomes between \$3,000 and \$5,000, and the three groups of farm households with money incomes between \$2,000 and \$5,000. I found that the rate of fluid whole milk consumption per person in rural nonfarm households in the South having total incomes roughly comparable to the urban group was about the same as the urban rate. This was also true for the North Central region. Farm rates of fluid whole milk consumption ran substantially higher than nonfarm rates, following the general pattern of the rest of the country. Rural nonfarm rates of consumption of buttermilk and of canned milk in the South were notably higher than the urban rates. And farm rates were much higher yet than rural nonfarm. My study turned up several curious variations. For example, the North Central Region showed a higher rate of usage for buttermilk by urban households with \$4 - 5,000 incomes than rural households with comparable incomes. Could this be caused by migrants from the South? Rates of consumption in farm households of the North Central Region were less than a tenth of the southern farm rates.

Urban households in the \$4 - 5,000 income group of the South consumed about the same amount of flour in all forms as those in the North Central Region. But southern rural groups consumed sharply more of the flour, cereal and bakery product groups combined than did urban families of the South or similar groups in the North Central Region.

Nonfarm households used much more commercially processed vegetables than did farm households, but less fresh. The general relationship between such rates for farm and nonfarm households was similar in the two regions. Urban use of frozen vegetables was far higher than rural use in both regions.

Consumption of fresh fruits differs little in total among the urbanization groups, but I noticed much more emphasis on deciduous fruits by rural households. It was surprising to me to find that households in the North Central Region use more citrus than do southern households comparable in income and in urbanization. Does this mean that citrus marketers have overlooked local market potentials? More commercially processed fruit is used by

urban families than by rural nonfarm families, and by rural nonfarm families than farm. Rural households' use of frozen fruits and fruit juices was much below that of urban households in both the South and the North Central Region.

Comparisons of Consumption Rates
for Prepared Foods in the South
and in the North Central Region

Prepared foods were generally more popular in the spring of 1955 in the North Central Region than in the South (table 5). Half as much cake mix was used per household in the South as in the other region, but use of cookie and pie mixtures was more similar. As might be expected from the emphasis on hot breads, the consumption of brown and serve rolls in nonfarm households in the South was higher than in the North Central Region. Also, more commercially canned beef was used in the South but less pork, less luncheon meats, less canned chicken and frozen chicken pie. Frozen potatoes are not yet used very much in the South, probably because they aren't available, and much less potato chips and sticks were consumed. Among the canned mixtures, chili con carne and corned beef hash were more popular in the South than in the North Central Region. There was little difference in the use of meat stew, ravioli, and spaghetti. I noticed that the items with higher consumption rates also were consumed by a larger proportion of the households in each instance.

Purchased versus Home-Produced

A large proportion of the increase in demand for food marketing services has come from the shift from home production to purchases of major food items. Before considering the relative importance of home-produced food in spring 1955, you should know that the money value per person of all food used at home ^{3/} was about equal for urban and rural nonfarm households, but slightly lower for farm households in the South. The money value of home-produced foods used by rural nonfarm households was twice as high as the total value of food received without direct expense by urban households, including home-produced. ^{4/} The use of home-produced foods by farm households in the South during the week reported on was at least 10 times as high as the use by urban households. The dollar value of home-produced foods declined with income for rural nonfarm households, but rose slightly for farm households. Home-produced foods accounted for about 40 percent of the total money value of food used at home by southern farm households in the \$2,000 to \$5,000 income range in one week of spring 1955 (table 6).

^{3/} For this survey, home-produced food was valued at the average rates paid for purchased food by households in the same category.

^{4/} Separate data on consumption of home-produced foods in week by urban households not available, but information for year 1954 now being tabulated.

Table 5.- Dry, canned, and frozen prepared foods: Consumption rates per household and percentage of households using in the South and North Central Region, in a week, spring 1955 ^{1/}

