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When a typical American family drives out to Little Pond for a Saturday of fishing, or when a father and son and their dog set out for an afternoon of hunting, they have lots of company. Probably more than the average citizen of any other great modern nation, the average American enjoys sport fishing and hunting.

Fishing and hunting have always been part of America. When colonists first came to this continent, the New World's fish and game meant the difference between life and death. Men fished and hunted then to feed their families. Today, long after they have ceased to be the basis of subsistence, fishing and hunting continue as an important part of our standard of living by providing recreation for millions of Americans.

There have been many evidences of the importance of fishing and hunting in modern America. Millions of fishing and hunting licenses are sold each year. Many thousands of people belong to fishing and hunting clubs. Sales of sport-fishing tackle and hunting arms and ammunition mount to millions of dollars annually.

But despite the many evidences that these sports are big in recreational importance and in economic importance, nobody has known exactly how lig. Rough estimates have been made that the Nation's sportsmen spend anywhere from a billion to $\$ 10$ billion a year for goods and services in connection with their fishing and hunting pursuits, but these have been little more than guesses.

Fishing and hunting licenses do not tell the whole story, because on the one hand many fishermen and hunters don't have to have licenses and on the other hand many persons have more than one kind. Only part of the army of fishermen and hunters belong to clubs. And the production of fishing and hunting equipment tells only part of the story about the economic importance of these sports.

In the last decade, the question of the economic importance of these forms of recreation has become of greater and greater concern to those interested in the conservation of fish and wildlife. Since World War II, changes in land use and water use have proceeded apace. Conservation agencies have sought to conserve fish and wildlife resources affected by these changes. Often the inclusion of conservation provisions in land-use and water-use projects has faced problems of justifying cost as compared with economic benefits. Consequently, the conservation agencies have needed more information on the economic aspects of sport fishing and hunting as a partial measure of the value of fish and wildlife conservation.

Excise taxes on sport-fishing tackle and on sporting arms and ammunition, which produce about 20 million dollars a year, have been allocated by Congress to special funds for fishing and hunting improvement. Through the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the conservation or fish and game departments of the States, these taxes on fishing and hunting equipment are used as Federal Aid to the States in cooperative programs for fish and wildlife restoration. In carrying out their management programs, fish and game agencies have felt the need for more exact figures to guide them.

In the last few years about a fourth of the State fish and game agencies have made economic surveys of fishing and hunting in their areas. Made at different times and by various methods, these surveys could not be combined to give the nationwide information needed.

The need for accurate countrywide information on sport fishing and hunting and their effect on the national economy reached a point in 1953 when the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the State fish and game agencies, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sport Fishing Institute, and other groups began giving serious consideration to conducting a comprehensive national study to obtain reliable answers. At its annual meeting in September 1954, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners (comprising the fish and game commissioners and directors of the 48 States and the Canadian Provinces) recommended that the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service carry out a nationwide survey financed from Federal Aid administrative funds.

To make the survey as accurate and as objective as possible, it was determined to have it done by independent experts in the field of national surveys. After approval by the Bureau of the Budget, outstanding firms specializing in large-scale sampling censuses were asked to submit proposals, and a survey contract was made with C'rossley, S-D Surveys, Inc., of New York.
Several months were spent in working out procedures to ensure an accurate and comprehensive count. The national survey was carried out during the months of January and February 1956, collecting data on sport fishing and hunting for the calendar year 1955. Ini every State, interviewers ascertained whether persons had fished or hunted in 1955 and recorded detailed information about their fishing and hunting activities.

## WHAT THE SURVEY MEASURED

The amount of money spent by fishermen and hunters is an indication of the value they place on their sports. Since it represents revenue to a variety of businesses serving the sportsmen, this expenditure is an indieation of the business value of fishing and lounting. It falls far short, however, of showing all the values of these sports. There are intangibles beyond the grasp of statistics. The enjorment, the satisfaction, the recreation of a fishing or hunting trip camnot be expressed in dollars. Only to the extent that the inoney a person spends for a particular form of recreation can suggest the value he places on that recreation, this survey has measured the value of fishing and hunting to the sportsman. And in showing the amount and nature of his expenditures, the survey indicates some of the value of these sports in the general economy.
The survey recorded specific items concerning fishing and hunting activities. It did not inquire into attitudes or other intangibles. Popularity of fishing and huriting was measured only as shown by actual participation. If someone woukd have liked to go fishing in 1955, but did not, he was not included in this survey.

