

A STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

(A Report of Progress: August 1, 1949 to January 31, 1949)

Institute of Statistics  
Mimeograph Series #26  
For Limited Distribution

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Appendix Table Number</u>
I. Introduction . . . . .	1	
II. Sample Plan (Survey I) . . . . .	2	
A. Methodology . . . . .	2	
B. Evaluation of the Sample . . . . .	6	
III. Administration . . . . .	14	
A. Enumerators . . . . .	14	
B. Field Costs . . . . .	15	
IV. Commodities Sold by Farmers . . . . .	19	
Corn . . . . .	26	1,2
Cotton . . . . .	27	3,4
Soybeans . . . . .	28	5,6
Cowpeas . . . . .	28	7,8
Peanuts . . . . .	28	9,10
Lespedeza Seed . . . . .	29	11,12
Pecans . . . . .	29	13,14
Lespedeza Hay . . . . .	30	15,16
Wheat . . . . .	30	17,18
Oats . . . . .	31	19,20
Irish Potatoes . . . . .	31	21,22
Sweet Potatoes . . . . .	32	23,24
Peaches . . . . .	32	25,26

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Appendix Table Number</u>
Apples . . . . .	33	27,28
Eggs . . . . .	33	29,30
Hens . . . . .	33	31
Broilers and Fryers . . . . .	34	32
All Chickens . . . . .	34	33
Hogs . . . . .	34	34,35
Turkeys . . . . .	35	36,37
Observations on Commodities Sold Data . . . . .	36	
V. Commodities Bought by Farmers . . . . .	37	
Farm Commodities . . . . .	38	38
Farm Machinery . . . . .	38	39
Feed . . . . .	39	40
Fertilizer and Lime . . . . .	39	41
Field Crop and Hay Seed . . . . .	39	42
Fencing Material . . . . .	40	43
Petroleum Products . . . . .	40	44
Building Materials . . . . .	40	45
Auto Supplies . . . . .	41	46
Non-farm Commodities . . . . .	41	47
Groceries . . . . .	42	48
Clothing . . . . .	42	49
Furniture . . . . .	42	50
Household Articles and Supplies . . . . .	43	51

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Appendix Table Number</u>
Hardware . . . . .	43	52
Electrical Equipment . . . . .	43	53
Fuel . . . . .	43	54
Motor Vehicles . . . . .	43	55,56
Observations on Commodities-bought Data . . . . .	44	
VI. Sample Plan (Survey II) . . . . .	44	

\* \* \* \* \*

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>List of Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Sampling data from 27 selected counties, North Carolina, 1949. . . . .	7
2	Data obtained from a sample of farms in 9 North Carolina counties surveyed for special commodities, 1949 . . . . .	10
3	Percentage distribution of farms classified by tenure, size, and race . . . . .	12
4	Enumeration cost per schedule and per visit, Survey I . . . . .	17
5	Cost per schedule for enumeration of scarce commodities: special survey . . . . .	18
6	Sales of eighteen farm commodities by size of town where sold . . . . .	20

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>List of Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
7	Frequency distribution of farms by number of commodities reported sold . . . . .	24
8	Sales reported on and off the farm . . . . .	25
9	Frequency of mention of various types of establishments as most important source of purchases by farmers . . . . .	37

\* \* \* \* \*

Appendix Tables 1 - 56, as listed above

Appendix Table 57: Specimen field schedules

## A STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES IN NORTH CAROLINA

(A Report of Progress: August 1, 1949 to January 31, 1950)

### I. Introduction.

One of the essential elements in a free enterprise economy is knowledge of the market, and one of the items about which knowledge is most needed is prices. This is the fundamental reason for the insistent demand for prompt and accurate price reporting. The trend of recent agricultural legislation in the United States, requiring the increasing use of government statistics in the administration of farm programs, has given rise to an additional demand for agricultural price data. There is, of course, the related demand that the information be provided at the lowest cost consistent with the necessary quality. One way of meeting such needs is through the use of modern statistical sampling methods.

The United States and North Carolina Departments of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Institute of Statistics of the University of North Carolina, are conducting a survey to study in detail the costs and efficiency of sampling techniques when applied to price estimation. The study is being conducted in two phases, as follows:

- (i) Survey I: A preliminary survey has been made to define channels through which farmers buy and sell, and to measure the relative importance of the different channels.

(ii) Survey II: Results of Survey I will be used to weight the various marketing channels in proportion to their importance to farmers. Prices received and prices paid by farmers will then be obtained from a sample drawn mainly from men in the trade. From these data, collected periodically over a year, price estimates will be prepared.

The following account is a report of progress to date, including a description of Survey I and its results, and an outline of the sampling plan to be used in Survey II.

## II. Sample Plan (Survey I).

A. Methodology. In Survey I, information was collected on marketing channels from a randomly selected group of farmers in North Carolina. Experience in previous surveys had shown that the Master Sample provided an efficient basis for selecting the farmers from whom to collect such information. Master Sample areas were selected in 28 counties, 26 of which had been used in the April and September, 1948, surveys of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The 100 North Carolina counties had been divided into 28 strata of contiguous counties, each stratum containing approximately an equal number of farms. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics then drew a county from each stratum with probability of selection of a given county proportional to the number of farms in that county. Upon consultation with the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, it was deemed advisable to add a county (Beaufort was chosen) in the Tidewater area to improve information on potatoes, and add a county in the Central Piedmont (Davidson) to supplement the information

on grain. Two counties in the Coastal Plain (Sampson and Johnston) were dropped, since this region appeared to be over-represented. With these exceptions, the counties were the same as those used by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The twenty-eight counties finally selected for Survey I were:

Anson	Cleveland	Guilford	Richmond
Ashe	Currituck	Harnett	Robeson
Beaufort	Davidson	Jones	Stanly
Bladen	Duplin	Lenoir	Swain
Buncombe	Edgecombe	Martin	Warren
Catawba	Forsythe	McDowell	Wayne
Chatham	Granville	Northampton	Yancey

Data were obtained from all farmers in selected Master Sample areas in 27 of the counties.<sup>1/</sup> Farmers were so defined as to include all residents of selected areas who had 3 or more acres of land and/or sold \$450 worth of agricultural products in 1948. This latter figure was considered comparable, under present price levels, to the \$250 used by the 1945 Census. Henceforth, unless specifically stated to the contrary, the term "farmer" will be used only as thus defined. Approximately 1000 farmers in all were interviewed in the selected areas. Since counties were chosen from strata of equal size, the same numbers of schedules were, insofar as possible, taken from each county. Where additional counties were added, the number

---

<sup>1/</sup> Duplin county data were not obtained. Personnel difficulties, not serious elsewhere, were extreme here. Four enumerators were hired and trained for this county, but sickness, other employment, and other difficulties, prevented them from getting the data until after the deadline had been passed.

of schedules per county was adjusted so that the total number of schedules for a type of farming area was unchanged.

By using the 1945 Agriculture Census data, a sampling rate for each county was computed by dividing the number of farms in the county into the number of schedules desired. The number of open country segments to be enumerated in each county was obtained by multiplying the total number of Master Sample areas in the county by the sampling rate. From a randomly-selected starting point, the segments were then drawn systematically, in order to insure adequate geographic representation of the entire county. In addition to these open country segments, some schedules were to be collected from the "B" segments or "rural places" in the state. For this selection, a probability value for a sampling unit from a rural place was computed by multiplying the number of "B" segments in each county, as obtained from Census Form 6000, by the sampling rate for the county. Counties were then grouped, following type of farming areas as closely as possible, so that each group could be assigned one segment from the "B" areas. One county from each group was then selected with probability proportional to the chances of selecting a sample unit from the county. For example; Currituck, .8; Beaufort, .1; Jones, .1; and Duplin, 0; were the 4 Tidewater counties with their respective probabilities for selection of a rural place, that were grouped together for the selection of one segment. Currituck county was selected in this manner, along with four other counties in other parts of the state. Within each county, the individual rural

place to be enumerated was selected in the manner described for open country segments. The rural places selected were

<u>County</u>	<u>Place</u>
Currituck	Popular Branch
Robeson	West Lumberton
Catawba	Area "A" North of Hickory
Richmond	Area "B"
McDowell	Area "C" SW of Marion

County highway maps were used to locate the open country segments to be enumerated. Each open country segment, on the basis of a map count, was expected to contain approximately 6 southern farms and 10 dwellings.<sup>2/</sup>

Aerial photos were used to locate the "B" segments. A sketch of each selected segment, both open country and "B", was drawn by the enumerator when he entered the area; all dwellings were located on the sketch and a general information schedule was completed for each dwelling (See Appendix Table 57.) On the basis of the general information schedule, eligibility of families was determined, i.e., the farmers were identified. Information on commodities purchased was obtained from all farmers in the areas. Schedules were also taken from all farmers on as many of the eighteen studied commodities as were sold.<sup>3/</sup>

2/ "Southern farms" includes operating units, i.e., sharecroppers are excluded.

3/ The items studied included:

Commodities purchased - groceries, clothing, household articles, furniture, building material, fencing material, farm machinery, feed, seed, household electrical equipment, fuel, petroleum products, other auto supplies, hardware, fertilizer and lime, automobiles.

Commodities sold - corn, cotton, soybeans, cowpeas, peanuts, lespedeza seed, lespedeza hay, wheat, oats, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, apples, peaches, pecans, chickens, eggs, turkeys, hogs.

In the "B" segments, it was impractical to contact all persons living in the areas to ascertain their status as farm families, because of very large numbers of dwellings. County agents were requested to furnish names of all known farmers in the "B" areas, and these farmers were asked for names of any other farmers who might have been overlooked by the county agents. Schedules were obtained from all the farmers whose names could be obtained from either source. A summary of the sampling data and records obtained in each county is given in Table 1.

Four of the commodities studied (apples, peaches, pecans and turkeys) are produced chiefly in a few concentrated sections of the state. The selected Master Sample areas did not include the desired number of farmers who reported sales of these items. As a supplement, information was obtained by selecting names at random from lists of growers in concentrated areas of production and contacting these producers directly. They were asked to provide the same type of data as were farmers interviewed in the regular sample counties. The counties entered and schedules obtained in this special survey of scarce commodities are shown in Table 2.

B. Evaluation of the sample. In Table 1 information is presented from 27 counties in which Master Sample areas were used. An examination of Columns 4 through 8 reveals considerable difference between the actual and expected numbers of dwellings and farms. In 17 counties an insufficient number of farms was found in the regular Master Sample areas to provide the required number of schedules, and extra areas were drawn. In only three

Table 1. SAMPLING DATA FROM 27 SELECTED COUNTIES, NORTH CAROLINA, 1949<sup>a</sup>

County	No. Farms 1945	Total M.S.U.	Sampling Rate	M.S.U.	No. of Dwellings		Number of Farms		Non coop- erative	Items Bought	Commodity		
					Used <sup>b</sup>	Expected <sup>c</sup> /Actual <sup>d</sup>	Expected <sup>e</sup> /Actual	Schedules <sup>f</sup>				Schedules <sup>g</sup>	
Anson	2436	388	.017	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Ashe	3955	520	.010	388	.017	7	63	59(6-1)	44	37	0	37	59(8)
Beaufort	3443	487	.009	520	.010	8*	51	56(3-1)	61	45	0	45	59(8)
Bladen	3480	486	.011	487	.009	6+	62	68(9-0)	42	44	0	28(16)	57(8)
Buncombe	5710	602	.007	486	.011	7+	58	79(12-1)	50	55	1	49(5)	119(13)
Catawba	3040	493	.014	602	.007	4	46	62(3-1)	38	38	1	37	34(8)
Chatham	2801	450	.011	493	.014	7	40	60(4-1)	43	39	0	39	111(12)
Cleveland	5443	598	.007	450	.011	6*	40	45(1-6)	37	29	0	29	55(10)
Currituck	679	114	.050	598	.007	5*	39	48(0-1)	46	38	0	38	66(7)
Davidson	3507	558	.009	114	.050	7*	58	83(12-0)	42	29	0	29	78(10)
Edgecombe	3615	467	.011	558	.009	6*	67	109(1-1)	38	32	4	28	41(12)
Forsythe	3370	315	.009	467	.011	7*	67	52(7-4)	54	37	0	37	70(7)
Granville	3147	449	.013	315	.009	6*	42	51(3-10)	64	32	1	30(1)	44(10)
Guilford	4669	710	.006	449	.013	7*	52	46(4-4)	49	37	0	37	42(9)
Harnett	4516	553	.009	710	.006	6*	48	55(1-3)	39	29	0	29	14(6)
Jones	1706	157	.020	553	.009	6*	48	80(8-9)	50	42	0	42	97(11)
Lenoir	3848	404	.010	157	.020	2**	21	43(1-0)	22	31	0	29(2)	37(7)
Martin	2868	277	.014	404	.010	5*	56	60(5-2)	48	38	0	37(1)	78(10)
McDowell	1983	174	.020	277	.014	5*	45	53(4-1)	52	38	1	37	96(9)
Northampton	3087	413	.013	174	.020	4	43	90(5-6)	19	50	0	50	17(7)
				413	.013	4**	37	50(6-0)	30	39	1	38	113(9)

(continued next page)

See end of table for all footnotes.

Table 1. SAMPLING DATA FROM 27 SELECTED COUNTIES, NORTH CAROLINA, 1949<sup>a/</sup> (continued)

County	No. Farms 1945	Total M.S.U.	Sampling Rate	M.S.U. (2)	(3)	Used <sup>b/</sup> (4)	No. of Dwellings		Number of Farms		Non coop- erative (9)	Items Bought Schedules <sup>f/</sup> (10)	Commodity Schedules <sup>g/</sup> (11)
							Expected <sup>c/</sup> (5)	Actual <sup>d/</sup> (6)	Expected <sup>e/</sup> (7)	Actual <sup>e/</sup> (8)			
Richmond	1923	277	.020	7*	79	84(17-10)	49	37	0	37	62(14)		
Robeson	8602	944	.005	7*	54	58(5-2)	64	42	2	40	102(13)		
Stanly	2332	367	.020	7	53	54(0-0)	44	49	0	47(2)	124(12)		
Swain	1068	122	.025	6*	48	50(5-1)	53	37	0	37	64(6)		
Warren	2982	347	.013	7*	47	46(5-1)	60	39	0	39	51(8)		
Wayne	4946	565	.008	6*	51	57(3-3)	53	44	2	42	105(13)		
Yancey	2870	264	.014	3**	26	55(6-3)	33	38	0	38	52(5)		
Total	92026	1327	.012	158	1341	1653(136-72)	1224	1045	13	1005(27)	1847(18)		

a/ Data obtained from "B" segments are included in their respective counties.

b/ Counties in which extra master sample areas were drawn to obtain the required number of schedules are indicated by \*. Counties where not all of the areas were needed are indicated by \*\*. In two counties extra areas were used where the regular areas would have been sufficient; these are indicated by †.

c/ Based on master sample maps.

d/ First number in parentheses indicates vacant dwellings; second number indicates dwelling whose occupants could not be contacted.

e/ Based on a ratio of actual master sample areas used to total master sample units in the county (Col.4 ÷ Col.2) x Col.1.

f/ Numbers in parentheses represent incomplete schedules.

g/ Numbers in parentheses represent numbers of different commodities.

counties was an excess of farmers present in the originally selected areas. For about twelve per cent of the dwellings no status was determined (Column 6), because (i) no one was available on three successive visits (4%), or (ii) the dwelling was vacant (8%). While the occupants of some of the occupied dwellings, whose status was not determined, may have been farmers, it is more likely that they were non-farmers who worked in non-agricultural jobs and were not at home during the day. Even after allowance was made for such cases, there were about 10 percent fewer farmers than were expected on the basis of the 1945 census.

In most areas, there was an excess of dwellings over those indicated on the county highway maps. Most of this difference can be associated with the fact that many of the maps were out of date and the population had increased considerably during recent years. With these contrasting differences found between the actual and expected numbers of dwellings and farms, there is some suggestion that the state is becoming more urban in character and farmers now represent a smaller proportion of the population than in previous years.