Item and urbanization	South		North Central Region	
	Average per household	Percentage of households using	Average per household	Percentage of households using
	Pounds	Percent	Pounds	Percent
Cake mixes - Urban	0.17	12	0.39	26
Rural nonfarm	.24	16	.40	27
Farm	.17	12	.43	29
Cookie and pie mixes - Urban	.05	6	.08	9
Rural nonfarm	.06	7	.07	8
Farm	.03	3	.04	5
Brown and serve rolls - Urban	.15	14	.10	10
Rural nonfarm	.14	12	.07	8
Farm	.08	7	.07	8
Commercially canned beef - Urban	.05	5	.02	2
Rural nonfarm	.06	6	.03	3
Farm	.05	4	.02	2
Commercially canned pork - Urban	.03	1	.09	3
Rural nonfarm	.05	2	.08	2
Farm	.01	1	.05	2
Luncheon meats - Urban	.95	65	1.34	76
Rural nonfarm	1.29	64	1.40	74
Farm	.99	51	1.59	72
Chicken pies, frozen ^{2/} - Urban	.05	4	.10	7
Rural nonfarm	.02	1	.07	4
Farm	.01	1	.02	1
Jellies, jams, marmalades - Urban	.51	56	.51	64
Rural nonfarm	1.00	69	.68	70
Farm	.85	58	1.07	78
Potato chips and sticks - Urban	.08	18	.22	28
Rural nonfarm	.05	10	.19	25
Farm	.02	6	.15	22
Chili con carne ^{2/} - Urban	.05	5	.04	3
Rural nonfarm	.07	5	.04	3
Farm	.03	3	.02	1
Canned corned beef hash ^{2/} - Urban	.05	4	.03	3
Rural nonfarm	.03	2	.03	2
Farm	.02	1	.01	1
Meat stew ^{2/} - Urban	.04	2	.01	1
Rural nonfarm	.03	2	.04	3
Farm	.02	1	.02	1
Spaghetti with meat balls ^{2/} - Urban	.04	3	.03	2
Rural nonfarm	.05	3	.03	2
Farm	.02	1	.02	1
Spaghetti - Urban	.04	3	.06	5
Rural nonfarm	.05	3	.02	2
Farm	.04	3	.05	4

^{1/} From the Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, No. 3, Food Consumption of Households in the North Central Region and No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

^{2/} Derived from unpublished data for urbanization groups. Data by income groups not available.

Table 6.- Foods consumed at home, from all sources and home-produced: Quantities per household and proportion using home-produced, for selected foods by selected groups of households of 2 or more in the South in a week in spring 1955 1/

Item	Urban				Rural nonfarm				Farm			
	Unit	Income	Under \$1,000	\$1-2,000	Under \$1,000	\$1-2,000	\$2-3,000	\$3-4,000	Under \$1,000	\$1-2,000	\$2-3,000	\$3-4,000
All foods, total money value	:Dollars:	7.01	4.30	4.70	5.46	6.42	7.19	4.63	5.65	6.19	6.38	6.76
Home-produced, money value	:Dollars:	2/.27	.93	.67	.69	.57	.60	2.20	2.53	2.46	2.52	2.73
- Proportion of total	:Percent:	4	22	14	13	9	8	48	45	40	39	40
Meats - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	10.51	4.59	7.34	10.10	9.89	11.63	7.27	9.00	11.13	10.74	11.49
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/.26	.27	.60	.99	.10	1.35	3.17	4.01	4.45	4.90	5.09
- Proportion	:Percent:	2	6	8	10	1	12	44	45	40	46	44
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	8	5	14	19	6	13	48	58	56	58	65
Poultry - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	2.05	1.63	2.16	3.40	2.36	2.11	2.26	3.05	2.42	3.54	2.86
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/.11	.69	.49	.45	.21	0	1.58	2.30	1.56	2.36	1.68
- Proportion	:Percent:	5	42	23	13	9	0	70	75	64	67	59
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	2	16	11	9	6	0	30	40	30	37	35
Eggs - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	2.92	2.07	3.18	3.26	3.69	4.00	3.36	3.74	4.07	4.57	5.93
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/.13	1.08	1.14	1.31	.71	.63	3.08	3.15	3.28	3.45	4.51
- Proportion	:Percent:	4	52	36	40	19	16	92	84	81	75	76
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	6	44	34	33	20	16	86	80	76	74	76
Butter - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	.23	.60	.58	.41	.38	.48	1.13	.86	.79	.98	.79
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/.04	.27	.11	.16	.15	.05	.97	.68	.63	.71	.58
- Proportion	:Percent:	17	45	19	39	39	10	86	79	80	72	73
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	5	18	10	9	8	4	51	40	37	37	35
Fluid whole milk - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	19.62	11.26	13.61	17.83	21.39	25.25	23.43	31.63	33.45	28.38	32.51
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/.35	5.99	5.83	4.70	6.71	2.89	22.04	28.88	28.07	23.59	24.61
- Proportion	:Percent:	2	53	43	26	31	11	94	91	84	83	76
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	1	21	16	13	10	6	68	60	62	54	56
Fresh vegetables - Use - All sources	:Pounds:	10.16	7.39	8.71	10.63	12.35	11.01	10.17	14.52	14.02	14.55	17.73
Home-produced	:Pounds:	2/1.11	2.89	3.24	3.71	3.25	2.66	7.43	10.15	8.47	9.05	11.14
- Proportion	:Percent:	11	39	37	35	26	24	73	70	60	62	63
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	34	52	51	44	48	44	85	82	78	83	85
Fresh potatoes and sweetpotatoes	:Pounds:	5.14	4.63	7.00	7.56	7.48	7.29	5.69	6.46	8.06	8.33	8.62
- Use - All sources	:Pounds:	2/.13	1.06	1.11	1.89	.42	1.58	2.47	2.44	3.08	3.48	2.47
Home-produced	:Percent:	3	23	16	25	6	22	43	38	38	42	29
- Proportion	:Percent:	5	14	13	16	6	20	32	34	29	34	30
Households with home-produced	:Percent:	8.70	4.97	7.18	10.09	9.40	11.16	4.78	7.71	11.03	12.01	16.17
Fresh fruits (including melons)	:Pounds:	2/.85	1.07	.98	1.32	1.10	.92	1.69	1.60	3.61	1.74	6.23
- Use - All sources	:Percent:	10	22	14	13	12	8	35	21	33	14	39
Home-produced	:Percent:	16	29	26	21	24	20	38	30	41	43	37
- Proportion	:Percent:	16	29	26	21	24	20	38	30	41	43	37