Since continuation of fishing and hunting depends upon the conservation of the resources on which these recreations depend, the economie benefits from fishing and hunting activities are a partial indication of the value of fish and wildhife conservation. Many others besides these sportsmen also enjoy the country's fish and wildlife resources. They, like the sportsmen, spend time and money in connection with their recreation. But unless they fished or hunted in 1955, they were not included in this survey.

Thus, the survey was limited strictly to measuring the extent of sport-fishing and hunting activities in 1955 and the effect of those activities on the general ecomomy.

## HOW THE SURVEY WAS MADE

A personal-interview survey was selected as the best method for obtaining the detailed information desired. It consisted of interviews with hunters and fishermen in a eross section of households throughout the United States. Houses, rather than individuals, were chosen for the initial contact since answers were desired from persons not requiring hunting and fishing licenses as well as from license holders, who might have been contacted directly. The sample of households was selected by scientifie sampling methods so as to be representative of the U'nited States as a whole.
Selection of samples of households began with the 1950 census of population. On the basis of that census, a large number of sample areas were selected. Interviewers personally surveyed each area and determined the increase in the number of households from 1950 to 1955. Thus, the survey was self-adjusting for increases in households and population since 1950. By this self-adjusting fealure the survey showed a total of $48,389,000$ houseliolds in 1955, containing 118,366,000 prosons 12 years old and older.

Calls on a specified proportion of the houscholds in cach sample area established the presence of eligible hunters or fishemen. To be cligible for interview a person had to be 12 years of age or older and to have hunted or fished at least once during the calendar year 1955.

Each of the 48 States was included in the sample. Interviews were conducted by some 300 interviewers in more than 250 places including more than a thousand cluster groupings. ('alls on approximately 20,000 homes yielded 6,220 interviews with fishermen and 3,108 interviews with hunters. The findings of these interviews were then projected, by standard statistical procedures, to the whole population.

The survey covered-

- Sport-fishing and hunting activities.
- Persons 12 years af age and over.
- The calendar year 1955.

The survey indicated that in 1955-

- The total number of households in the United States was 48,389,000.
- The total number of persons 12 years old and older was $118,366,000$.

This report shows-

- The number of households in which one or more persons fished or hunted.
- The number of persons who fished or hunted.
- How much these persons spent on fishing and hunting.
- How far they traveled to fish or hunt.
- How many days of fishing and hunting they enjoyed.

The information on fishing and hunting activities is based on personal interviews and is subject to the limitations of respondents' memory.
All figures represent projections from the sample and are subiect to standard sampling limitations.
The results with respect to numbers of fishermen and hunters in the nation are considered accurate within 5 percent. For expenditures and resional figures, the potential statistical variation may be greater.

## 1IN EVERY 3

## households in the U.S. in 1955

had one or more fishermen or hunters


| 1 in 6 |
| :---: |
| BIG CITIES |
| 1 in 3 |
| SMALL CITIES |
| 1 in 3 |
| TOWNS |
| 1 in 2 |
| RURAL AREAS |

Of the $118,366,000$ persons 12 years of age and over in the United States in 1955, close to 8 million enjoyed both fishing and hunting.

When these "boths" are included in the total for each group-

18 percent went fishing.
10 percent went hunting.

20,813,000 persons fished.
$11,784,000$ persons hunted.

1 in every 5
persons age 12 and over
fished
or hunted in 1955

$1_{\text {in every }} 4$

12,938,000 MEN FISHED






## percent who fished BY AGE GROUPS-1955



## percent who hunted BY AGE GROUPS-1955



25 million people spend a lot of money on fishing and hunting.
They spend it for fishing tackle and hunting equipment, for camping gear and special clothing, for automobile expense and food and lodsing on their fishing and hunting trips, for dogs, for boats and motors, and for various kinds of fishing and hunting licenses.