For the "B" areas, the urbanization was more pronounced than in the open country segments. In four of the five counties in which rural places were selected, the indicated segments had been included within the expanded limits of the neighboring cities and included only a total of nine farms. In the fifth county, Currituck, the segment more closely resembled an open country unit than a rural place and was

Table 2. DATA OBTAINED FROM A SAMPLE OF FARMS IN 9  
NORTH CAROLINA COUNTIES SURVEYED FOR SPECIAL  
COMMODITIES, 1949.

County	Special Commodity Studied	Number of other Commodities Obtained	Number of Schedules Taken	
			Special Commodity	Other Commodities
Alexander	Apples	2	11	3
Anson	Turkeys	1	15	2
Bladen	Pecans	8	7	20
Montgomery	Peaches	11	8	24
Moore	Peaches	7	8	15
Richmond	Peaches	10	8	22
Robeson	Pecans	12	10	45
Union	Turkeys	0	10	0
Wilkes	Apples	5	12	9

treated as such. For the four counties, the data from "B" areas were pooled with the information from open country segments.

In Table 3 a comparison is given of the tenure, size, and race distribution of the sample farms and all farms in North Carolina according to the 1945 Census. The correspondence between the two is close, differences arise from (i) sampling variation, (ii) changes in the population since 1945 when the census was taken.

Cooperation among farmers contacted was excellent. Information was obtained from all but about one percent of the eligibles. Of the 13 not giving information, located in 8 scattered counties, only six were refusals. (Table 1, Col. 9). In addition, there were 27 families who were known to be eligible, but who give only partial information.

In the Mountain counties, very few commodities were produced for sale, with chickens, eggs, corn, and some Irish potatoes accounting for a large part of the sales reported. In the Upper Piedmont, almost all farms produced tobacco, and a number of dairy farms were reported. Since these commodities were not being studied, the number of useful schedules obtained was somewhat lower than in other areas. The production in the Sandhills, Coastal Plain, and Tidewater areas, was principally of those commodities which were being studied. The number of commodity schedules and different commodities sold per farm in these areas, was therefore higher than for the rest of the state. On those farms which were visited especially for information on one of

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Farms Classified by Tenure, Size and Race. 1945 Census of Agriculture, North Carolina, Compared with a Sample of 1045 Farms from 27 North Carolina Counties, 1949.

Item	Farms Classified by Size of Farm											
	Under 30 Acres		30-69 Acres		70-139 Acres		140 or more acres		All Farms			
	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %	N.C.: 1945 Census %	Sample: 1949 %
White												
Owner	14.6	15.3	17.1	17.8	12.1	13.8	6.5	8.6	50.3	55.5		
Tenant	4.9	7.0	4.7	4.4	2.8	1.8	1.4	0.9	13.8	14.1		
Cropper	5.2	1.9	3.0	1.6	1.2	0.2	0.5	0	9.9	3.7		
Negro												
Owner	3.1	3.4	2.3	3.0	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.6	6.9	7.8		
Tenant	2.9	4.7	2.6	2.2	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.2	7.1	7.4		
Cropper	7.0	6.7	3.5	3.7	1.0	0.4	0.3	0	11.8	10.8		
White and Negro Manager	0	0.2	0	0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.7		
All Farms	37.7	39.2	33.2	32.7	18.9	17.6	10.2	10.5	100.0	100.0		

the four scarce commodities, a large number of other commodity schedules were also obtained. The number of schedules from these farms is shown in Table 2.

Corn, chicken, cotton, and egg schedules were obtained in almost all counties; the bulk of most of the other commodity schedules were obtained in a few counties. The only available basis for predicting the numbers of various commodity schedules to be expected was the census data on number of producers. A comparison of expected number of farmers producing the commodities being studied<sup>4/</sup> and the actual number of farms in the survey who reported sales,<sup>5/</sup> indicates that a considerable difference existed for 13 commodities (Group I), below. Little or no difference existed for the remaining 5 (Group II) commodities.

Group I			Group II		
Commodity	Expected Producers	Actual Sellers	Commodity	Expected Producers	Actual Sellers
Corn	869	237	Cotton	399	367
Wheat	220	77	Lespedeza Seed	53	43
Oats	91	23	Peanuts	122	126
Lespedeza Hay	243	23	Soybeans	50	62
Irish Potatoes	486	54	Hogs	175	183
Sweet Potatoes	437	36			
Chickens	888	251			
Eggs	820	334			
Pecans	132	9			
Apples	437	4			
Peaches	339	2			
Turkeys	22	6			
Cowpeas	42	10			

<sup>4/</sup> Expected numbers based on 1945 Census data.

<sup>5/</sup> In the 27 counties.

For the commodities in Group I, only about 25 percent of the expected producers were found to sell any of the commodity. Of the crops in Group I, production of apples, peaches, pecans turkeys, and Irish potatoes is known to be concentrated in a few areas. Special attention, the nature of which has been described above, had to be given to these commodities to provide information adequate for a description of marketing channels.

Sampling variation and changes in the population since the Census undoubtedly contributed to the differences between expectation and realization. Another contribution to the variation is emphasized when Group I is compared to Group II. The items in Group I, characterized by large differences, include products which, in general, are not produced primarily for sale. (The crop which seems to fit this pattern least is wheat; apparently sales of this crop relative to production are smaller than is often supposed.) In Group II are found the commercial crops, and differences here between expected and obtained data are small. This comparison shows how wholly inadequate are figures on production when used to predict sales, and suggest the need for a division of Census production figures into two components: (i) produced for farm and/or home use; (ii) produced for sale.

### III. Administration.

A. Enumerators. Enumerators used in Survey I were obtained from several sources: personnel which had been employed in previous surveys

conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and North Carolina Department of Agriculture, personnel hired through the North Carolina Employment Service, applicants for County Agent work with the North Carolina Extension Service, and some personal contacts. The Employment Service was especially helpful in providing high quality personnel on relatively short notice.

Enumerators were trained at sessions held simultaneously in Raleigh and Shelby. Additional training was given on an individual basis whenever needed, most often in cases where enumerators were not available for the training school or were hired after the survey was under way. The required editing of schedules was minor, and in only a few instances was there need for additional supervision on the field work.

Personnel who had been previously employed as enumerators were able to "probe" with greater effect than inexperienced workers and the former group generally supplied more information on schedules than the latter. Newer enumerators also had greater difficulty in finding families at home and reported a greater number of "no response after 3 visits" than the more experienced enumerators. The differences was not large, however.

B. Field Costs. Field costs for the 1005 complete records obtained in the 27 sample counties averaged \$3.65 per schedule. Data shown in Table 4 portray the wide variation in the cost per schedule. A large part of this variation resulted from the variations in number of

visits. When costs were based on the number of visits to all families, therefore, a figure was obtained, which took into consideration "call backs" and ineligible non-farmers contacted. In the two cases where costs per visit exceeded \$3.00, the counties were in the Mountain area and segments were widely scattered. Enumerator 6 was on the office staff, and no allocation of salary was made. The average cost was \$2.25 per visit. An average of slightly more than 1.6 visits were required to get one schedule, making the cost per schedule in the regular survey the above-noted \$3.65.

Cost per visit and cost per schedule for the special survey were practically identical since visits averaged one per schedule. Cost per visit was therefore higher on the special survey than on the regular survey. This difference probably resulted chiefly from differences in travel costs, which are usually higher with list sampling than with area sampling. A full analysis of costs will be prepared when more complete data from Survey II become available.

The cost of obtaining data from the special commodity interviews, for which only known producers were contacted, and in which no time was lost because of non-cooperators, was as shown in Table 5. The concentrated production of these commodities, and the absence of non-cooperators and ineligible non-farmers, account for the somewhat lower cost per schedule than that experienced in the area sampling. As indicated above, however, cost per visit was somewhat higher on the special survey.

Table 4. Enumeration Costs per Schedule and per Visit.  
Survey I, Prices Study, North Carolina, 1949.

Enumerator	Total Visits	Schedules Obtained	Total Field Cost	Cost per Visit	Cost per Schedule
1	88	42	\$197.54	\$2.24	\$4.70
2	160	64	452.01	2.82	4.81
3	44	39	116.05	2.64	3.05
4	80	45	220.97	3.68	4.91
5	60	42	137.56	2.31	3.28
6	46	29	57.50	1.26	1.98
7	132	74	265.95	2.02	3.59
8	141	65	288.34	2.04	4.44
9	110	42	221.51	2.01	5.27
10	54	47	123.14	2.28	2.62
11	122	89	258.32	2.11	2.90
12	65	29	122.50	1.89	4.22
13	108	77	137.03	1.26	1.78
14	104	74	249.85	2.40	3.38
15	86	60	292.12	3.40	4.87
16	93	76	274.73	2.94	3.61
17	118	45	165.93	1.40	3.69
18	45	37	92.19	2.04	2.49
All enumerators	1636	1005	\$3673.24	\$2.25	\$3.65

Table 5. Cost per Schedule for Enumeration of Scarce Commodities, Special Survey, Prices Study, North Carolina, 1949.

Enumerator	Commodity	Number of Schedules	Total Cost	Cost per Schedule and per Visit
3	Apples	23	\$67.19	\$2.92
1	Peaches	24	87.86	3.66
7	Turkeys	25	67.54	2.70
11	Pecans	<u>17</u>	<u>61.70</u>	<u>3.62</u>
Total		89	\$284.29	\$3.19

IV. Commodities Sold by Farmers

For the eighteen commodities included in this study which were sold by farmers, the number of schedules per commodity ranged from 10 for cowpeas to 393 for cotton. A summary is presented in Table 6, showing the number of farmers reporting sales of the various commodities, the quantities reported sold, and the average size of sale, classified by the size of town in which the sales are reported to have been made.

It is immediately apparent from the table that a very large part of North Carolina farm products move to market through small towns. This is to be expected in a rural state, where the distribution of incorporated places is as follows:

Size of incorporated town (according to 1940 census)	Number of incorporated towns in North Carolina
Less than 500	212
500 to 999	103
1000 to 2499	94
2500 to 4999	31
5000 to 9999	19
10000 to 24999	17
25000 to 44999	4
45000 or more	5
All towns	<u>485</u>

Even the above tabulation understates the proportion of smallest towns, because it includes only incorporated places. In the twenty-seven sample counties alone, nearly one hundred additional places were

Table 6. Sales of Eighteen Farm Commodities by Size of Town Where Sold. A Sample of Farms from Thirty-two North Carolina Counties, 1949.<sup>a</sup>

Commodity	No. of Sales and Quantity Sold	No. of Schedules	Population (1940) of North Carolina towns where sales were made.			All out-of-state towns	Towns Not Reported <sup>c</sup>	All Sales <sup>d</sup>	
			Less than 1000 <sup>b</sup>	1000-4999	5000-24999				25000- or more
Chickens	Sales reported	265	136	96	78	16	9	44	379
	Chickens sold		128,983	116,203	7,656	942	4,620	4359	262,763
	Chicken per sale		948	1,210	98	58	513	99	693
Turkeys	Sales reported	32	2	13	10	7		2	34
	Turkeys sold		515	11,520	12,072	12,388		746	37,241
	Turkeys per sale		257	886	1,207	1,769		373	1,095
Eggs	Sales Reported	355	200	99	58	18	7	30	412
	Dozen Sold		69,658	15,697	13,297	6,191	1,845	4,795	111,283
	Dozen per sale		347	158	229	344	264	160	270
Cotton	Sales Reported	393	157	137	107	11	5	10	427
	Bales Sold		1,589	979	915	264	522	304	4,573
	Bales per sale		10	7	8	24	104	30	10
Corn	Sales Reported	253	125	82	55	9		7	278
	Bushels Sold		24,404	12,833	11,088	1,204	2,835	2,835	52,364
	Bushels per Sale		195	156	202	134	405	405	188
I. Potatoes	Sales Reported	54	25	16	9		1	6	57
	Bushels Sold		10,589	1,306	444		8	77	12,424
	Bushels per Sale		424	82	49		8	13	218

(continued next page)

Table 6. Sales of Eighteen Farm Commodities by Size of Town Where Sold. A Sample of Farms from Thirty-two North Carolina Counties, 1949<sup>a</sup> (continued)

Commodity	No. of Sales and Quantity Sold	No. of Schedules	Population (1940) of North Carolina towns where sales were made				All out-of-state towns	Towns not Reported <sup>c</sup>	All Sales <sup>d</sup>
			Less than 1000 <sup>b</sup>	1000-4999	5000-24999	25000- or more			
S. Potatoes	Sales Reported	41	15	10	8	2	6	43	
	Bushels Sold		563	641	1,495	27	431	4,012	
	Bushels per Sale		38	64	187	13	78	93	
Apples	Sales Reported	32	6	13	4	3	11	42	
	Bushels Sold		3,190	31,510	2,240	17,500	41,075	97,595	
	Bushels per Sale		552	2,424	560	5,833	3,734	2,324	
Peaches	Sales Reported	36	17	9	4	3	6	44	
	Bushels Sold		82,800	22,000	14,100	22,776	3,460	168,050	
	Bushels per Sale		4,871	2,444	3,525	7,592	578	3,819	
Pecans	Sales Reported	28	8	5	14	1	1	29	
	Pounds Sold		1,795	4,065	7,685	200	50	13,705	
	Pounds per Sale		213	813	549	200	50	473	
Wheat	Sales Reported	84	26	39	16	4	1	86	
	Bushels Sold		3,610	4,348	1,029	253	5	9,275	
	Bushels per Sale		139	111	64	63	5	168	
Oats	Sales Reported	30	13	4	9	2	3	31	
	Bushels Sold		1,841	600	1,477	3,500	285	7,703	
	Bushels per Sale		142	150	164	1,750	95	248	

(continued next page)

Table 6. Sales of Eighteen Farm Commodities by Size of Towns Where Sold.  
 A Sample of Farms from Thirty-two North Carolina Counties, 1949. a/(continued)

Commodity	No. of Sales and Quantity Sold	No. of Schedules	Population (1940) of North Carolina towns where sales were made.			All out-of-state towns	Towns not Reported	All Sales d/
			Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-19,999			
Soybeans	Sales Reported	66	34	16	17	1	68	
	Bushels Sold		16,712	3,099	1,290	24	21,125	
	Bushels per Sale		492	194	76	24	311	
Cowpeas	Sales Reported	10	5	3	3		11	
	Bushels Sold		81	15	19		115	
	Bushels per Sale		16	5	6		10	
Lesp. Hay	Sales Reported	26	12	1	1	1	26	
	Tons Sold		56	20	4	1	151	
	Tons per Sale		5	20	4	1	6	
Lesp. Seed	Sales Reported	49	25	15	2	1	51	
	Pounds Sold		63,840	38,225	1,200	400	114,565	
	Pounds per Sale		2,554	2,548	600	400	2,246	
Peanuts	Sales Reported	135	51	58	17	3	144	
	Bags Sold		7,883	6,099	3,670	130	205	
	Bags per Sale		154	105	216	43	142	
Hogs	Sales Reported	197	64	49	85	11	232	
	No. Hogs Sold		620	484	1,299	78	2,790	
	No. Hogs per Sale		10	10	15	7	12	

a/ The thirty-two counties include 27 randomly selected counties, and 9 counties (5 of them different from the 27) selected for information on the four scarce commodities: peaches, apples, pecans, turkeys.  
 b/ Includes inter-farm sales.  
 c/ Includes sales to buyers like itinerant truckers whose business locations are frequently not remembered by farmers.  
 d/ Sales reported in towns of various sizes do not add across to the "All Sales" total because the same farmer often reported sales in more than one place.

reported by farmers as places where they either bought or sold. Almost all of these towns were unincorporated, and fell into the "less than 500" size category.