1/ Derived from Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Household in the South. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. Some items of home-produced foods from unpublished data.

2/ Includes food received as gift or pay.

To seek out the meaning of the mass of pertinent data on purchased and home-produced foods available in the reports on one week's patterns from the 1955 survey, I asked myself a series of questions. Following are the questions and the answers I found.

(1) Which items were produced for home use by the most families?

The answer was fresh vegetables for all urbanization categories, with eggs running a close second for farm households.

(2) Which items had the highest ratios of home production to total consumption? Answer: Fresh vegetables for urban households. ^{5/} For rural nonfarm households, fluid whole milk made the greatest contribution to consumption rates of the lowest income groups (eggs running a close second), butter for the middle income groups, and vegetables for the highest. For farm households, fluid whole milk again made the greatest contribution, but eggs and butter were close competitors.

(3) Which home-produced items made the greatest contribution in terms of money value? The answer for urban households was fresh vegetables, with fruits second. For rural households, fluid whole milk made the largest dollar contribution, followed by fresh vegetables.

(4) For individual foods, how did home production affect the consumption rate and the rate of purchase? Home production of meats is a relatively small item for rural nonfarm households. Percentage contribution of home-produced meats to the consumption rates for farm households is fairly constant across the income range, although absolute quantities of both home-produced meats and total consumption of meats increased substantially with income. This means that higher-income farm households as a group produced more meat for home use, and bought more as well.

The proportion of households having home-produced poultry and its relative contribution to total consumption of poultry meat declined with higher income across the range for rural nonfarm and, after the lowest income group, for farm households as well. Higher income farm households purchased more poultry than did lower income groups, but the pattern is not as marked for farm households as for rural nonfarm ones.

Purchase of eggs was tied to income for both farm and rural nonfarm households, and total usage rose with income for both groups. The proportion of households having home-produced eggs declined markedly with income for rural nonfarm households, and to some extent for farm households.

A surprising proportion of rural nonfarm households in the South produced some of the fluid whole milk they used, but the proportion having home-produced, and the rate of such usage, declined with higher incomes. This

^{5/} Excluding the dubious instance of butter, which was probably a gift item, not home-produced. See footnote ^{4/}.

means that there was a marked rise in the purchase of fluid whole milk by rural nonfarm households with higher and higher incomes. The rate of increase was less for farm households. Purchased milk supplies two-thirds of total consumption for the \$3 - 4,000 income group of rural nonfarm households, but a sixth of total consumption of farm households with comparable incomes.

