TABLE 5.5.—*Food production for home consumption by applicants and participants, 1966*

	Applicants	Participants
Had a home vegetable garden	28	21
Did not have a home vegetable garden	8	16
Preserved food in some way	23	12
Did not preserve food in any way	13	25
Total annual value of preserved food	$1,240	$706
Mean value of preserved food	[1] 54	59
Total value of October consumption of preserved food	336	121
Mean value of October consumption of preserved food	15	13
Produced and consumed some milk, meat, or eggs in October	18	9
Did not produce and consume any milk, meat, or eggs in October	18	28
Total value of milk, meat, and eggs produced and consumed in October	$376	$238
Mean value of milk, meat, and eggs produced and consumed in October	21	26
Total gross value of food production for home consumption in October	712	359
Reported expenditures for feed	47	121
Total net value of food produced for home consumption in October	665	238
Mean value for entire group	18	6

[1] Mean values were calculated for those preserving or consuming; that is, the total value was not divided by the total number in the group, but only those reporting such activity, except for the mean for total food production for home consumption for the entire group.

Eighteen applicants and nine participants reported producing milk, meat, or eggs in October while 18 applicants and 28 participants reported not producing any. Chi square analysis revealed this to be a significant difference at the 95 per cent probability level. Thus significantly more applicants reported any kind of milk, meat, or egg production for home consumption in October. The total value of such production was $376 for applicants and $238 for participants, and the mean values for those producing any were $21, and $26, respectively. There was not a significant difference at the 95 per cent confidence level according to the "t" test. Once again, it seemed that the number of people engaged in production was the important aspect of milk, meat and egg production.

From the gross values of food production for home consumption in October, $712 for applicants, and $359 for participants, the reported expenditures for feed were subtracted, $47 and $121, respectively. The total net value of food produced for home consumption for October was $665 for the applicants and $238 for the participants. The mean values for the entire group were $18 for the applicants and $6 for the participants. This was a significant difference at the 95 per cent confidence level using the "t" test. It was concluded that there was indeed more food produced for home consumption by the applicants than by the participants. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

Expenditures for food

Expenditures for food were complexly interwoven throughout the foregoing analysis; and were classified all three possible ways: (1) developmentally significant; (2) developmentally related; and (3) probably not developmentally significant. Total expenditures for food, regardless of food stamp considerations, were analyzed by the major categorizations utilized in important consumption studies.[2] The hypothesis was that participant would spend more than applicants, absolutely, but not proportionately, for total food expenditures. Data for the month of October 1966 were utilized to test this hypothesis.

The mean expenditures for food by applicants and participants are summarized by major categories and important subcategories in Table 5.6. Participants generally reported higher mean expenditures; some interesting exceptions were that applicants spent more for "Fats and Oils" and "Flour and Meal." This would probably help explain why the participants had spent so much more than applicants for "Bakery Goods" and "Mixes" and probably indicated that participants had a preference for prepared bakery goods and mixes and prepared fewer bakery goods at home.

[2] G. G. Quackenbush and J. D. Shaffer, *Collecting Food Purchase Data by Consumer Panel,* Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 279, August 1960, p. 37.