The relation between average size of sale and size of town in which it occurred was not the same for the eighteen commodities studied. There was a tendency on the part of four of the commodities for sales to be larger in larger cities; in the case of seven, the reverse was noted; in the others, no consistent pattern was apparent. The data for all commodities are given in Table 6. In general it appeared that the commodities produced primarily for sale were those for which sales were larger in the larger towns.

It was indicated above that four of the commodities studied were not, because of the highly concentrated nature of their production, adequately represented in the randomly-selected sample of farmers. It was necessary to make a special survey in nine counties to get data on peaches, apples, pecans, and turkeys. Four of these counties had been entered in the random sampling survey, while five were new counties. In the counties entered for special crops, farmers were selected from lists of large producers of the scarce items, and each selected farmer was asked to give a full schedule, even though primary interest centered upon his report for the scarce commodity.

The following tabulation gives the frequency distribution of numbers of commodities reported sold by the 1105 farms visited for both the regular and special surveys.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Farms, by Number of Commodities Reported Sold. A Sample of Farms from 32 North Carolina Counties, 1949.

Number of commodities reported sold from a list of nineteen selected commodities <sup>a/</sup>	Number of farmers reporting	
	27 randomly selected counties	9 special counties <sup>b/</sup>
0	168	2
1	190	39
2	237	10
3	188	8
4	113	15
5	70	13
6	21	5
7	10	7
8	4	4
9	1	0
Total	<u>1002</u>	<u>103</u>
Average per farm	2.3	3.1

Over one-half of all the farmers visited reported sales of not more than two of the commodities studied. When it is considered that these include the large numbers of non-commercial sales, like those of eggs or chickens to neighbors, further evidence is provided that diversification is limited.

Table 8 gives a summary of reported sales of the eighteen commodities studied by place of sale, i.e., on the farm or off the farm. As might be anticipated, the situations vary widely between commodities, ranging from the case of cotton, where less than 1% was

<sup>a/</sup> Includes the eighteen studied commodities and tobacco, which was counted but not studied in detail.

<sup>b/</sup> Five of the nine counties were different from those on the list of randomly selected counties.

Table 8. Sales Reported On and Off the Farm.  
A Sample of Farms from Thirty-two  
North Carolina Counties, 1949.

Commodity	Unit	Number of Farmers Reporting Sales	On Farm		Off Farm		Not Reported	
			No. Sales	Quantity	No. Sales	Quantity	No. Sales	Quantity
<b>32 Randomly-selected Counties</b>								
Corn	Bushels	253	98	19,934	137	28,158	30	4,272
Cotton	Bales	393	11	38	367	4,434	18	101
Soybeans	Bushels	66	29	14,687	32	5,316	5	1,122
Cowpeas	Bushels	10	6	94	4	21		
Peanuts	Bags	135	40	7,084	72	10,396	24	3,033
Lesp.Seed	Pounds	49	13	16,335	15	39,130	22	59,100
Pecans	Pounds	28	6	1,205	20	11,950	3	550
Lesp.Hay	Tons	26	31	79	6	72		
Wheat	Bushels	84	20	2,131	50	5,729	15	1,415
Oats	Bushels	30	15	5,495	14	2,123	1	85
I.Potatoes	Bushels	54	12	1,704	38	10,651	6	69
S.Potatoes	Bushels	41	19	2,694	21	1,303	2	15
Peaches	Bushels	26	23	167,200	3	850		
Apples	Bushels	32	24	82,425	7	6,170	1	9,000
Eggs	Dozen	355	102	62,792	245	44,044	39	4,447
Hens	No.Birds	179	48	2,904	118	4,930	14	433
Brs.&Frs.	No.Birds	168	70	135,497	89	61,311	14	6,593
Hogs	No.Hogs	197	76	707	119	1,768	20	315
Turkeys	No.Birds	32	14	13,696	14	19,372	5	4,173
<b>8 Special Counties for Scarce Commodities (included in tabulation above)</b>								
Corn	Bushels	16	4	428	12	3,167	1	500
Cotton	Bales	29			29	908		
Soybeans	Bushels	4	3	100	1	150		
Cowpeas								
Peanuts	Bags	9			7	1,076	2	420
Lesp.Seed	Pounds	6			6	23,780		
Pecans	Pounds	19	6	1,205	11	7,525	2	500
Lesp.Hay	Tons	3	3	13	1	9		
Wheat	Bushels	5	2	400	3	450		
Oats	Bushels	7	4	670	3	650		
I.Potatoes								
S.Potatoes	Bushels	5	1	10	4	466		
Peaches	Bushels	25	22	166,800	3	850		
Apples	Bushels	5	3	14,050	2	6,040		
Eggs	Dozen	18	2	20,030	15	8,170	2	150
Hens	No.Birds	6	1	12	5	2,157		
Brs.& Frs.	No.Birds	6	1	50	5	55,644	1	5,000
Hogs	No.Hogs	11	4	150	8	148	1	35
Turkeys	No.Birds	26	10	12,929	12	15,561	5	4,173

reported sold on the farm, to the case of peaches, where less than 1% were sold off the farm. Data were not obtained on who pays transportation costs in the cases of sales off the farm, but it is obvious that such information is of great importance. It is one of the points to be investigated in Survey II.

The individual commodities sold will now be considered separately. Only brief comments will be made here, but fully detailed tables are included in the appendix of this report. The comments below apply to all schedules taken, both from the randomly selected farms and the special-commodity farms. Separate tabulation of the schedules from the special-commodity farms is included in the appendix.

CORN. (Appendix Tables 1 and 2.) Two hundred and fifty-three farmers reported sales of corn. Slightly over one-half of this corn (28000 of 52000 bushels) was sold to buyer-shippers. Farmers were not specifically asked whether they knew the destination of corn sold to buyer-shippers, but the general observation was that they seldom knew where it went after the sale. Not one farmer reported direct out-of-state sales. About one-fourth of the corn was sold to milling companies, while the remaining one-fourth went to a variety of buyers, like seed dealers, local merchants, and other farmers. Over 90% of the sales were reported to have been made in towns of less than 2500 persons. Although it is against the law in North Carolina either to buy or sell corn on other than a shelled basis, almost one-third of the corn was reported sold in the ear. Most of the sales of unshelled corn were

smaller sales, averaging about 150 bushels as compared to 250 bushels for sales of shelled corn. Most of the shelled corn was sold in the commercial corn counties of the northeastern part of the state. While only nine farmers reported selling graded corn, it is possible that many more were actually, if unwittingly, selling it on grade, not realizing that the price they received was based in part on moisture content. This point is to be investigated in Survey II when factors associated with price differences will be analyzed.

COTTON. (Appendix Tables 3 and 4.) Sale of cotton was reported by 393 farmers. Over one-half of this cotton was sold to local gins, while cooperatives and other local buyers took about one-fourth. Only about one-eighth of the cotton reported was placed under government loan. Five farmers reported sales out of the state, all of them large sales averaging 104 bales each. Three-fourths of the cotton was sold in towns of less than 2500 population, but most of it off the farm. Only 38 bales in the 4573 bales reported were sold on the farm. The equivalent of only 66 bales were sold unbaled, and these were concentrated mainly in the northeastern corner of the state; elsewhere the sales were almost exclusively on a baled basis except for fractional bales left over when the lint was baled. Less than 2% of the cotton was sold ungraded, while the largest part, about 65%, of it was graded by individual buyers. Government or cooperative graders graded the remainder.

SOYBEANS. (Appendix Tables 5 and 6.) Sixty-six farmers reported selling soybeans, the majority of them to buyer-shippers in small towns. Of the 21000 bushels reported sold, 19000 bushels moved through these channels. Other buyers listed were cooperatives, seed stores, local farmers, and oil mills. None of the crop was reported sold outside the state; in fact 15000 bushels of it was sold on the farm. Less than one-half of the farmers reported sales of graded or bagged soybeans, but about four-fifths of the crop was sold in this way.

COWPEAS. (Appendix Tables 7 and 8.) Only ten schedules on cowpeas were obtained, so it is not possible to describe with any confidence the marketing channels followed by this crop. The crop is still grown fairly widely, but is seldom sold, and its popularity is steadily decreasing. The crop is therefore of little significance in the prices-received picture. Of the cowpeas reported sold, over 90% were sold either to seed dealers or to local farmers. All the sales reported were small quantities, in no case exceeding forty bushels. Little information can be added by inclusion of cowpeas in the prices received analysis of Survey II.

PEANUTS. (Appendix Tables 9 and 10.) Among the farmers in the sample, one hundred and thirty-five reported sales of peanuts. Local shellers were the largest buyers from farmers, with buyer-shippers a close second. Both were operating in the small towns, as evidenced by the fact that some 85% of the peanuts were sold in towns of less than 2500 population. The major portion of the peanuts moving into government

loan were reported to be going out of state; this is explained by the fact that most of them were from Northampton County, on the Virginia border. The major portion of the peanuts were sold off the farm, mostly at the place of business of the local shellers. Nearly 90% of the peanuts were sold bagged or graded.

LESPEDEZA SEED. (Appendix Tables 11 and 12.) This was one of the crops most concentrated in one marketing channel. Practically the entire crop was moved through local seed dealers and local farmers. This implies, of course, that it was also sold in small towns, as in fact it was. Only about 1% of the crop was not clean at sale. Location of sale (on or off the farm) was not reported for about one-half the lespedeza seed reported, but in view of the fact that nearly 90% was sold to local seed dealers, it is likely that a large part of this was sold off the farm. Of the seed for which location of sale was reported, about two pounds were sold off the farm for every one pound sold on the farm.

PECANS. (Appendix Tables 13 and 14.) Production of pecans for sale is concentrated in relatively few farms in the southeastern quarter of North Carolina. The random selection of farms from the state as a whole include only nine commercial pecan growers. To supplement this list, schedules were taken from a group of known producers of pecans. Twenty-eight growers were interviewed in the two surveys. One-half of the nuts reported sold were sold to local buyers, like retail stores, and directly to consumers. The next biggest buyers reported were the

cooperatives. The modal size of town where the nuts were sold was in the 5000-25000 category, somewhat larger than for most other commodities studied. About one-half of the nuts were from improved stocks, and some 80% were sold ungraded. None of the producers attempted to brand their product. About 90% of the pecans were reported sold off the farm.

LESPEDEZA HAY. (Appendix Tables 15 and 16.) Like sales of lespedeza seed, the sale of the hay is concentrated almost entirely in one marketing channel, most of it being sold to local farmers. Of the 151 tons reported sold by the 26 reporting farmers, 112 tons were sold to other local farmers. One report of a sale to a local farmer was for forty tons of hay, in a city of over 25000. This is thought to be an address of an absentee landlord, so the item was placed under Not Reported in the size of town classification. It is mentioned here because it accounts for over 25% of the hay reported sold. Of the remaining hay, two-thirds was sold in towns of less than 1000 persons. Most of the hay sold was baled. About equal quantities were reported sold on and off the farm.

WHEAT. (Appendix 17 and 18.) Of the 84 farmers reporting wheat sales, three-quarters reported selling either to flour mills or feed mills. About three-fourths of the reported sales were handled in this way. Other buyers reported were cooperatives, local farmers, and a small amount to local merchants and seed dealers. Nearly 90% of the grain was sold in towns of less than 5000 population. About a third of it was sold graded. The major portion was sold off the farm, about twice

as much being sold in this way as on the farm.

OATS. (Appendix Tables 19 and 20) Thirty farmers reported the sale of 7703 bushels of oats, 13 of them selling to local farmers. Only about one-fifth of the volume of sales, however, were to other farmers. The major part of the crop was bought by seed dealers; other buyers mentioned were feed mills, cooperatives, and local merchants. Four hundred bushels were reported to have been placed under government loan. Only 451 bushels were sold graded. Sales were chiefly on the farm, two-thirds of the reported sales having been made there.

IRISH POTATOES. (Appendix Tables 21 and 22.) The notable point in the potato data is the fact that not a single one of the farmers interviewed indicated any potatoes sold to the government. Fifty-four farmers reported selling a total of 12,424 bushels of potatoes, the biggest type of buyer being buyer-shippers. The second most important were the local buyers, the two together accounting for 11,842 bushels. Cooperatives, truckers, consumers, hotels and cafes, all were reported as small buyers. Only two commercial potato counties, Beaufort and Currituck, were included in the sample, these two having been drawn for the express purpose of providing data on this crop, commercial production of which is highly concentrated, not only within counties, but even within townships. Such concentrated production is very difficult to cover adequately by the use of randomly drawn area samples from a large state like North Carolina. Most of the crop (nearly 90%)

was reported sold off the farm, in towns of less than 1000 population. About one-half of the reported production was sold field run, the remainder being sold with various amounts of grading and processing. The most common method, other than field run, was washed-graded-sacked. SWEET POTATOES. (Appendix Tables 23 and 24.) Forty-one farmers reported sale of a total of 4012 bushels of sweet potatoes. Nearly one-half of the potatoes were sold to truckers, who were the largest group of buyers. Others mentioned were local buyers, produce jobbers, retail stores, and consumers. Auction market sales were mentioned by only a few producers, and were not as important an outlet among farmers interviewed as might have been supposed. This situation may in part reflect the lack of convenient opportunity to sell through auction markets except in the eastern section of the state. The size of town most frequently mentioned as place of sale was in the 5000-25000 population group. About two-thirds of the potatoes reported sold were sold on the farm.

PEACHES. (Appendix Tables 25 and 26.) Over one-half of the peaches reported sold by the 26 producers interviewed were shipped on consignment to terminal markets. The next largest outlets reported were the truckers, who took about one-third of the crop. Other buyers reported were buyer-shippers and consumers. The part of the crop sold in the smallest-sized towns amounted to nearly one-half of the peaches reported sold, but the distribution of sales in towns of other sizes

was fairly even in this crop. Most of the peaches sold were graded, packed, and sold under the brand name of the packer.

APPLES. (Appendix Tables 27 and 28.) The most common way of selling apples reported by the 32 producers contacted was to truckers. About 80% of the crop was reported to have been sold to them. The only other important outlets were buyer-shippers and direct wholesale selling. Like peaches, apples were sold widely in towns of various sizes, the concentration of sales in small towns being less pronounced than in some of the other commodities studied. Most of the apples were sold graded, packed, and under the packer's brand name. The larger part of the crop was sold at the farm.

EGGS. (Appendix Tables 29 and 30.) The sale of eggs was very widely reported among farmers interviewed, 355 of them reporting the item. The channels through which eggs moved were diverse. Hatcheries took the largest single share, about 41,000 dozen out of the 111,000 dozens reported. Cash sales to retail stores and other local buyers were the second largest outlets, with direct sales to consumers ranking next. Sales were distributed over all town sizes, with the largest portion concentrated in the towns of less than one thousand population. Sales on the farm were slightly more important than those off the farm, in the ratio of approximately 60-40.

HENS. (Appendix Table 31.) Of the chickens sold, only 8267 of the total of 215,047 reported sold, were hens. Local dressing plants took 2450 hens, which was the largest number bought by a single type

of buyer, Live shippers, truckers, and local retailers ranked next, in that order. The list of important buyers was completed by cooperatives, produce dealers, and direct purchases by consumers. Nearly one-half of the hens were sold in towns of less than one thousand population, the larger part of them sold off the farm. Practically all the hens (all but 150 of them) were sold alive.

BROILERS AND FRYERS. (Appendix Table 32.) Most of the poultry production in North Carolina is production of broilers and fryers. One of the most important counties, Chatham, was included in the twenty-seven sample counties. The biggest type of buyer reported was a hatchery, but this was attributable to one establishment which was both hatchery and dressing plant. Otherwise the largest buyers were feed dealers, who financed the production of the birds and assumed responsibility in some cases for marketing. Local dressing plants and cooperatives were other important buyers. Small towns of less than one thousand population accounted for most of the broilers and fryers sold. Practically all the birds were sold alive, only 315 having been reported sold New York dressed.

ROOSTERS AND CAPONS. (Appendix Table 33.) Relatively small numbers of roosters and capons were reported sold. Those reported, numbering some 3000, were practically all sold direct to consumers in small-lot sales. All of them were reported sold alive.