A third of the urban households in the \$4 - 5,000 income group, half of the rural nonfarm households, and five-sixths of the farm households used (in the week reported on) fresh vegetables produced in their own gardens. (These home-produced vegetables may have been consumed in the form of home-canned or frozen items.) Rural nonfarm households with money incomes between \$3,000 and \$5,000 bought almost as much as the comparable urban group, that is, 8 or 9 pounds out of their total. But farm households had a higher consumption rate and bought a third less.

Consumption rates and purchases of fresh fruits, including melons, rose with income. The \$4 - 5,000 group of farm households both produced more and bought more fresh fruits than did nonfarm households with comparable incomes.

How Have Southern Food Patterns with Marketing Significance Changed from Earlier Years to 1955?

For direct comparison of past southern food patterns with those of spring 1955, we have only the food group data for urban families of 2 or more in the spring of 1948 (table 7). 6/

Comparison of data for the same dollar income groups of urban households in 1948 and 1955 reveals some of the effects of the 20-percent rise in the price level. That is, consumption rates for some foods for households with given dollar incomes run 10 to 20 percent lower for the income groups up to \$5,000. Examples here are the milk and dairy group and sugar and sweets. But flour and cereal use in lower income groups stayed at much the same level per person.

Consumption of meat, poultry, and fish combined was higher in 1955 than in 1948 throughout the range of incomes. This is apparently explained by the fact that the prices of meat were lower in the spring of 1955, relative to those of other foods than in the spring of 1948. This reflected a great change in the meat supply situation and in that for poultry as well.

Consumption of bakery products and of eggs in urban southern families in 1955 was notably higher than in 1948 for the higher income groups. On the other hand, consumption rates for potatoes and sweetpotatoes and for fresh vegetables and fruits were lower in 1955 for income groups up to \$5,000. Use of frozen fruits and vegetables was, of course, much higher in the

6/ Combination of data for 1935-36 into meaningful all-South averages is well-nigh impossible. Furthermore, they excluded relief families. Separate data for the South were not collected or tabulated for the 1942 survey.

Table 7.- Per person consumption rates for major groups of foods in urban households of 2 or more in several income groups in the South in a week of spring 1948 and 1955 ^{1/}

(In pounds except where otherwise indicated)

Food group and year	Income after income taxes						
	Under \$1,000:	\$1-2,000	\$2-3,000	\$3-4,000	\$4-5,000	\$5-8,000 ^{2/}	\$8,000 and over ^{2/}
Milk and dairy products (milk equiv. - qt.) ^{3/} - 1948	2.99	3.25	3.92	4.18	4.88	4.31	4.88
1955	2.20	2.54	3.07	3.73	4.07	4.57	4.53
Fats and oils - 1948	.94	.99	.97	1.09	.95	.97	.91
1955	.82	.87	.90	.92	.93	.98	1.04
Flour and other cereal products - 1948	2.94	2.92	2.24	2.14	1.65	1.73	1.53
1955	3.01	2.36	2.28	1.87	1.69	1.43	1.20
Bakery products - 1948	1.48	1.53	1.56	1.75	2.46	1.72	2.07
1955	1.27	1.49	1.59	1.80	1.93	2.19	2.71
Meat, poultry, fish - 1948	2.90	2.46	2.77	3.31	3.18	3.02	3.40
1955	3.60	4.21	4.16	3.78	4.08	4.34	4.47
Eggs (dozens) - 1948	.54	.41	.55	.63	.74	.61	.65
1955	.35	.51	.56	.60	.65	.67	.79
Sugar, sweets - 1948	1.09	1.31	1.31	1.49	1.53	1.35	1.06
1955	1.06	1.17	1.24	1.32	1.36	1.35	1.27
Potatoes, sweetpotatoes ^{4/} - 1948	1.74	1.35	1.63	1.60	1.84	1.32	1.25
1955	1.04	1.35	1.38	1.38	1.59	1.45	1.44
Fresh vegetables (excluding melons) - 1948	2.96	2.44	2.93	3.68	3.22	2.98	3.33
1955	2.29	2.28	2.51	2.43	3.01	3.23	3.37
Fresh fruit (including melons) - 1948	2.01	3.38	4.72	4.62	3.68	3.74	3.16
1955	1.61	2.31	2.17	2.24	2.57	3.10	3.25
Com'l frozen fruit and vegetables ^{5/} - 1948	.04	.04	.05	.07	.11	.05	.03
1955	.04	.06	.17	.19	.39	.40	.61
Canned fruit and vegetables (including juice) ^{6/} - 1948 (com'l and home canned)	1.48	1.10	1.83	1.69	2.07	2.01	1.87
1955 (com'l only)	1.34	1.41	1.48	1.63	1.92	2.03	2.47

^{1/} Derived from Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 132, Food Consumption of Urban Families in the United States, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. and from Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. The Consumer Price Index increased 20 percent from 1947 to 1954.