HOGS. (Appendix Tables 34 and 35.) There were 197 farmers reporting sales of hogs, nearly one-half of them selling through the hog-buying

stations which dot eastern North Carolina. Other important outlets were auctions, local farmers and consumers, and local butchers. Since the hog buying stations are usually located in fairly large towns, the hog marketing outlets were mainly in such towns, namely those of 5000-25000 population. Over twice as many hogs were reported sold off the farm as on the farm. About one-third were reported to have been sold by the head, instead of by weight. Only nine producers reported a discount because of soft pork; the discounts reported were from 5% to 20% per hundredweight. There were 150 of the farmers who did not know whether their pork was discounted for softness.

TURKEYS. (Appendix Tables 36 and 37.) Thirty-two turkey producers were interviewed, and reported sale of 37,241 turkeys. Since the randomly selected sample of farms failed to provide adequate representation of the highly concentrated turkey producers, the men interviewed were selected from a list of known commercial growers. Two-thirds of the birds were marketed through local dressing plants; nearly all the others were handled by feed dealers in a manner similar to that used in broiler production. All but 1600 of the turkeys reported were sold by weight. About 28,000 were sold alive, 9,000 were sold New York dresses, and the remainder, less than a thousand, were sold eviscerated. Over one-half of the birds were sold off the farm.

OBSERVATIONS ON COMMODITIES SOLD DATA. A few observations of interest can be made on the basis of the above consideration of the eighteen commodities studied:

- a. The question concerning place of sale, on the farm or off the farm, seems not to have been interpreted clearly. This is particularly evident in the fruits, especially peaches. A large proportion of this crop is reported sold on consignment; yet most of it was also reported sold on the farm. The obvious inconsistency, on the basis of what is known, appears to result from inaccurate reporting on the location of sale. More attention needs to be given to the definition of sale, to insure that the idea is clearly conveyed to the respondent.
- b. The area sampling method is poorly adapted to surveys involving scarce commodities. Several commodities, as outlined above, were almost entirely missed because of the concentrated nature of their production; another crop, potatoes, was seemingly poorly sampled although allowance was made for concentrated production. This observation merely re-enforces what is already well known.
- c. Cowpeas should be dropped from further consideration in this study. Acreage in the state has been declining rapidly, and the crop is seldom grown for sale. The problem of getting price quotations will be difficult, and the value of the quotations will be small.

V. COMMODITIES BOUGHT BY FARMERS

Sixteen groups of items bought by farmers were included in Survey I, ranging from such farm commodities as feed, seed, fertilizer, and farm machinery, to non-farm commodities like groceries, clothing, and furniture. The farmers interviewed were asked where they had purchased the most of each of these items during the past year; or, if they had not purchased any, where they would have purchased most of them if they had bought any. The name of the most frequented single establishment was obtained wherever possible, along with the percent of all purchases of the item made there, and a classification of the establishment according to type of management, i.e., independent, chain, mail order, etc. In cases where approximately equally important purchases in a given commodity group were made from more than one source, data were taken on all such sources. No questions were asked on volume of purchases; the data refer only to frequency of patronage of the most often patronized types of establishments.

Table 9. Frequency of Mention of Various Types of Establishments as Most Important Source of Purchases by Farmers. A Sample from 32 North Carolina Counties, 1949.

Type of Establishment	Number of Mentions as Most Important Source of Purchases		
	Farm Commodities	Non-farm Commodities	All Commodities
Independent	4718	4820	9538
Chain	330	1591	1921
Cooperative	690	37	727
Mail-order	41	272	313
Other farmers	59	0	59
Other	415	306	721
All Establishments	<u>6253</u>	<u>7026</u>	<u>13279</u>

The dominant position of independent stores is strikingly apparent from these data. It is pertinent to note that chain stores were patronized five times as often for non-farm purchases as for farm purchases. This, of course, does not mean that the volumes of business were proportionately different, because, for example, the average size of the individual purchase was undoubtedly smaller in the A&P for groceries than in an International Harvester store for farm equipment. Other points worth noting are the differences in numbers of farm and non-farm purchases from cooperatives and from mail order houses.

FARM COMMODITIES. (Appendix Table 38.) The main source of purchases of all groups of farm commodities was reported to be independent stores. The degree to which they dominated the market varied from the case of Building Materials, in which 90% of the farmers reported their most important source of purchases to be independents, to the case of Seed, where the corresponding figure was 53%. Commodity groups will be considered separately below.

FARM MACHINERY. (Appendix Table 39.) Of the 639 farmers who reported on sources of farm machinery purchases, 530 preferred independent stores. The cooperatives, preferred by 60 men, were the second most frequently mentioned type of establishment. Most purchases of machinery, like sales of most farm products previously reported, were in small towns. The modal size of town, however, was 1000 - 5000, rather than the smallest-size towns which were by a wide margin most commonly reported as places of sales. Relatively small numbers of respondents reported

more than one major source of purchases of farm machinery, FEED. (Appendix Table 40.) As in the case of farm machinery, the independent stores were most frequented by the overwhelming majority of farmers for feed purchases, with cooperatives a poor second. Feed was reported purchased most frequently in the towns of less than 1000 population, 40% of the responses being in this category. Local farmers do not appear as an important source of feed purchases, although they were mentioned by farmers as an outlet for sales of corn, wheat, and oats. There are probably two reasons for this; (i) the most important reason is that farmers were asked to give only their most important source of feed purchases, while they were asked to account for all their sales (sales of grains to farmers were generally small, although fairly frequent); (ii) the question on "feed" may have meant "mixed feed" to the respondent unless the enumerator specifically explained that another meaning was implied. The latter situation was not anticipated in the instructions to the enumerators, so it is unlikely that many of them made such an explanation.

FERTILIZER AND LIME. (Appendix Table 41.) The pattern of purchases here, with respect to size of town and type of establishment, was about the same as that reported for feed. The only pertinent difference was that more farmers, 837 as compared to 639, reported the purchase of fertilizer and lime.

FIELD CROP and HAY SEED. (Appendix Table 42.) Seed was reported purchased from cooperatives more than any other commodity group, although even in

the case of seed cooperatives were reported as the most important source of purchases by only 266 of the 885 farmers reporting. This figure is to be compared with the 472 who reported major purchases from independent stores. Purchases from other farmers were reported by 59 respondents. The modal size of town in which purchases were made was 1000 - 5000.

FENCING MATERIAL. (Appendix Table 43.) Here again independents accounted for most of the business, with cooperatives far behind in second position. Most purchases were reported in the towns of 1000 - 5000 population.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS. (Appendix Table 44.) This category included only products used on the farm. Fuel oil used for heating or cooking in the household was put under Fuel, which will be considered below. Independents took the lion's share of the business in petroleum products, with the chain distributors second, but accounting for only 47 of 782 reported purchases, as compared to the 647 reported from independents. Petroleum products are, of course, purchased locally, so it could be anticipated that the smallest towns would be the most often reported places of purchase, as indeed they were.

BUILDING MATERIALS. (Appendix Table 45.) Although the independent store was by far the leading source of all farm purchases, it was farthest ahead in the purchase of building materials. Of the 718 farmers reporting such purchases, 651 bought from independents. Cooperatives, with 29, were second. Most of the purchases were in small towns, the modal size group being the towns of population from 1000 - 5000.

AUTO SUPPLIES. (Appendix Table 46.) There was some question about the appropriateness of classifying this item as a farm commodity, but on the basis that it included truck supplies and the part of auto supplies attributable to the farm use of the car, it was so classified. Independents were reported by about two-thirds of the farmers as the biggest source of purchases, with chain stores next in importance. Of the 642 farmers reporting purchases, 434 preferred independent stores, with 170 reporting a preference for chains. The modal size of town in which purchase was made was 1000 - 5000 persons.

NON-FARM COMMODITIES. (Appendix Table 47.) Purchases of the commodities bought by farm people for household and personal use were, like purchases of farm commodities, mainly made at independent stores in small towns. The proportion of purchases made from independents in the various non-farm commodity groups ranged from slightly above 90% for hardware down to 43% for clothing. The latter group was the only one, farm or non-farm, in which less than one-half of the farmers reported their main source of purchases to be independent stores. Chain stores were a very close second in importance with respect to purchases of clothing. One of the most apparent differences between the farm and non-farm commodities was that, while only one major source of purchases was usually noted for the farm items, two and sometimes more sources were frequently given for the non-farm items. The number of places mentioned therefore sometimes exceeds the number of farmers interviewed.

GROCERIES. (Appendix Table 48.) Independent and chain stores accounted for practically all purchases of groceries, the independents being mentioned nearly four times as frequently as the chains. The fact that groceries are purchased near home was reflected by the size of the modal towns, which was less than 1000 persons, the smallest size category considered.

CLOTHING. (Appendix Table 49.) Of the 1538 reports on sources of clothing purchases, 43% were at independent stores and 41% at chain stores. Most of the remainder were purchases from mail order houses. The clothing purchases from independents showed the same location pattern as purchases of other commodities, but because of the influence of chain stores, usually located in larger towns, the modal size of town was 1000 - 5000.

FURNITURE. (Appendix Table 50.) Independent stores dominated in furniture purchases, with chain stores far behind in second place. Of the 818 reports on purchases, 680 were in independent stores, compared with 99 chain stores. It must be re-emphasized that this is not necessarily a good indication of the relative volumes of sales in independent and chain stores. The survey only asked farmers where they customarily traded. This tended to measure the frequency of purchases as well as the volume. The modal town size was 1000 - 5000.

HOUSEHOLD ARTICLES AND SUPPLIES. (Appendix Table 51.) Purchase of household supplies was reported in 1010 cases, almost exactly one-half of them being at independent stores. Chain Stores, the most important source of supply of about one-fourth of the respondents, was the only other important source reported. The modal size of town reported was 1,000-5,000, but purchases in the larger towns were not as infrequent as they were in many of the other commodity groups.

HARDWARE. (Appendix Table 52.) The predominance of independent stores in hardware purchases by farmers was more pronounced than it was in most of the other non-farm items. Of the 894 reports, 776 were to the effect that independent stores were the most important source of purchases. Chain stores, cooperatives, and mail order houses were also mentioned, the latter, surprisingly enough, by only three farmers. The pattern of town size was very similar to that observed for Household Articles, described above.

ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT. (Appendix Table 53.) The pattern of purchases was practically identical to that observed in purchases of Household Articles and Supplies.

FUEL. (Appendix Table 54.) The most important sources of purchases of fuel were in the smallest towns, almost exclusively from independent distributors. Only 15 of the 511 reports specified purchases from chains; these were 102 "others" reported.

MOTOR VEHICLES. (Appendix Tables 55 and 56.) Sellers of motor vehicles were classified into two groups: dealers and individuals. Dealers were reported as the source of about 80% of purchases. Most of the cars bought from

individuals were used cars, while those from dealers were about evenly divided between new and used. Ford was by a narrow margin the most frequently bought passenger car, with Chevrolet second and Plymouth a poor third. In purchases of trucks, however, Chevrolet was first and Ford, second. The modal size of town was the 1,000-5,000 group.

OBSERVATIONS ON COMMODITIES - BOUGHT DATA.

- a. The predominance of independent stores is associated with the predominance of small towns. In towns where chains and other stores are available, the degree of concentration of purchases in independent stores is sharply diminished. Small towns are often unable to support the larger stores, so inevitably, the small independent stores get the bulk of the trade. In an area less rural than North Carolina, the dominance of the independent store would probably be less.
- b. In general, the frequently purchased, standardized, or small cost-per-unit items were most often purchased in the smallest towns. These included groceries, feed, seed, fuel, petroleum products and fertilizer and lime. Other Commodity groups tended to be bought in larger towns, but in no case was the modal size of town larger than the 1,000-5,000 group. The commodities most reported from larger towns were clothing, furniture, and farm machinery.

VI. Sample Plan (Survey II).

The following general outline of the sample plan developed for Survey II will be followed. A fully detailed statement of the plan, including a list

of towns selected, and numbers of establishments visited in each, will be given in a later report.

1. Prices Paid by Farmers.

A. Allocation of records to towns of different sizes and to stores of different types.

(1). The general objective is to keep  $a/b = c/d$ , where

a is the number of records to be taken from a given store type in a given town-size category

b is the total number of records to be taken

c is the number of purchases and/or sales by farmers in a given store type in a given town-size category

d is all purchases and/or sales by farmers.

(2). An estimate of  $c/d$  is available from Survey I, and will be used as the basis for allocation.

(3). All records will, insofar as possible, be taken from one set of sample towns.

B. Selection of towns to be visited.

(1). Towns of less than 1,000

a. Quota of records needed from stores of all types in this stratum will have been established in "A", above.

b. All towns listed by farmers in the 27 randomly-drawn counties of Survey I will be eligible for selection.

c. Two towns will be randomly selected from this list.

(2). Towns of 1,000 to 5,000

- a. Quotas of records needed will have been established in "A", above.
- b. All North Carolina towns listed by farmers in or out of the sample counties are eligible.
- c. Towns will be stratified by Crop Reporting District.
- d. Two towns will be selected within each Crop Reporting District, with probability of selection proportional to the number of sales reported by farmers in those towns.

(3). In towns of 5,000 to 45,000, selection will be made separately but in the same manner as in the 1,000 to 5,000 group, except that one town per district will be selected.

(4). All towns of more than 45,000 except Wilmington will all be surveyed. Wilmington will be omitted because practically no farmers in Survey I reported buying or selling there.

C. Selection of the establishments within selected towns.

- (1). In towns of less than 1,000, all establishments will be enumerated.
- (2). In towns of 1,000 to 5,000, the required quota of establishments of different types will be selected proportional to the number of times reported by farmers

in Survey I. In addition to these, a supplementary sample will be selected for each of the different types of stores from the classified telephone directory. If this directory is not available, some other appropriate list will be used to provide the supplementary information.

- (3). The same procedure as above will be followed for towns of 5,000 to 45,000. For towns greater than 45,000, establishments will be selected from the lists provided from Survey I in the same manner as for towns of 1,000 to 5,000. Supplementary information will be obtained from respondents falling in block samples taken from Sanborn maps. The number of supplementary schedules to be obtained will be determined by the relative proportion of the business establishments in the city that are represented on the lists obtained from Survey I.

2. Prices Received by Farmers.

- A. The same procedure outlined for selecting towns and establishments to provide data on prices paid, above, will be used to select sources of prices received information. It is desired, if possible, to select one set of towns which will provide information on both prices received and prices paid.

- B. Data on four commodities, characterized by highly concentrated production areas and relatively small numbers of producers, could not be obtained from a randomly selected list of farmers. It was, therefore, necessary in Survey I to enter the counties where the specialized production occurred to get data on peaches, pecans, apples, and turkeys. These counties will be entered in Survey II to obtain prices received information on the special crops and on prices paid.
- C. Many farmers sell to truckers and to other farmers. Since no organized business establishment is directly involved in these transactions, data will be taken from the farmers reporting such sales. Farmers reporting sales to truckers and/or other farmers (data available from Survey I) will make up the list of eligibles from which the quota of records will be taken. The farmers to be interviewed will be randomly selected from this list.

Appendix Table 1. Sales of Corn Classified by Size of Town  
in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State Towns	Towns not reported	All Sales
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 24,999	25,000 or more		b/	c/
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>							
Farmers reporting	23	16	12	1		1	53
Bushels sold	17,391	2,720	5,092	100		2,400	27,703
<u>Milling company</u>							
Farmers reporting	21	35	20	3			79
Bushels sold	1,990	8,422	3,427	145			13,984
<u>Local Farmers</u>							
Farmers reporting	42	10	5	1		1	59
Bushels sold	2,678	353	403	55		100	3,589
<u>Local Merchants</u>							
Farmers reporting	19	8	4	1			32
Bushels sold	1,155	493	725	250			2,623
<u>Cooperative</u>							
Farmers reporting	3	7	4	1			15
Bushels sold	180	555	755	600			2,090
<u>Truckers</u>							
Farmers reporting	3	1	7			3	14
Bushels sold	350	50	575			235	1,210
<u>Seed Dealer</u>							
Farmers reporting	5	1	1	1			8
Bushels sold	200	50	5	4			259
<u>Others</u>							
Farmers reporting	9	4	2	1		1	17
Bushels sold	460	190	106	50		50	856
<u>Total All Buyers</u>							
Farmers reporting	125	82	55	9		6	277
Bushels sold	24,404	12,833	11,088	1,204		2,785	52,314

a/ Includes inter-farm sales.

b/ Includes sales to truckers and others whose business locations may be unknown to farmers.

c/ Farmers reporting sales in towns of different sizes do not add to a total because the same farmer often reported sales in more than one place.