^{2/} In 1948 data shown are for families with incomes of \$5-7,500 and \$7,500 and over rather than the ranges shown.

^{3/} Excludes butter. Changes resulting from different methods of computing milk equivalent (in terms of protein and mineral content in 1948 and in calcium content in 1955) are minor.

^{4/} Includes frozen potatoes.

^{5/} Excludes frozen potatoes.

^{6/} Includes baby food; excludes pickles and relishes, and catsup, etc.

recent year. Comparison of the rates of consumption for canned fruits and vegetables in the two years is greatly impeded by changes in handling the data mentioned earlier. All home-canned fruits and vegetables consumed in the week of 1955 reported on were converted to their fresh equivalents and combined with the fresh category. But in 1948, home-canned fruits and vegetables, whether from home production or purchased supplies, were included in the group with commercially canned items.

For some of the newer prepared foods, I have compared (in table 8) the 1948 urban U. S. rates, the 1955 urban U. S. and urban South rates. I found a significant increase from 1948 to 1955 in the proportion of households using commercially prepared foods except for plain spaghetti and the minor item, corned beef hash. Where the proportion of households using the commodity increased, there appears to have been even greater increase in the average rate consumed in the household. For most products, except brown and serve rolls and canned beef and hash, use by southern households ran below the rate for comparable households in the U. S.

Will Southern Food Patterns Follow Those of Other
Regions as soon as Incomes Rise?

After some study of the data for several urban income groups in the South and the North Central Region such as those given in table 9, I have concluded that the answer is generally yes, except that greater emphasis on home baking will probably maintain, for some years, relatively higher levels of use of flour, sugar, eggs, and cooking fats purchased in "visible forms." Likewise, I suspect that greater usage of buttermilk and evaporated milk will continue, partly because their price relationships with fluid whole milk encourage use for cooking, and partly because of the residual effect of past shortages of refrigeration, lower incomes, and smaller supplies of fluid whole milk. Higher rates of consumption of fresh vegetables in the South may well continue because of the longer season for fresh produce and the closeness to major producing areas. In the case of margarine and butter, we might see the rest of the country approach the southern pattern of greater acceptability for margarine and less butter usage even in the highest income groups.

Is There Evidence of Movement toward Homogeneity of Food
Patterns outside the South?

In seeking an answer to this question, I have made two sets of comparisons - (1) the consumption patterns of urban households with \$5 - 6,000 incomes in the West and Northeast, and (2) the farm and urban consumption patterns for selected foods in 1942 and in 1955 for the United States as a whole (table 10).

I was surprised to find a number of sharp differences in consumption rates between West and Northeast, even in the moderately high income group I used. Differences in available supplies may help explain some of the variations in consumption rates for fresh items, but not differences in use of processed foods. I have not yet examined differences in prices paid. To be

Table 8.- Average consumption per household and proportion of households using selected prepared foods, urban households of 2 or more in U. S. in a week of springs 1948 and 1955 and all urban households of South, 1955 1/

Food item	Average rate per urban household			Proportion of urban households using in survey week		
	United States		South	United States		South
	1948	1955	1955	1948	1955	1955
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Percent	Percent	Percent
Prepared flour mixes	.32	.63	.46	28	42	30
Brown and serve rolls	---	.10	.15	---	10	14
Canned beef (commercial) <u>2/</u>	.01	.03	.05	<u>3/</u>	3	5
Canned pork (commercial) <u>2/</u>	.22	.10	.03	<u>3/</u>	3	1
Luncheon meats and canned sausages	.95	1.22	.95	62	73	65
Canned chili con carne <u>2/</u>	.02	.04	.05	2	3	5
Canned corned beef hash <u>2/</u>	.04	.04	.05	3	3	4
Meat stew, canned <u>2/</u>	.01	.02	.04	1	1	2
Canned ravioli <u>2/</u>	.01	.02	.01	1	2	1
Canned spaghetti with meat balls <u>2/</u>	.01	.04	.04	1	3	3
Canned spaghetti in tomato sauce and with cheese <u>2/</u>	.08	.05	.04	6	4	3
Frozen white potatoes	---	.06	.01	---	6	1
Potato chips and sticks	<u>3/</u>	.14	.08	<u>3/</u>	23	18
Frozen chicken pie <u>2/</u>	---	.07	.05	---	5	4
Canned chicken <u>2/</u>	.02	.02	<u>4/</u>	1	1	<u>5/</u>