Appendix Table 2. Sales of Corn by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Corn Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Bushels Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Shelled	121	31,744
Unshelled	138	20,620
Graded	9	4,855
Ungraded	251	47,509
Total Corn Sold	253	52,364
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Shelled	5	2,485
Unshelled	9	1,610
Graded	1	800
Ungraded	13	3,295
Total Corn Sold	14	4,095

Appendix Table 3. Sales of Cotton Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyer's Place of Business is Located.

		Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made					Out of State not reported		All Sales
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	State	not reported	All Sales	
		a/	b/	c/	d/	e/	f/	g/	
<u>Local Gins</u>									
Farmers reporting	106	69	46			4		225	
Bales sold	1,062	386	410			508		2,366	
<u>Other Local Buyers</u>									
Farmers reporting	28	44	26	4	1	1		104	
Bales sold	331	279	144	17	14	2		787	
<u>Government Loan</u>									
Farmers reporting	2	8	16				7	33	
Bales sold	13	104	223				282	622	
<u>Cooperatives</u>									
Farmers reporting	7	5	10	5				27	
Bales sold	47	49	82	231				409	
<u>Local Warehouses</u>									
Farmers reporting	2	4	4	1		1		12	
Bales sold	14	122	24	8		3		171	
<u>Mill Buyers</u>									
Farmers reporting	6	6	5	1				18	
Bales sold	81	34	32	8				155	
<u>Others</u>									
Farmers reporting	6	1				1		8	
Bales sold	41	5				17		63	
<u>Total</u>									
Farmers reporting	157	137	107	11	5	10		427	
Bales sold	1,589	979	915	264	522	304		4,573	

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 4. Sales of Cotton by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Cotton Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Bales Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Baled	374	4,507
Unbaled	19	66
Total Cotton Sold	393	4,573
Graded by		
Gov. or Coop. Graders	85	1,523
Individual Buyers	293	2,922
Others	5	22
Ungraded	20	82
Not Reported	9	24
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Baled	29	908
Total Cotton Sold	29	908
Graded by -		
Gov. or Coop. Graders	19	432
Individual Buyers	20	476

Appendix Table 5. Sales of Soybeans Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State Towns reported	All Sales
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	b/	c/
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>						
Farmers reporting	21	7		2		30
Bushels Sold	16,279	2,929		72		19,280
<u>Cooperatives</u>						
Farmers reporting		4		2		6
Bushels Sold		127		505		632
<u>Seed Stores</u>						
Farmers reporting	2			4		6
Bushels Sold	55			420		475
<u>Local Farmers</u>						
Farmers reporting	8	3		2		13
Bushels Sold	240	15		35		290
<u>Local Oil Mills</u>						
Farmers reporting				7	1	8
Bushels Sold				258	24	282
<u>Local Truckers</u>						
Farmers reporting	2					2
Bushels Sold	110					110
<u>Others</u>						
Farmers reporting	1	2				3
Bushels Sold	28	28				56
<u>Total</u>						
Farmers reporting	34	16		17	1	68
Bushels Sold	16,712	3,099		1,290	24	21,125

a/b/c/See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 6. Sales of Soybeans by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Soybeans sold	Number of farmers reporting	Bushels sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded and bagged	27	16,257
Total Soybeans sold	66	21,125
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Graded and Bagged	1	20
Total Soybeans sold	4	250

Appendix Table 7. Sales of Cowpeas Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State Towns	All Sales c/
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more		
<u>Local Farmers</u>						
Farmers reporting	2	2	2			6
Bushels sold	15	5	14			34
<u>Seed Stores</u>						
Farmers reporting	3					3
Bushels sold	66					66
<u>Cooperatives</u>						
Farmers reporting		1				1
Bushels sold		10				10
<u>Others</u>						
Farmers reporting			1			1
Bushels sold			5			5
<u>Total</u>						
Farmers reporting	5	3	3			11
Bushels sold	81	15	19			115

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table J.

Appendix Table 8. Sales of Cowpeas by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Cowpeas sold	Number of farmers reporting	Bushels sold
<u>Regular Surveys</u>		
Graded and bagged	1	60
Total Cowpeas sold	10	115

None reported on Special Surveys.

Appendix Table 9. Sales of Peanuts Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and bags sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State towns	Towns not reported	All Sales
	Less than 1,000	1,000 a/ 4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more		b/	c/
<u>Local Shellers</u>							
Farmers reporting	9	37	8	1	1		56
Bags sold	839	3,485	2,748	44	400		7,516
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>							
Farmers reporting	18	14	6	1	2		41
Bags sold	3,641	1,965	512	76	86		6,280
<u>Government Loan</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	4	1		11	1	19
Bags sold	138	443	295		2,138	107	3,121
<u>Local Farmers</u>							
Farmers reporting	5	1	1				7
Bags sold	669	2	5				676
<u>Local Truckers</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	1					3
Bags sold	147	150					297
<u>Cooperatives</u>							
Farmers reporting	4						4
Bags sold	270						270
<u>Local Oil Mills</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	1					3
Bags sold	43	54					97
<u>Others</u>							
Farmers reporting	9		1	1			11
Bags sold	2,136		110	10			2,256
<u>Total</u>							
Farmers reporting	51	58	17	3	14	1	144
Bags sold	7,883	6,099	3,670	130	2,624	107	20,513

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 10. Sales of Peanuts by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of peanuts sold	Number of farmers reporting	Bags sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Bagged and graded	121	17,105
Total Bags sold	135	20,513
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Bagged and graded	7	1,106
Total Bags sold	9	1,496

Appendix Table 11. Sales of Lespedeza Seed Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

		Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State Towns not reported		All sales c/
		Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	State Towns	b/	
<u>Local Seed Dealers</u>								
Farmers reporting	21	14						35
Pounds sold	58,760	34,225						92,985
<u>Local Farmers</u>								
Farmers reporting	3	1	2		6			12
Pounds sold	3,300	4,000	1,200		5,900			14,400
<u>Cooperatives</u>								
Farmers reporting	1			1	1			3
Pounds sold	1,780			400	1,000			3,180
<u>Others</u>								
Farmers reporting					1			1
Pounds sold					4,000			4,000
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	25	15	2	1	8			51
Pounds sold	63,840	38,225	1,200	400	10,900			114,565

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 12. Sales of Lespedeza Seed by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Lespedeza seed sold	Number of farmers reporting	Pounds sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Cleaned	47	113,365
Total Lespedeza seed sold	49	114,565
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Cleaned	6	23,780
Total Lespedeza seed sold	6	23,780

Appendix Table 13. Sales of Pecans Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and pounds sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State towns	Towns not reported	All Sales c/
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000 - 4,999	5,000 - 24,999	25,000 or more		b/	c/
<u>Local Buyers</u>							
Farmers reporting	7	3	6	1			16
Pounds sold	1,305	3,300	1,310	200			6,065
<u>Cooperatives</u>							
Farmers reporting		1	6				7
Pounds sold		165	4,775				4,940
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>							
Farmers reporting		1	2			1	4
Pounds sold		600	1,600			50	2,250
<u>Truckers</u>							
Farmers reporting		1					1
Pounds sold		400					400
<u>Total</u>							
Farmers reporting	8	5	14	1		1	29
Pounds sold	1,705	4,065	7,685	200		50	13,705

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 14. Sales of Pecans by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of pecans sold	Number of farmers reporting	Pounds sold	Number of Trees
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>			
Wholesale:			
Bagged and graded	3	1,800	
Ungraded	15	9,650	
Retail:			
Loose	7	1,155	
Bagged	3	650	
No report	2	450	
Total pecans sold	28	13,705	
Unbranded	28	13,705	
Improved stock	25		1,079
Total pecan trees	28		1,193
<u>Special Survey Only</u>			
Wholesale:			
Bagged and graded	3	1,800	
Ungraded	8	5,575	
Retail:			
Loose	5	805	
Bagged	2	600	
No report	2	450	
Total pecans sold	19	9,230	
Unbranded	19	9,230	
Improved stock	19		979
Total Pecan trees	19		1,043

Appendix Table 15. Sales of Lespedeza Hay Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State towns		All reported Sales
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	State towns	not reported b/	c/
<b>Local Farmers</b>							
Farmers reporting	11		1		1	8	21
Tons sold	48		4		1	59	112
<b>Feed Dealers</b>							
Farmers reporting		1		1			2
Tons sold		20		1			21
<b>Truckers</b>							
Farmers reporting						2	2
Tons sold						10	10
<b>Others</b>							
Farmers reporting	1						1
Tons sold	8						8
<b>Total</b>							
Farmers reporting	12	1	1	1	1	10	26
Tons sold	56	20	4	1	1	69	151

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 16. Sales of Lespedeza Hay by Condition at Time of Sales.

Condition of Lespedeza hay sold	Number of farmers reporting	Tons sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Baled	15	126
Total Lespedeza hay sold	26	151
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>		
Baled	2	20
Total Lespedeza hay sold	3	22

Appendix Table 17. Sales of Wheat Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

Farmers reporting : sales, and bushels : sold to different : types of buyers :	Population of North Carolina : towns where sales were made : Less than:1,000-: 5,000-: 25,000: : 1,000 a/:4,999 :24,999 :or more:				Out of: Towns : State :not re- : towns :ported :	All : sales : c/ : b/ :
<u>Flour Mills</u>						
Farmers reporting	12	17	8	4		41
Bushels sold	1,334	1,646	460	253		3,743
<u>Feed Mills</u>						
Farmers reporting	6	14	1			21
Bushels sold	1,310	2,102	100			3,512
<u>Local Farmers</u>						
Farmers reporting	4	2	3		1	10
Bushels sold	331	315	72		5	723
<u>Cooperatives</u>						
Farmers reporting	2	4				6
Bushels sold	500	190				690
<u>Seed Dealers</u>						
Farmers reporting		2	2			4
Bushels sold		95	175			270
<u>Local Merchants</u>						
Farmers reporting	2		1			3
Bushels sold	115		150			265
<u>Others</u>						
Farmers reporting			1			1
Bushels sold			72			72
<u>Total</u>						
Farmers reporting	26	39	16	4	1	86
Bushels sold	3,640	4,348	1,029	253	5	9,275

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 18. Sales of Wheat by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of wheat sold	Number of farmers reporting	Bushels sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded	20	3,024
Total sold	84	9,275
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>		
Graded	1	300
Total sold	5	850

Appendix Table 19. Sales of Oats Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

	Population of North Carolina ;				Out-of-Towns		
Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers :	towns where sales were made :				State :		All Sales
	Less than 1,000 a/ :	1,000 a/ :4,999 :	5,000-:24,999 :	25,000: or more :	not re-ported :	b/ :	c/
<b>Seed Dealers</b>							
Farmers reporting	1	2		2			5
Bushels sold	200	985		3,500			4,685
<b>Local Farmers</b>							
Farmers reporting	8	2			3		13
Bushels sold	1,191	35			285		1,511
<b>Feed Mills</b>							
Farmers reporting	2	2	1				5
Bushels sold	100	350	25				475
<b>Government Loan</b>							
Farmers reporting	1						1
Bushels sold	400						400
<b>Local Merchants</b>							
Farmers reporting	1		2				3
Bushels sold	100		250				350
<b>Cooperatives</b>							
Farmers reporting	1	1	2				4
Bushels sold	50	50	182				282
<b>Total</b>							
Farmers reporting	13	4	9	2	3		31
Bushels sold	1,841	600	1,477	3,500	285		7,703

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 20. Sales of Oats by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Oats sold	Number of farmers reporting	Bushels sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded	2	451
Total sold	30	7,703
<u>Special Survey only</u>		
Graded	2	400
Total sold	7	1,320

Appendix Table 21. Sales of Irish Potatoes Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located.

	: Population of North Carolina :				: :	
Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	: towns where sales were made :			: Out of :	Towns :	All :
	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999 :	5,000-24,999 :	25,000 or more :	State not reported :	Sales c/ :
	:	:	:	:	b/ :	:
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>						
Farmers reporting	10	5	5			20
Bushels sold	5,717	1,116	118			6,951
<u>Local Buyers</u>						
Farmers reporting	8	2	1			11
Bushels sold	4,774	6	111			4,891
<u>Truckers</u>						
Farmers reporting		1	1		1	3
Bushels sold		16	75		20	111
<u>Retail stores</u>						
Farmers reporting	2	2	1	1		6
Bushels sold	16	26	40	8		90
<u>Cooperatives</u>						
Farmers reporting		3				3
Bushels sold		35				35
<u>Others</u>						
Farmers reporting	5	3	1		5	14
Bushels sold	82	107	100		57	346
<u>Total</u>						
Farmers reporting	25	16	9	1	6	57
Bushels sold	10,589	1,306	444	8	77	12,424

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 22. Sales of Irish Potatoes by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Irish potatoes sold	Number farmers reporting	Bushels sold
<u>Regular</u>		
Field run	31	6,692
Washed	1	1
Washed and graded	4	527
Washed and sacked	1	500
Washed, graded and sacked	12	4,349
Not reported	5	355
Total Irish potatoes sold	54	12,424

None Reported on Special Surveys.

Appendix Table 23. Sales of Sweet Potatoes Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

		Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of: Towns		
		Less than: 1,000	1,000 a/ : 4,999	5,000- : 24,999	25,000 or more	State : not re-ported	All sales	
						b/	c/	
<u>Truckers</u>								
Farmers reporting			2		1	3	6	
Bushels sold			790		785	375	1,950	
<u>Local Buyers</u>								
Farmers reporting	7	5	3	1	1		17	
Bushels sold	514	261	580	12	70		1,437	
<u>Local Retail Stores</u>								
Farmers reporting	2	2	2	1			7	
Bushels sold	15	155	95	15			280	
<u>Produce Jobbers</u>								
Farmers reporting		1	1				2	
Bushels sold		70	30				100	
<u>Others</u>								
Farmers reporting	6	2				3	11	
Bushels sold	34	155				56	245	
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	15	10	8	2	2	6	43	
Bushels sold	563	641	1,495	27	855	431	4,012	

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 24. Sales of Sweet Potatoes by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Sweet Potatoes Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Bushels Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Field Run	29	1758
Washed Only	1	3
Washed and Waxed		
Washed and Graded	10	2101
Washed, Waxed, Graded	1	150
Total Sweet Potatoes Sold	41	4012
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Field Run	3	310
Washed Only		
Washed and Waxed		
Washed and Graded	2	166
Washed, Waxed, Graded		
Total Sweet Potatoes Sold	5	476

Appendix Table 25. Sales of Peaches Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

		Population of North Carolina				Out of State		All sales
		towns where sales were made				Towns		not reported
		Less than 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 24,999	25,000 or more	State		All
		a/	b/	c/	d/	e/		f/
<u>Consignment Shipment</u>								
Farmers reporting	6	6	1	5				18
Bushels sold	55,350	12,400	2,376	22,914				93,040
<u>Truckers</u>								
Farmers reporting	4	3	3	2		5		17
Bushels sold	7,600	9,600	14,000	20,400		3,060		54,660
<u>Buyer-shippers</u>								
Farmers reporting	5							5
Bushels sold	14,750							14,750
<u>Direct to Consumer</u>								
Farmers reporting	2		1			1		4
Bushels sold	5,100		100			400		5,600
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	17	9	4	3	5	6		44
Bushels sold	82,800	22,000	14,100	22,776	22,914	3,460		168,050

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 26. Sales of Peaches by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Peaches Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Bushels Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded	19	116,064
Ungraded	19	51,986
In Bulk	20	59,836
In Containers Packed by grower	22	108,214
Under own Brand	16	102,414
Under other Brand	1	700
Unbranded	6	5,100
Total Peaches Sold	26	168,050
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Graded	19	116,064
Ungraded	18	51,586
In Bulk	20	59,836
In Containers Packed by grower	21	107,814
Under own Brand	16	102,414
Under other Brand	1	700
Unbranded	5	4,700
Total Peaches Sold	24	167,650

Appendix Table 27. Sales of Apples classified by size of town in which buyers place of business is located.