1/ From 1948 Food Consumption Survey Preliminary Report No. 5, Food Consumption of Urban Families in the United States, Spring 1948 and the 1955 Household Food Consumption Survey Report No. 1, Food Consumption of Households in the United States and Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

2/ Unpublished data. No breakdown by income available.

3/ Separate data not available.

4/ Less than 0.005 pounds.

5/ Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 9.- Per person consumption of selected foods by selected groups of urban households of 2 or more in South and North Central Region, in a week, spring 1955 ^{1/}

Food item and region	1954 income after income taxes		
	\$2-3,000	\$5-6,000	\$8-10,000
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
Beef - South	0.91	1.21	1.63
North Central	1.37	1.67	1.70
Pork - South	1.36	1.25	1.02
North Central	1.29	1.23	1.08
Poultry - South	.82	.76	.74
North Central	.47	.84	.61
Fluid whole milk - South	3.05	5.18	6.67
North Central	6.93	7.55	6.64
Butter - South	.08	.09	.13
North Central	.24	.24	.32
Margarine - South	.22	.30	.32
North Central	.15	.20	.18
Fresh citrus - South	.93	1.07	1.54
North Central	1.40	1.63	1.25
Canned fruit - South	.27	.32	.48
North Central	.46	.61	.71
Frozen fruit ^{2/} - South	.01	.05	.08
North Central	.03	.07	.08
Frozen vegetables - South	.11	.15	.29
North Central	.05	.15	.23
Fresh vegetables - South	2.51	3.23	2.70
North Central	2.74	2.36	2.91
Flour - South	.92	.75	.38
North Central	.50	.46	.39
Bread - South	1.12	1.37	2.03
North Central	1.34	1.63	1.50
Other bakery products - South	.48	.71	.80
North Central	.46	.69	.77
Coffee, green bean equivalent			
- South	.28	.28	.34
North Central	.28	.39	.45

^{1/} Derived from Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, Report No. 3, Food Consumption of Households in the North Central Region and Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South. ^{2/} Excludes juices.

Table 10.- Per household consumption rates for selected foods in urban households of 2 or more having 1954 incomes after income taxes of \$5-6,000 in West and Northeast in a week, spring 1955 and for all urban and all farm households, in a week, springs 1942 and 1955 1/

Food item	Per household consumption rates 2/									
	1942					1955				
	Pounds	Percent	Farm	Urban	Farm as percent-age of urban	Pounds	Percent	Farm	Urban	Farm as percent-age of urban
Beef	6.15	143	1.77	3.05	58	4.80	114	4.20	4.20	114
Pork	3.37	94	2.68	1.68	160	4.95	140	3.54	3.54	140
Poultry	2.52	79	1.22	1.12	109	2.67	109	2.44	2.44	109
Fluid whole milk	24.64	95	34.81	17.20	202	32.27	162	19.96	19.96	162
Butter	.48	55	1.89	1.16	163	1.12	178	.63	.63	178
Margarine	.90	180	.13	.17	76	.53	85	.62	.62	85
Fresh citrus fruit	4.63	118	4.71	7.78	61	3.61	89	4.04	4.04	89
Com'l canned fruits 3/	2.37	136	4/.43	5/1.62	27	.99	66	1.51	1.51	66
Frozen fruits 6/	.13	76	---	---	---	.05	42	.12	.12	42
Frozen vegetables 7/	.43	64	---	---	---	.16	29	.56	.56	29
Fresh vegetables	8.81	87	8.06	9.31	87	8/11.37	133	8/8.54	8/8.54	133
Fresh potatoes	4.87	92	12.84	7.84	164	8.83	180	4.90	4.90	180
Flour	1.12	122	10.65	2.03	525	7.12	512	1.39	1.39	512
Bread	5.55	96	2.96	5.90	50	4.41	95	4.66	4.66	95
Other bakery goods	2.21	83	.92	2.01	46	1.54	73	2.12	2.12	73
Coffee, green bean equivalent	1.23	98	9/	9/	86	1.07	96	1.11	1.11	96