	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State towns		All Sales
Farmers reporting sales, and bushels sold to different types of buyers	Less than 1,000 a/	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000- or more	Towns reported b/	Towns not reported c/	Sales
<u>Truckers</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	11	1	1	2	10	27
Bushels sold	1,600	31,000	10	7,000	1,700	36,575	77,885
<u>Buyer-shipper</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	1	2	1			6
Bushels sold	1,500	500	2,200	4,500			8,700
<u>Direct wholesale selling</u>							
Farmers reporting				1			1
Bushels sold				6,000			6,000
<u>Consignment shipments</u>							
Farmers reporting					1		1
Bushels sold					300		300
<u>Others</u>							
Farmers reporting	2	1	1		2	1	7
Bushels sold	90	10	30		80	4,500	4,710
<u>Total</u>							
Farmers reporting	6	13	4	3	5	11	42
Bushels sold	3,190	31,510	2,240	17,500	2,080	41,075	97,595

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 28. Sales of Apples, by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Apples Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Bushels Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded	7	25,300
Ungraded	32	72,295
In Bulk	31	81,755
In Containers Packed by grower	7	15,840
Under own Brand	5	15,000
Under other Brand	1	300
Unbranded	2	540
Total Apples Sold	32	97,595
<u>Special Survey Only</u>		
Graded	3	11,300
Ungraded	5	8,790
In Bulk	4	9,250
In Containers Packed by grower	4	10,840
Under own Brand	2	10,500
Under other Brand	1	300
Unbranded	1	40
Total Apples Sold	5	20,090

Appendix Table 29. Sales of Eggs Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

Farmers reporting sales, and dozens sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made	Less than: 1,000	1,000 a/ : 4,999	5,000- : 24,999	25,000 : or more	Out of: State towns	Towns : not re-ported	All sales
							b/	c/
<u>Hatcheries</u>								
Farmers reporting	4	1		1				6
Dozens sold	37,467	2,800		1,000				41,267
<u>Retail Stores for Cash</u>								
Farmers reporting	41	28	21	3		3		96
Dozens sold	12,559	5,311	3,612	1,366		28		22,876
<u>Local Buyers</u>								
Farmers reporting	37	17	13	6	2	2		77
Dozens sold	9,654	2,450	5,425	1,645	1,050	250		20,474
<u>Direct to Consumer</u>								
Farmers reporting	46	16	8	3	2	23		98
Dozens sold	3,636	1,281	1,115	190	545	3,957		10,774
<u>Retail Stores for Trade</u>								
Farmers reporting	67	18	13	4	3	1		106
Dozens sold	4,476	869	1,995	950	250	60		8,600
<u>Cooperatives</u>								
Farmers reporting	2	10	2	1				15
Dozens sold	100	1,813	1,000	1,040				3,953
<u>Egg Brokers</u>								
Farmers reporting	2	2						4
Dozens sold	1,100	348						1,448
<u>Truckers</u>								
Farmers reporting	1					1		2
Dozens sold	416					500		916

Appendix Table 29, Continued

Farmers reporting: sales, and dozens sold to different types of buyers :	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made Less than: 1,000- 1,000 a/:	5,000- 4,999 :	25,000- 24,999 :	for more: :	State :not re- towns :ported :	Out of: Towns :	All sales
						b/	c/
<u>Others</u>							
Farmers reporting		7	1				8
Dozens sold		825	150				975
<u>Total</u>							
Farmers reporting	200	99	58	18	7	30	412
Dozens sold	69,458	15,697	13,297	6,191	1,845	4,795	111,283

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 30. Sales of Eggs, by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Eggs Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Dozen Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Graded	12	27,574
Candled Only	343	83,709
No Report		
Total Dozen Eggs Sold	355	111,283
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>		
Graded		
Candled Only		
No Report	18	28,350
Total Dozen Eggs Sold	18	28,350

Appendix Table 31. Sales of Hens Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

		Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of: Towns		
		Less than: 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	State	not reported	All sales
						b/	c/	
<u>Local Dressing Plants</u>								
Farmers reporting	4	2	3	2				11
Hens sold	2,180	100	85	85				2,450
<u>Live Shippers</u>								
Farmers reporting		4	10	2				16
Hens sold		1,442	206	70				1,718
<u>Truckers</u>								
Farmers reporting	8	3	21			3		35
Hens sold	333	57	598			71		1,059
<u>Local Retailers</u>								
Farmers reporting	15	6	9	2	2	2		36
Hens sold	262	255	223	105	70	36		951
<u>Cooperatives</u>								
Farmers reporting		14	4	1				19
Hens sold		426	42	125				593
<u>Direct to Consumers</u>								
Farmers reporting	18	7	4	2		3		34
Hens sold	226	145	87	70		64		592
<u>Produce Dealers</u>								
Farmers reporting	14	2	4			1		21
Hens sold	244	60	170			50		524
<u>Hucksters</u>								
Farmers reporting	7		2	1		1		11
Hens sold	235		24	20		90		369

Appendix Table 31, Continued

		Population of North Carolina				Out of: Towns		All sales
		towns where sales were made				State: not re-		
Farmers reporting sales, and hens sold to different types of buyers		Less than: 1,000	1,000 <u>a/</u> : 4,999	5,000-: 24,999	25,000: or more	towns:	ported:	
							<u>b/</u>	<u>c/</u>
<u>Others</u>								
Farmers reporting			1					1
Hens sold			11					11
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	66	39	57	10	4	8		184
Hens sold	3,480	2,496	1,435	475	210	171		8,267

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 32. Sales of Broilers or Fryers Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

Farmers reporting sales, and broilers or fryers sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made	Less than 1,000	1,000 <u>a/</u> to 4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more	State	Out of towns reported	All sales
							<u>b/</u>	<u>c/</u>

Hatchery

Farmers reporting	2							2
Broilers and fryers sold	95,100							95,100

Feed Dealers

Farmers reporting	1	3				1		5
Broilers and fryers sold	3,000	50,525				4,300		57,825

Local Dressing Plants

Farmers reporting	5	5	5	2				17
Broilers and fryers sold	10,300	2,220	5,185	250				18,455

Cooperatives

Farmers reporting	2	8						10
Broilers and fryers sold	5,006	4,489						9,495

Local Retailers

Farmers reporting	15	11	6	1	2	1		36
Broilers and fryers sold	7,610	590	145	8	40	50		8,443

Hucksters

Farmers reporting	4	2				1		7
Broilers and fryers sold	128	5,010				25		5,163

Produce Dealers

Farmers reporting	10	3	1	1				15
Broilers and fryers sold	2,445	1,375	15	80				3,915

Appendix Table 32, Continued

Farmers reporting sales, and broilers or fryers sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina	towns where sales were made	Less than 1,000	1,000 a/ to 4,999	5,000- to 24,999	25,000 or more	State not reported	Out of towns	All sales
								b/	c/
<u>Direct to Consumers</u>									
Farmers reporting	30	17	4	1	2	19			73
Broilers and fryers sold	1,333	597	225	125	70	681			3,081
<u>Live Shippers</u>									
Farmers reporting		6	2						8
Broilers and fryers sold		1,149	610						1,759
<u>Truckers</u>									
Farmers reporting	1					1			2
Broilers and fryers sold	25					40			65
<u>Others</u>									
Farmers reporting			2			1			3
Broilers and fryers sold			65			35			100
<u>Total</u>									
Farmers reporting	70	55	20	5	5	23			178
Broilers and fryers sold	125,497	65,955	6,245	463	4,410	331			203,401

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 33. Sales of Poultry, by Condition at Time of Sale.

Kind of Poultry	<u>Alive</u>		<u>N. Y. Dressed</u>		<u>Eviscerated</u>		<u>Total Sales</u>	
	Farmers Reporting	:No. Birds	Farmers Reporting	:No. Birds	Farmers Reporting	:No. Birds	Farmers Reporting	:No. Birds
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>								
Hens	177	8,117	2	150	179			8,267
Broilers & Fryers	164	203,086	5	315	168			203,401
Capons								
Roosters	18	3,379			18			3,379
Total All Birds Sold	358	214,582		465	265			215,047
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>								
Hens	6	2,169			6			2,169
Broilers & Fryers	6	60,694			6			60,694
Capons								
Roosters	1	3,000			1			3,000
Total All Birds Sold		65,863			6			65,863

Appendix Table 34. Sales of Hogs Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

		Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made				Out of State towns		All sales
		Less than 1,000	1,000 a/ - 4,999	5,000 - 24,999	25,000 or more	State reported	not reported	b/ c/
<b>Farmers reporting sales, and hogs sold to different types of buyers</b>								
<u>Hog-buying Stations</u>								
Farmers reporting	5	10	45	1	2			63
Hogs sold	117	208	865	5	17			1,212
<u>Consumers, Farmers</u>								
Farmers reporting	42	21	2	3		14		82
Hogs sold	344	89	3	44		132		612
<u>Auction Markets</u>								
Farmers reporting	9	6	17	6				38
Hogs sold	49	52	210	26				337
<u>Truckers</u>								
Farmers reporting	1	3	3			4		11
Hogs sold	4	23	82			95		194
<u>Local Butchers</u>								
Farmers reporting	4	5	6		2			17
Hogs sold	24	31	48		55			158
<u>Packers</u>								
Farmers reporting		3	11	1				15
Hogs sold		61	87	3				151
<u>Others</u>								
Farmers reporting	3	1	1			1		6
Hogs sold	82	20	4			20		126
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	64	49	85	11	4	19		232
Hogs sold	620	484	1,299	78	72	237		2,790

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 35. Sales of Hogs by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Hogs Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Hogs Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
By the Head	90	987
By Weight	105	1559
No Report	18	244
Discount for "Soft Hogs"		
No. of "Yes"	9	
No. of "No"	38	
Don't Know	150	
Total Hogs Sold	197	2790
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>		
By the Head	6	149
By Weight	8	184
No Report		
Discount for "Soft Hogs"		
No. of "Yes"		
No. of "No"		
Don't Know	11	
Total Hogs Sold	11	333

Appendix Table 36. Sales of Turkeys Classified by Size of Town in Which Buyers Place of Business is Located

Farmers reporting sales, and turkeys sold to different types of buyers	Population of North Carolina towns where sales were made	Less than 1,000	1,000 a/ 4,999	5,000- 24,999	25,000 or more	State not reported	Out of towns	All sales
							b/	c/
<u>Local Dressing Plants</u>								
Farmers reporting	1	3	7	7			1	19
Turkeys sold	15	2,600	8,925	12,388			735	24,663
<u>Feed Dealers</u>								
Farmers reporting		9	1					10
Turkeys sold		8,909	2,500					11,409
<u>Local Buyers</u>								
Farmers reporting	1	1	1				1	4
Turkeys sold	500	11	11				11	533
<u>Others</u>								
Farmers reporting			1					1
Turkeys sold			636					636
<u>Total</u>								
Farmers reporting	2	13	10	7			2	34
Turkeys sold	515	11,520	12,072	12,388			746	37,241

a/ b/ c/ See Appendix Table 1.

Appendix Table 37. Sales of Turkeys by Condition at Time of Sale.

Condition of Turkeys Sold	Number of Farmers Reporting	Turkeys Sold
<u>Regular and Special Surveys</u>		
Alive	28	27,807
N. Y. Dressed	5	8,784
Eviscerated	1	650
Total Turkeys Sold	32	37,241
<u>Special Surveys Only</u>		
Alive	23	27,029
N. Y. Dressed	4	4,984
Eviscerated	1	650
Total Turkeys Sold	26	32,663

Appendix Table 38. Major Sources of Purchases of Farm Commodities.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more			
Independent:	Less than 25%	7	10	2	1			20
	25 - 75%	109	124	30	23	8	6	305
	More than 75%	1,627	1,490	909	267	82	18	4,393
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%	3	8	2	1			14
	25 - 75%	18	85	6	14	1		124
	More than 75%	84	282	114	66	6		552
Chain:	Less than 25%	2	1	1				4
	25 - 75%	6	27	12	22	2		69
	More than 75%	19	104	76	50	8		257
Other Farmers:	Less than 25%	6	2	1				9
	25 - 75%	5	3		1	1	2	12
	More than 75%	21	6	1	2		8	38
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%				2	1		3
	25 - 75%		1		5	5		11
	More than 75%		3		13	10	1	27
Others:	Less than 25%	9	6	2	3	3	12	35
	25 - 75%	39	30	8	8	3	6	94
	More than 75%	131	65	45	24	16	5	286
Total:	Less than 25%	27	27	8	7	4	12	85
	25 - 75%	177	270	56	78	20	14	615
	More than 75%	1,882	1,950	1,145	422	122	32	5,553

a/ Farmers reporting sales in towns of different sizes do not add to a total because the same farmer often reported sales in more than one place.

Appendix Table 39. Major Sources of Purchases of Farm Machinery.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	1	1	1	1			4
	25 - 75%	2	7	1	4			14
	More than 75%	117	186	151	39	18	1	512
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%		2					2
	25 - 75%	2	7		2			11
	More than 75%	12	26	3	5	1		47
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		1		2			3
	More than 75%		2		1	1		4
Others:	Less than 25%	1						1
	25 - 75%	1		3				4
	More than 75%	8	7	9	10	2	1	37
Total:	Less than 25%	2	3	1	1			7
	25 - 75%	5	15	4	8			32
	More than 75%	137	221	163	55	22	2	600

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 40. Major Sources of Purchases of Feed.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more			
Independent:	Less than 25%	2						2
	25 - 75%	24	20	6	3			53
	More than 75%	276	177	109	28	9		599
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%		1					1
	25 - 75%	7	16	3	2			28
	More than 75%	9	49	21	12	2		93
Chains:	Less than 25%	1						1
	25 - 75%	4	4		3	1		12
	More than 75%	2	5	4		4		15
Others:	Less than 25%				1		1	2
	25 - 75%	4	1	2				7
	More than 75%	11	7	3	2	1		24
Total:	Less than 25%	3	1		1		1	6
	25 - 75%	39	41	11	8	1		100
	More than 75%	298	238	137	42	16		731

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 41. Major Sources of Purchases of Fertilizer and Lime.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:	
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:				
Independent:	Less than 25%			1				1	
	25 - 75%	23		22	2	1		48	
	More than 75%	313		225	150	30	14	1	733
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%	1		2	1			4	
	25 - 75%	4		21		2	1	28	
	More than 75%	16		50	16	16	1	99	
Chains:	Less than 25%				1			1	
	25 - 75%	1			1	1		3	
	More than 75%	5		5	10	1	1	22	
Others:	Less than 25%	2		2	1	2	1	1	9
	25 - 75%	15		19		7	1	1	43
	More than 75%	60		15	11	12	2	1	101
Total:	Less than 25%	3		5	3	2	1	1	15
	25 - 75%	43		62	1	12	3	1	122
	More than 75%	394		295	187	59	18	2	955

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 42. Major Sources of Purchases of Field Crops and Hay Seed.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	1	6	1				8
	25 - 75%	15	28	10	5	1	1	60
	More than 75%	152	122	90	34	6		404
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%	2	3	1	1			7
	25 - 75%	3	31	3	4			41
	More than 75%	40	126	31	19	2		218
Other Farmers:	Less than 25%	6	2	1				9
	25 - 75%	5	3		1	1	2	12
	More than 75%	21	6	1	2		8	38
Chains:	Less than 25%	1						1
	25 - 75%		5	1		1		7
	More than 75%	4	6	3	3	3		19
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%							
	More than 75%					3	1	4
Others:	Less than 25%	4	3			1	1	9
	25 - 75%	5	4	3				12
	More than 75%	19	7	7	1	1	1	36
Total:	Less than 25%	14	14	3	1	1	1	34
	25 - 75%	28	71	17	10	3	3	132
	More than 75%	236	267	132	59	15	10	719

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 43. Major Sources of Purchases of Fencing Materials.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	2						2
	25 - 75%	8	6	2	3		1	20
	More than 75%	190	192	101	33	6	4	526
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%	1	5		3			9
	More than 75%	6	25	30	8			69
Chains:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%				2			2
	More than 75%		2	2	6			10
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%				2			2
	25 - 75%					1		1
	More than 75%				2	4		6
Others:	Less than 25%		1					1
	25 - 75%				1			1
	More than 75%	1	4	1		3		9
Total:	Less than 25%	2	1		2			5
	25 - 75%	9	11	2	9	1	1	33
	More than 75%	197	223	134	49	13	4	620

a/ See Appendix Table 33.