1/ Derived from the Household Food Consumption Survey 1955, Report No. 2, Food Consumption of Households in the Northeast and Report No. 5, Food Consumption of Households in the West, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. and Family Food Consumption in the United States, Spring 1942, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 2/ Farm households in 1942 averaged 4.23 persons; in 1955, 4.08. 3/ Excludes juices and baby or junior foods. 4/ Excludes 3.23 pounds of home canned. 5/ Includes some home produced and home canned. 6/ Excludes juices. 7/ Excludes frozen potatoes. 8/ Includes vegetables bought fresh, processed at home, and used in week. Not comparable with 1942 data. 9/ Value in 1942; farm - \$0.24, urban - \$0.28.

specific, I found consumption rates for beef, margarine, citrus, canned fruits, and flour to be higher for this particular income group in the West than in the Northeast. The margarine and flour rates reminded me of the southern patterns. On the other hand, I found higher rates for poultry, butter, frozen fruits and vegetables, fresh vegetables, potatoes, and bakery products in the Northeast.

Comparison of farm and urban consumption rates for 1942 and for 1955 showed that the relationships between the two groups were much closer in the recent year, except in the cases of butter, margarine, and potatoes. For butter and potatoes, there were sharp declines from 1942 to 1955 in consumption by both urban and farm families.

There have been notable changes in the rates of consumption of some of the major foods from 1942 to 1955. The consumption of meats and poultry was generally higher in the spring of 1955 for both farm and urban families. We note that farmers used far more beef in the spring of 1955 than in 1942, probably at least in part because of the availability of freezers. The big drop in the consumption of butter by both farm and urban households and the increase for margarine are well-publicized. Potatoes, fresh citrus, and flour show substantial declines in consumption in farm and urban households. Consumption of commercially canned fruits on farms was substantially higher in a week of spring 1955 than a week's rate of consumption in 1942. The urban 1942 rate for canned fruits included some home-canned supplies, but they cannot be separated out for comparison with 1955. For bread and other bakery products combined, there were contrary trends--farm purchases and use of these "bought" products increased considerably, but the urban rates of consumption decreased. This is just about what we would expect.

To What Extent Are Families Buying More of Their Food
and Producing Less for Their Own Use?

For lack of southern data I have studied U. S. data to answer this question. But the effect of such changes in the South on demand for commercial farm and marketing inputs probably has exceeded the U. S. average. The proportion of farm families in the total number of southern households dropped from 40 percent in 1935-36 ^{7/} to 17 percent in the spring of 1955. The rural nonfarm proportion rose from 24 to 34 percent, urban from 37 to 49 percent. For the North and West comparable data are: farm, from 16 to 8 percent in 1955; rural nonfarm, 18 to 24; urban, no material change.

Comparison of the proportions of home-produced food in total food consumption of rural nonfarm and farm households in 1942 and in 1955 reveals a decline. Among rural nonfarm households, the proportion of money value of foods home produced compared with total money value of foods consumed declined

^{7/} Data for 1935-36 from p. 75 Consumer Incomes in the U. S., National Resources Committee. GPO, Washington. 1938. Data for 1955 from the 1955 Household Food Consumption Survey.

from 22 percent to 8 percent between 1942 and 1955, among farm households, from 61 percent to 41 percent (table 11). Not only did overall reliance on home production fall sharply, but the proportion in the total declined for every major home-produced item for both groups of rural households. The actual quantities of meats and poultry consumed per capita by farm households from home-produced supplies were higher in one week of the spring of 1955 than in 1942. There was a marked increase in purchases of most major items except butter and potatoes and in the proportion of total use which was purchased by rural nonfarm and farm households. 8/

What Do the 1955 Survey Data Tell Us about the Future
Food Market of the South?

Before we look forward, let us look backwards for a moment. Income and urbanization are probably the two most important factors affecting the southern food market. Personal income per capita (in constant dollars) doubled in the South from 1929 to 1954, whereas per capita income outside the South increased 50 percent. Recall too that the proportion of farm population in the total has declined far more in the South, and the urban proportion has risen substantially. These factors have probably resulted in greater increases in food outlays or food expenditures (excluding home produced supplies) by southern families than the 45 percent increase per capita for the whole country from 1929 to 1954, in constant dollars. Just how much more I have yet to learn.