Appendix Table 44. Major Sources of Purchases of Petroleum Products.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State towns:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	1	1					2
	25 - 75%	14	9		2	3	1	29
	More than 75%	251	193	122	30	15	5	616
Chains:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		2	1	3			6
	More than 75%	2	27	11	1			41
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		1					1
	More than 75%				1			1
Others:	Less than 25%	2		1			8	11
	25 - 75%	5	1			2	2	10
	More than 75%	23	25	10	1	4	2	65
Total:	Less than 25%	3	1	1			8	13
	25 - 75%	19	13	1	5	5	3	46
	More than 75%	276	245	143	33	19	7	723

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 45. Major Sources of Purchases of Building Materials.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%		1				1	
	25 - 75%	14	17	6	4	3	47	
	More than 75%	192	253	108	44	4	603	
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%		4				6	
	25 - 75%	1	4		1		6	
	More than 75%	1	6	11	5		23	
Chains:	Less than 25%		3	4	2		9	
	25 - 75%		3	4	2		9	
	More than 75%		1	1	2		4	
Others:	Less than 25%					1	1	
	25 - 75%	8	4	1			14	
	More than 75%	5		3		2	10	
Total:	Less than 25%		1			1	2	
	25 - 75%	23	28	11	7	3	76	
	More than 75%	198	260	123	51	6	640	

a/ See Appendix Table 33.

Appendix Table 46. Major Sources of Purchases of Other Automobile Supplies.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina:				Out of State:	Towns reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%	9	15	5	5			34
	More than 75%	136	142	73	29	10	5	400
Chains:	Less than 25%		1					1
	25 - 75%	1	13	4	11			29
	More than 75%	6	56	43	35			140
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%					1		1
	25 - 75%				3	4		7
	More than 75%		1		10	2		13
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%							
	More than 75%			2				2
Others:	Less than 25%						1	1
	25 - 75%	1	1				2	4
	More than 75%	4	2	3		1		10
Total:	Less than 25%		1			1	1	3
	25 - 75%	11	29	9	19	4	2	74
	More than 75%	146	201	126	74	13	5	565

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 47. Major Sources of Purchases of Non-farm Commodities.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State towns:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	26	19	10	6	3	5	69
	25 - 75%	225	271	143	62	17	10	728
	More than 75%	1,536	1,386	762	258	60	21	4,023
Chains:	Less than 25%	15	42	33	17	3	1	111
	25 - 75%	44	231	184	128	11	4	602
	More than 75%	25	337	321	186	6	3	878
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%	1	1	1	35	11	2	51
	25 - 75%		7	10	85	45	1	148
	More than 75%	1	3	3	41	23	2	73
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		5		1			6
	More than 75%	4	20	2	5			31
Others:	Less than 25%	4	3	3			51	61
	25 - 75%	17	21	9	10	2	53	112
	More than 75%	53	37	12	8	13	10	133
Total:	Less than 25%	46	65	47	58	17	59	292
	25 - 75%	286	535	346	286	75	68	1,596
	More than 75%	1,619	1,783	1,100	498	102	36	5,133

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 48. Major Sources of Purchases of Groceries.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more			
Independent:	Less than 25%	15	3	1	3	1		23
	25 - 75%	110	75	38	9	5		237
	More than 75%	503	192	89	37	14	5	840
Chains:	Less than 25%	9	29	21	11	1	1	72
	25 - 75%	15	88	70	27	3	1	204
	More than 75%	9	37	33	17	1		97
Others:	Less than 25%	2	1	2			14	19
	25 - 75%	5	9	1	5		18	38
	More than 75%	1	4		5	1		11
Total:	Less than 25%	26	33	24	14	2	15	114
	25 - 75%	130	172	109	41	8	19	479
	More than 75%	513	233	122	59	16	5	948

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 49. Major Sources of Purchases of Clothing.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State towns:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	6	10	7	3	2	3	31
	25 - 75%	54	107	61	30	6	7	265
	More than 75%	100	146	83	27	8	3	367
Chains:	Less than 25%	1	8	7	5	2		23
	25 - 75%	19	94	86	51	6	2	258
	More than 75%	6	147	127	68		2	350
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%	1	1	1	32	9	1	45
	25 - 75%		4	7	70	36	1	118
	More than 75%		3		15	10	1	29
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%							
	More than 75%	1						1
Others:	Less than 25%	1		1			18	20
	25 - 75%	5	2	2			20	29
	More than 75%				1		1	2
Total:	Less than 25%	9	19	16	40	13	22	119
	25 - 75%	78	207	156	151	48	30	670
	More than 75%	107	296	210	111	18	7	749

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 50. Major Sources of Purchases of Furniture.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State towns:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more			
Independent:	Less than 25%	1						1
	25 - 75%	6	14	8	6	1		35
	More than 75%	131	302	142	57	12		644
Chains:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		4	4	10			18
	More than 75%	1	16	44	17	3		81
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%				3	1		4
	25 - 75%			2	1	3		6
	More than 75%				7	2		9
Others:	Less than 25%						3	3
	25 - 75%	1			2		1	4
	More than 75%	4	1	1	2	1	4	13
Total:	Less than 25%	1			3	1	3	8
	25 - 75%	7	18	14	19	4	1	63
	More than 75%	136	319	187	83	18	4	747

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 51. Major Sources of Purchases of Household Articles and Supplies.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000:	1,000-4,999:	5,000-24,999:	25,000 or more:			
Independent:	Less than 25%	4	3	2		2	11	
	25 - 75%	27	36	9	9	2	85	
	More than 75%	232	161	84	23	6	510	
Chains:	Less than 25%	4	5	3	1		13	
	25 - 75%	5	41	18	27	2	94	
	More than 75%	6	105	67	48	1	228	
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%					1	1	
	25 - 75%		2	1	8	3	14	
	More than 75%				4	5	10	
Others:	Less than 25%		1				15	
	25 - 75%	2		3	2	1	18	
	More than 75%	3	3			4	10	
Total:	Less than 25%	8	9	5	1	1	41	
	25 - 75%	34	79	31	46	8	211	
	More than 75%	241	269	151	75	16	758	

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 52. Major Sources of Purchases of Hardware.

Type of Store:	: Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	: Population of North Carolina : towns where purchases were made :				: Out of State towns :	: not reported :	: All pur-chases :
		: Less than 1,000 :	: 1,000 - 4,999 :	: 5,000 - 24,999 :	: 25,000 or more :			
Independent:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%	15	15	16	2	1		49
	More than 75%	268	290	154	51	9	4	776
Chains:	Less than 25%	1		1				2
	25 - 75%	4	2	2	5			13
	More than 75%	1	6	9	4	1		21
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%		2		1			3
	More than 75%	3	14	1	4			22
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%				1			1
	More than 75%	1			1			2
Others:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%						2	2
	More than 75%		1			1	1	3
Total:	Less than 25%	1		1				2
	25 - 75%	19	19	18	9	1	2	68
	More than 75%	273	311	164	60	11	5	824

a/ See Appendix Table 30.

Appendix Table 53. Major Sources of Purchases of Household Electrical Equipment.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina : towns where purchases were made :				Out of State :	Towns not reported :	All purchases :
		Less than 1,000 :	1,000 - 4,999 :	5,000 - 24,999 :	25,000 or more :			
Independent:	Less than 25%		2				2	
	25 - 75%	5	11	8	5		29	
	More than 75%	172	197	97	42	9	4	521
Chains:	Less than 25%			1			1	
	25 - 75%	1	2	3	7		13	
	More than 75%	2	17	33	31		83	
Mail Order Houses:	Less than 25%					1	1	
	25 - 75%		1		5	3	9	
	More than 75%			3	14	6	23	
Cooperatives:	Less than 25%		3				3	
	25 - 75%		6	1	1		8	
Others:	Less than 25%	1	1				2	
	25 - 75%		5	1		2	8	
	More than 75%	2	3			1	6	
Total:	Less than 25%	1	3	1			1	6
	25 - 75%	6	22	12	17	3	2	62
	More than 75%	176	223	139	88	16	4	646

a/ See Appendix Table 38.

Appendix Table 54. Major Sources of Purchases of Fuel.

Type of Store:	Per cent of all purchases made at major source:	Population of North Carolina towns where purchases were made:				Out of State towns:	Towns not reported:	All purchases:
		Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-24,999	25,000 or more			
Independent:	Less than 25%		1					1
	25 - 75%	8	13	3	1	2	1	28
	More than 75%	130	98	113	21	3		365
Chains:	Less than 25%							
	25 - 75%			1	1			2
	More than 75%		9	3	1			13
Others:	Less than 25%						1	1
	25 - 75%	4	5	2	1	1		13
	More than 75%	43	25	11		4	5	88
Total:	Less than 25%		1				1	2
	25 - 75%	12	18	6	3	3	1	43
	More than 75%	173	132	127	22	7	5	466

a/ See Appendix Table 30.

Appendix Table 55. Major Sources of Purchases of Motor Vehicles.

Source of purchase	Description of car	Population of North Carolina : towns where purchases were made				: Out of State : towns	: not reported	: All purchases
		: Less than 1,000	: 1,000-4,999	: 5,000-24,999	: 25,000 or more			
Dealer	New	13	40	20	11	1	2	87
	Used	10	56	21	9	0	1	97
	Not reported	3	4	5	2	0	0	14
	All cars	26	100	46	22	1	3	198
Individual	New	0	2	1	0	2	0	5
	Used	26	12	9	2	6	2	57
	Not reported	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
	All cars	26	14	12	2	8	3	65
Other	New	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Used	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
	Not reported	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All cars	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
Total	New	13	43	21	11	3	2	93
	Used	37	68	30	12	6	3	156
	Not reported	3	4	7	2	0	1	17
	All cars	53	115	58	25	9	6	266

Appendix Table 56. Kinds of Motor Vehicles Purchased.

Make of car	Passenger cars	Trucks	Total
Ford	73	20	93
Chevrolet	59	29	88
Plymouth	23	0	23
Buick	5	0	5
Other	45	12	57
All makes	205	61	266

Appendix Table 57. Specimen field schedules.

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington 25, D. C.

Cooperating

SAMPLE AREA SKETCH

County \_\_\_\_\_ Segment Number \_\_\_\_\_ Enumerator \_\_\_\_\_

---

Total No. Dwellings \_\_\_\_\_

Total No. Farms \_\_\_\_\_

No. Farms Eligible \_\_\_\_\_

No. Non-cooperators \_\_\_\_\_

No. Schedules \_\_\_\_\_

Date Area Entered \_\_\_\_\_

Date Area Completed \_\_\_\_\_



SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
(If eligible as shown in  
Items 7 and 9)

BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

County \_\_\_\_\_  
Segment \_\_\_\_\_  
Dwelling No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Unoccupied \_\_\_\_\_  
Non-Cooperator \_\_\_\_\_  
Give reason \_\_\_\_\_  
Enumerator \_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL INFORMATION SCHEDULE

1. Name of operator \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address \_\_\_\_\_
3. Race \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Tenure \_\_\_\_\_
5. How many acres do you own in this or adjoining counties? \_\_\_\_\_ Acres
6. How many acres do you rent from others or work on shares for others? \_\_\_\_\_ Acres
7. This makes a total of \_\_\_\_\_ acres that you either own or rent from others. Is that right? \_\_\_\_\_ Acres
8. How many acres do you rent out to others, including croppers? \_\_\_\_\_ Acres

In the questions that follow, we are concerned with your share of the product from land rented out, as well as with the produce from the land you operate yourself.

9. Was the total value of products sold last year more than \$250? \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes or No

---

IF ITEM 7 IS LESS THAN 3 ACRES AND ITEM 9 IS "NO", THIS RESPONDENT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THE SURVEY. THANK HIM AND GO ON TO THE NEXT.

---

THE RESPONDENT IS ELIGIBLE AND SHOULD BE ASKED THE QUESTIONS BELOW IF ITEM 7 IS AT LEAST 3 ACRES OR ITEM 9 IS "YES".

---

10. Did you sell any of the following from last year's (1948) production:

Corn?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Peanuts?	Yes ( ) No ( )
Cotton?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Lespedeza seed?	Yes ( ) No ( )
Soybeans?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Pecans?	Yes ( ) No ( )
Cowpeas?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Tobacco?	Yes ( ) No ( )

11. Did you sell any of the following from this year's (1949) production:

Lespedeza hay?	Yes ( )	No ( )	Sweet potatoes?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Wheat?	Yes ( )	No ( )	Peaches?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Oats?	Yes ( )	No ( )	Apples?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Irish potatoes?	Yes ( )	No ( )			

12. During the last 12 months (Oct. 1948-Sept. 1949) did you sell any of the following:

Eggs?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Chickens?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Hogs?	Yes ( )	No ( )
Turkeys?	Yes ( )	No ( )

FOR EACH ITEM CHECKED "YES" ASK ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS IN SUPPLEMENTAL SECTIONS A, B, C, ETC. IF NO ITEMS ARE CHECKED "YES", PROCEED DIRECTLY TO SCHEDULE T.

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. <sup>(A)</sup> RAO - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

CORN

1. How many bushels of corn did you produce last year, including your share of corn produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

2. How many bushels of your corn crop did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

a. Of these, how many bushels were sold as shelled corn? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

IF SOLD SHELLED:

IF NONE SOLD SHELLED SKIP TO 3.