Now for a look ahead. Average income in the South is still 30 percent below that for the North and West, and the South is still less urbanized. If incomes of the South and nonSouth were equal now, the U. S. food market might be 10 percent larger. On the other hand, incomes and food consumption will probably be increasing all across the country in the next 2 or 3 decades. As most of you probably know, Rex Daly and others have worked out projections for agriculture from 1953 to 1975 which involve a 12 percent increase in per capita food consumption. This will mean a substantially greater rise in food expenditures or dollar outlays, maybe a third to a half, measured in constant dollars. It is safe to say that a major part of this huge expansion in the total U. S. food market will come in the South. Will southern food marketing facilities be tooled up to meet a possible increase of, say, 50 percent per head in the demand for food marketing services in the next 20 years?

8/ Survey data concerning home production in 1954 are now being tabulated and a special report will be issued. This report will provide benchmarks for estimating total consumption of home-grown vegetables as well as other foods; it will be useful for work on the estimates of total real farm income.

Table 11.- Home produced and total foods consumed at home: Quantities per household and proportions home produced for selected foods by rural nonfarm and farm households in the United States, in a week, springs 1942 and 1955 and in the South, spring 1955 1/

Item and region	Rural nonfarm				Farm							
	Total foods consumed at home per household		Home produced as percentage of total consumed		Total foods consumed at home per household		Total home produced per household		Home produced as percentage of total consumed			
	1942	1955	1942	1955	1942	1955	1942	1955	1942	1955		
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent		
										Percent		
<u>United States</u>												
All foods 2/	9.96	23.43	2.19	1.80	22	8	12.60	26.96	7.74	11.04	61	41
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds			Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds		
Meats 3/	5.78	9.79	.64	.49	11	5	7.23	11.60	4.33	5.73	60	49
Poultry 3/	.75	2.04	.32	.28	43	14	1.22	2.67	1.16	1.93	95	72
Eggs 4/	3.46	2.91	1.74	.53	50	18	4.38	4.16	4.22	3.35	96	81
Butter	1.06	.59	.31	.06	29	10	1.89	1.12	1.28	.49	68	44
Fluid whole milk 4/	19.03	20.74	8.45	2.13	44	10	34.81	32.27	33.65	26.28	97	81
Fresh vegetables 3/	5/9.85	8.57	5/4.96	2.18	50	25	6/14.82	11.37	6/11.51	6.75	78	59
Fresh potatoes and sweetpotatoes 3/	10.46	6.88	1.97	.60	19	9	13.81	9.06	8.75	2.81	63	31
Fresh fruit including melons 3/	7/9.76	9.58	7/2.20	1.19	23	12	8/11.72	11.51	8/5.44	3.22	46	28
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars			Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars		
<u>South</u>												
All foods 2/	---	22.18	---	2.38	---	11	---	24.17	---	10.32	---	43
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds			Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds		
Meats 3/	---	8.72	---	.54	---	6	---	9.25	---	3.93	---	42
Poultry 3/	---	2.33	---	.38	---	16	---	2.74	---	1.90	---	69
Eggs 4/	---	3.16	---	.91	---	29	---	3.83	---	3.16	---	83
Butter	---	.47	---	.14	---	30	---	.96	---	.78	---	81
Fluid whole milk 4/	---	17.06	---	4.63	---	27	---	28.24	---	24.65	---	87
Fresh vegetables 3/	---	10.13	---	2.80	---	28	---	13.16	---	8.73	---	66
Fresh potatoes and sweetpotatoes 3/	---	6.36	---	.90	---	14	---	6.71	---	2.69	---	40
Fresh fruit, including melons 3/	---	8.24	---	.94	---	11	---	8.31	---	2.29	---	28

1/ From Family Food Consumption in the United States, Spring 1942, and Household Food Consumption Survey 1955 Report No. 1, Food Consumption of Households in the United States and Report No. 4, Food Consumption of Households in the South. U. S. Department of Agriculture.
 2/ Excludes alcoholic beverages.
 3/ Unpublished data.
 4/ Published in different units.
 5/ Includes 3.07 pounds fresh equivalent of home canned vegetables.
 6/ Includes 6.76 pounds fresh equivalent of home canned vegetables.
 7/ Includes 1.64 pounds fresh equivalent of home canned fruits.
 8/ Includes 4.08 pounds fresh equivalent of home canned fruits.