(1) How many bushels of shelled corn was sold on a graded basis? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of corn sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:

4. Where did you deliver the corn for the agreed price?

5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold corn last year?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
Buyer-shippers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Seed dealers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local merchants (other than seed dealers)	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Government loan?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____

(Specify)

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(B)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
 STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

COTTON

1. How many bales of cotton did you harvest last year including your share of cotton produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
2. How much did you sell as baled cotton? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
  - a. Then you sold the equivalent of \_\_\_\_\_ Bales in the seed
3. How many bales of your cotton was graded by:
  - a. Government or co-op. graders? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
  - b. Individual buyers? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
  - c. Others? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
  - d. Not graded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bales
4. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bales of cotton sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
5. Where did you deliver the cotton for the agreed price? (check which)
6. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold cotton last year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
Local gins? _____ Bales	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local warehouses? _____ Bales	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives? _____ Bales	( )	( )	_____	_____
Mill buyers? _____ Bales	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local buyers? _____ Bales	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ Bales (Specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

(C)

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992

APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

SOYBEANS

1. How many bushels of soybeans did you harvest last year, including your share of soybeans produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels of your soybean crop did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - a. Of these, how many bushels were sold graded and bagged \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of soybeans sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the soybeans for the agreed price? (check which)
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold soybeans last year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
Buyer-shippers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local oil mills? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Seed stores? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local truckers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ Bu. (Specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(D)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. R/0 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

COWPEAS

1. How many bushels of cowpeas did you harvest last year including your share of cowpeas produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels of your cowpea crop did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - a. Of these, how many bushels were sold graded and bagged? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of cowpeas sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the cowpeas for the agreed price? (check which)
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold cowpeas last year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Seed Stores? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ Bu. (Specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. (E) R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12 - 31 - 49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

PEANUTS

1. How many bags of peanuts did you harvest last year, including your share of peanuts produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bags
2. How many bags of your peanut crop did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bags
  - a. Of these how many bags were sold on a graded basis? \_\_\_\_\_ Bags
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bags of peanuts sold (item 2) how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the peanuts for the agreed price? (Check which)
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold peanuts last year?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Local shellers?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Buyer-shippers?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Seed stores?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local truckers?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers?	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ (Please specify)	_____ Bags	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(F)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
 STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N.C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

LESPEDEZA SEED

1. How many pounds of lespedeza seed did you harvest last year, including your share of seed produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds
2. How many pounds of this seed did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds
  - a. Of the seed sold how many bushels were cleaned seed? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ pounds of seed sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the seed for the agreed price?
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold your seed last year?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
Buyer-shippers?	_____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local seed dealers?	_____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives?	_____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers?	_____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ (Specify)	_____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____

6. Of your production of \_\_\_\_\_ pounds of lespedeza seed last year (item 1), how much was of the following varieties:
 

Korean?	_____ Pounds	Kobe?	_____ Pounds
Common or Tennessee 76?	_____ Pounds	Sericea?	_____ Pounds

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(G)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-1949

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

PECANS

1. How many trees of bearing age do you have? \_\_\_\_\_ Number

a. How many of these trees are from improved stock? \_\_\_\_\_ Number

2. How many pounds of pecans did you harvest last year? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many pounds of pecans did you sell last year? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds

a. Of these how many were sold:

(1) Wholesale:

(a) Bagged and graded? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds

(b) Ungraded? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds

(2) Retail:

(a) Loose? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds

(b) Bagged? \_\_\_\_\_ Pounds

4. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ pounds of pecans sold (item 3), how many did you sell to each of the following:

5. Where did you deliver the pecans for the agreed price?

6. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold pecans last year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
	(Check which)			
Processors? _____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Buyer-shippers? _____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Consignment shipments? _____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers? _____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Road-side stand? _____ Lbs.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ Lbs. (Specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

7. Of your sales of bagged pecans how many were sold under:

a. Your brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Lbs.

b. Another brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Lbs.

c. No brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Lbs.

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(I)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
 STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

LESPEDAZA HAY

1. How many tons of lespedeza hay did you harvest this year, including your share of lespedeza hay produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Tons
2. How many tons of lespedeza hay did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Tons
  - a. Of the lespedeza hay sold how much was baled hay? \_\_\_\_\_ Tons
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ tons of lespedeza hay sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the hay for the agreed price?
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold hay this year?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
		(Specify which)			
Feed mills?	_____ Tons	( )	( )	_____	_____
Feed dealers?	_____ Tons	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers?	_____ Tons	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers?	_____ Tons	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? (Specify)	_____ Tons	( )	( )	_____	_____

(J)

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992

APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

WHEAT

1. How many bushels of wheat did you produce this year, including your share of wheat produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels of your wheat crop did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - a. Of these, how many bushels were sold on a graded basis? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of wheat sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the wheat for the agreed price?
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold wheat this year?

		<u>At your</u> <u>farm</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>place</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or City</u>
Buyer-shippers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Flour mills?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Feed mills?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Seed dealers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local merchants (other than seed dealers?)	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Government loan?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? (Specify)	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(K)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

OATS

1. How many bushels of oats did you produce this year, including your share of oats produced by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels of your oats did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - a. Of these, how many bushels were sold on a graded basis? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of oats sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the oats for the agreed price?
5. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold oats this year?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Buyer-shippers?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Food mill?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Seed dealer?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local merchant (other than seed dealer)	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Trucker:	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local farmer?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Government loan?	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Other _____ (Specify)	_____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(L)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
 STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

IRISH POTATOES

1. How many bushels of Irish potatoes did you harvest this year, including your share of those harvested by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. How many of those sold were:
 

Field run?	_____ Bushels
Washed only?	_____ Bushels
Washed and graded only?	_____ Bushels
Washed and sacked only?	_____ Bushels
Washed, graded, and sacked?	_____ Bushels
4. If any of your potatoes were graded, who did the grading? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (buyer, Govt., etc. Please specify)
5. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of potatoes sold (item 2), how many did you sell to each of the following:
6. Where did you deliver the potatoes for the agreed price? (check which)
7. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold potatoes this year?

	<u>At your</u>	<u>Other</u>				
	<u>farm</u>	<u>place</u>	( )	( )	<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or City</u>
Buyer-shippers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local buyers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Terminal markets on consignments? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Government purchase? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Trucker? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Retail store? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperative? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Roadside stand? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____
Other _____? _____ Bushels (please specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(M)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

SWEET POTATOES

1. How many bushels of sweet potatoes did you harvest this year, including your share of those harvested by your tenants? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
2. How many bushels did you sell? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. How many of those sold were:  
Field run (unwashed)? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Washed only? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Washed and waxed only? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Washed and graded only? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Washed, waxed, and graded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
4. If any of your sweet potatoes were graded who did the grading? \_\_\_\_\_  
please specify

5. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of sweet potatoes sold (item 2) how many did you sell to each of the following:
6. Where did you deliver the sweet potatoes for the agreed price?  
(Check which)
7. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold sweet potatoes this year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or City
Grower-shippers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local buyers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Produce jobbers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local retail stores? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Roadside stands? _____ Bushels	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ Bushels (please specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. <sup>(N)</sup> R40 - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

PEACHES

1. How many peach trees of bearing age do you have? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2. How many bushels of peaches did you harvest this year? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. How many bushels of peaches did you sell this year? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
4. Of these how many were sold: Graded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Ungraded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
5. How many were sold by you: In bulk? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
In containers packed by you? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

IF SOLD IN CONTAINERS: IF NONE SOLD IN CONTAINERS SKIP TO QUESTION 7

a. What kind of containers were used? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Kind and size)

6. Of the packed peaches how many were sold:
  - a. Under your own brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - b. Under another brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - c. Under no brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

7. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of peaches sold (item 3), how many did you sell to each of the following:
8. Where did you deliver the peaches for the agreed price? (Check which)
9. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold peaches this year?

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Buyer-shipper? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Consignment shipment? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Processors? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Roadside stand? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Other? _____ Bu. (Please specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

(0)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992

APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

APPLES

1. How many apple trees of bearing age do you have? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2. How many bushels of apples did you harvest this year? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
3. How many bushels of apples did you sell (or will you sell)? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
4. Of these, how many were sold: Graded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
Ungraded? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
5. How many were sold by you: In bulk? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels  
In containers packed by you? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

IF SOLD IN CONTAINERS:

IF NONE SOLD IN CONTAINERS SKIP TO QUESTION 7

a. What kind of containers were used? \_\_\_\_\_  
(kind and size)

6. Of the packed apples, how many were sold:
  - a. Under your own brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - b. Under another brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels
  - c. Under no brand name? \_\_\_\_\_ Bushels

7. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ bushels of apples sold (item 3), how many did you sell to each of the following:

8. Where did you deliver the apples for the agreed price? (check which)

9. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold apples this year?

	At your farm	(other place)	Name	Town or city
Buyer-shippers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Consignment shipments? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Processors? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperative? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Road-side stand? _____ Bu.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Other? _____ Bu. (Please specify)	( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

(P)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

EGGS

1. How many laying hens do you have now? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2. How many dozens of eggs did you sell during the last 12 months (Oct.-Sept.)? \_\_\_\_\_ Dozen
3. Of these eggs how many were sold as graded eggs? \_\_\_\_\_ Dozen
4. How many were candled only? \_\_\_\_\_ Dozen
5. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ dozen eggs sold (item 2) how many dozen were sold to the following:
6. Where did you deliver the eggs for the agreed price? (Check which)
7. What is the name and address of the buyer of each type to whom you customarily sell?

		At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Egg brokers?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local buyers?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Feed dealers?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Egg grading stations?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Hatcheries?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local cafes, restaurants, or hotels?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Retail stores for cash?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Retail stores for trade?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Direct to consumers?	_____ doz.	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ doz. (Please specify)		( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

BUDGET BUREAU NO. RAO - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington 25, D. C.

Cooperating

CHICKENS:

1. How many chickens of all kinds did you raise during the last 12 months (Oct.-Sept.)? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2. How many chickens of all kinds did you sell during these 12 months? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
3. Of these how many did you sell as follows:

	Total	Alive	N.Y. Dressed	Eviscerated
Hens	_____	_____	_____	_____
Broilers or fryers	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capons	_____	_____	_____	_____
Roosters	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ hens you sold (item 3), how many did you sell to each of the following:
5. Where did you deliver the chickens for the agreed price? (Check which)
6. Give the name and address of each type of buyer to whom you customarily sell.

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Local dressing plants? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Produce dealers? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Live shippers? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Local retailers? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Hucksters? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Truckers? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Cooperatives? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Direct to consumers? _____ No. ( ) ( )			_____	_____
Others? _____ No. ( ) ( ) (Please specify)			_____	_____

(continued)

Chickens (continued) - 2

7. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ broilers and fryers sold (item 3), how many did you sell to each of the following:
8. Where did you deliver the chickens for the agreed price? (check which)
9. Give name and address of each type of buyer to whom you customarily sell.

	At your farm	Other place	Name	Town or city
Local dressing plants? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Local retailers? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Feed dealers? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Hucksters? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Produce dealers? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Live shippers? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Direct to consumers? _____	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ (Please specify)	No. ( )	( )	_____	_____

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
 NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE  
 Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
 OF AGRICULTURE  
 Raleigh, N.C.

(R)  
 BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1992  
 APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
 Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

HOGS

1. How many hogs 4 months old and over do you have on your farm now? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many pigs did you raise this spring? \_\_\_\_\_  
 last fall? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many hogs (and/or pigs) did you sell during the last 12 months (Oct.-Sept)? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Of these \_\_\_\_\_ hogs how many did you sell to each of the following:
5. Where did you deliver the hogs for the agreed price?
6. What is the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you customarily sell?

	Number	At your farm (Check which)	Other place	Name	Town or city
Hog-buying stations?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Auction markets?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Local butchers?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Sausage plants?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Packers?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Truckers?	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ (Please specify)	_____	( )	( )	_____	_____

7. What percentage of the hogs sold liveweight did you sell: By the head? \_\_\_\_\_%  
 By hundredweight? \_\_\_\_\_%  
 100%

8. Does your local market pay less for "soft hogs"?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Don't Know \_\_\_\_\_

a. If "Yes", how much less? \_\_\_\_\_ Cents per pound

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

(S)  
BUDGET BUREAU NO. RAO - 1992  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

TURKEYS

1. How many turkeys did you raise last year (Oct.-Sept.)? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
2. How many turkeys did you sell last year (Oct.-Sept.)? \_\_\_\_\_ Number
3. Of the \_\_\_\_\_ turkeys sold how many did you sell to each of the following:
4. Where did you deliver the turkeys for the agreed price?
5. Give the name and address of the \_\_\_\_\_ to whom you sold turkeys last year.

		At your <u>farm</u>	Other <u>place</u>	Name	Town or city
		(Check which)			
Local dressing plants?	_____ Number	( )	( )	_____	_____
Feed dealers?	_____ Number	( )	( )	_____	_____
Cooperatives?	_____ Number	( )	( )	_____	_____
Others? _____ (Please specify)	_____ Number	( )	( )	_____	_____

6. How many of the turkeys sold last year did you sell: By the head? \_\_\_\_\_  
By the pound? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How many did you sell: Alive? \_\_\_\_\_  
New York Dressed? \_\_\_\_\_  
Eviscerated? \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_  
SEGMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
SCHEDULE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BUDGET BUREAU NO. R40 - 1993  
APPROVAL EXPIRES 12-31-49

NORTH CAROLINA  
STATE COLLEGE  
Raleigh, N. C.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE  
Raleigh, N. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
BU. OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
Washington, D. C.

Cooperating

Now I would like to ask about the kind of stores (independent, chain, mail-order house, farmers' co-op) at which your household buys the supplies for the use of yourself and your family and for running your farm.

By independent we mean stores that are operated directly by or for the owner, and are not parts of a chain.

By chain we mean all companies that operate four or more branch stores, such as J. C. Penny Co., A & P, Woolworth Co., etc.

By mail-order house we mean companies that sell by means of orders through the mail such as Sears, Roebuck, and Co., and Montgomery, Ward, and Co. If you go to one of these stores to buy rather than ordering by mail it would be considered a chain store.

1. a. Groceries: About what percent of your expenditures for groceries during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_%

Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_%

Other? \_\_\_\_\_%

(Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_%  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. a. Clothing: About what percent of your expenditures for clothing during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_%

Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_%

Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_%

Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_%

Other? \_\_\_\_\_%

(Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_%  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or City</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. a. Household articles and supplies: About what percent of your expenditures for household articles and supplies during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. a. Furniture: About what percent of your expenditures for furniture during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Auctions \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. a. Building materials: About what percent of your expenditures for building materials during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. a. ~~Fencing~~ materials: About what percent of your expenditures for building materials during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. a. Farm machinery: About what percent of your expenditures for farm machinery during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Auctions \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. a. Feed: About what percent of your expenditures for feed during the last 12 months have been made at?

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. a. Field crop & hay seeds: About what percent of your expenditures for field crop and hay seeds during the last 12 months have been made at:

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

		<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
Independent stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Other farmers?	_____ %	_____	_____
Chain stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Mail-order houses?	_____ %	_____	_____
Co-ops?	_____ %	_____	_____
Agents?	_____ %	_____	_____
Other?	_____ %	_____	_____
Please specify	_____ %	_____	_____
TOTAL	100 %		

10. a. Household electrical equipment: About what percent of your expenditures for household electrical equipment during the last 12 months have been made at:

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

		<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
Independent sotres?	_____ %	_____	_____
Chain stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Mail-order houses?	_____ %	_____	_____
Co-ops?	_____ %	_____	_____
Other?	_____ %	_____	_____
Please specify	_____ %	_____	_____
TOTAL	100 %		

11. a. Fuel: About what percent of your expenditures for fuel during the last 12 months have been made at:

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

		<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
Independent stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Chain stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Co-ops?	_____ %	_____	_____
Other?	_____ %	_____	_____
(Please specify)	_____ %	_____	_____
TOTAL	100 %		

12. a. Petroleum products: About what percent of your expenditures for petroleum products during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Other? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. a. Other auto supplies: About what percent of your expenditures for other auto supplies during the last 12 months have been made at?

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

14. a. Hardware: About what percent of your expenditures for hardware during the last 12 months have been made at:

Independent stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Chain stores? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Mail-order houses? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Co-ops? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Other? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Please specify \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 TOTAL 100 %

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. a. Fertilizer and lime: About what percent of your expenditures for fertilizer and lime during the last 12 months have been made at?

b. What is the name and address of the store of each type at which you customarily trade?

		<u>Name</u>	<u>Town or city</u>
Independent stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Chain stores?	_____ %	_____	_____
Co-ops?	_____ %	_____	_____
Other?	_____ %	_____	_____
	Please specify _____ %		
	TOTAL 100 %		

16. a. Automobiles: Did you purchase an automobile during the last twelve months?

b. Did you buy from an

Yes ( ) No ( )

Individual ( )

If YES, was it a

Dealer ( )

Car Truck

Other \_\_\_\_\_ ( )

Please specify

Ford ( ) ( )

c. Was the automobile

Chevrolet ( ) ( )

New ( ) Used ( )

Plymouth ( ) ( )

d. What are the name and address of the seller?

Buick ( ) ( )

Other \_\_\_\_\_ ( ) ( )

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name Town or city

Please specify