## 3 billion dollars (\$2,850,979,000)

 for fishing and hunting in 1955

## - billion dollars

(\$1,914,292,000)
for
FISHING
in 1955


EQUIPMENT
\$793

This is the first time that good information has been available on the extent and importance of salt-water fishing in the United States. In most of the coastal States, licenses are not required for salt-water fishing, so we have not had even the license-sale figures to suggest how many people enjoy fishing along the Nation's coastline.

## salt-water fishing 1955

| FISHERMEN |  | SPENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EAST COAST \& GULF | 3,420,000 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 91 \text { each } \\ & \$ 311,862,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| WEST COAST | 1,137,000 | \$177,077,000 |
|  |  | \$156 each |
|  | 4,557,000 | \$488,939,000 |

The figures in the facing chart are car-miles, not passenger-miles. Automobile travel for different kinds of hunting and fishing included-


The charts on pages 24 and 25 show the distribution of the hunters and fishermen according to the distances they traveled by all kinds of transportation to pursue their sport.

## 10.4 billion miles by automobile




Many fishermen and hunters were not required to have licenses.
In most of the coastal States, salt-water fishing did not require a license in 1955.

In many States, persons under 16, or persons over 65, or women, or servicemen, or veterans, or persons fishing or hunting on their own property, did not need licenses.
The survey report on licenses purchased and the annual reports of license sales are discussed on page 45.
not licensed 1 in 3

FISHERMEN
7,076,000
licensed 13,737,000

## 1116

HUNTERS
1,833,000


# in 1955 <br> the typical 


hunter \& fisherman

## SPENT <br> $\$ 91.98$ <br> $\$ 79.49$

FISHED \& HUNTED
81/2 DAYS
$91 / 2$ DAYS
TOOK
$51 / 2$ TRIPS
8 TRIPS

DROVE 206 MILES
319 MILES

IN 1955

|  | U. S. TOTAL | MEAN | MEDIAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $14+\infty$ | 20,813,000 FISHERMEN: <br> Money expended . . \$1,914,292,000 | \$91.98 | \$29.75 |
| 5 | Man-days . . . . . 397,447,000 | 19.1 | 9.5 |
|  | Trips taken . . . . 341,333,000 | 16.4 | 8 |
|  | Miles by automobile . 17,910,434,000 | 860.5 | 319 |
|  | 11,784,000 HUNTERS: <br> Money expended . . \$936,687,000 | \$79.49 | \$27.30 |
|  | Man-days . . . . . 169,423,000 | 14.4 | 8.5 |
|  | Trips taken . . . . 154,370,000 | 13.1 | 5.5 |
|  | Miles by automobile . 6,072,296,000 | 515.3 | 206 |

## Correction and supplement sheet for- NATIONAL SURVEY OF

 FISHING AND HUNTING(Circular 44)

In the chart on page 28, the expenditure figures were transposed in printing. Further, those expendifure figures are average (mean) values, while the other figures in the chart are median values. Inasmuch as there is need, in considering the economic aspects of fishing and hunting, for both the means and the medians for all the items concerned, the table on the reverse of this sheet should be substituted for the chart on page 28.

Corrections should be noted on other pages of Circular 44 as follows: On pages 24 and 25 , the first mileage block in each chart should read "LESS THAN 1 MILE," and the fourth mileage block should read "251-500 MILES." On page 49, the table captions were transposed; the first table relates to number of fishermen and hunters, and the second table relates to expenditures.

[^0]

## NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

The figures shown in the tables are the projections of the results of interviews in sample areas in all of the 48 States, providing a cross section of the United States. The figures are given in projected terms of total population in 1955 (rather than only in percentages of the sample). Initial contacts were with individual households. In each selected houschold, each person who had fished or hunted in 1955 was interviewed at length. The primary purpose was to obtain information for the country as a whole, but since certain population groupings were used in carrying out the survey, it is possible to give figures for these groupings.

The geographical seetions are the standard divisions used by the Bureau of the Census for population statistics. They are indicated on the map below.


The population-density groupings are based on C'ensus Bureau classifieations as set out in the 1950 census. They are as follows:
a. Bia cities.-All central cities with populations of 500,000 or more within the city limits. In the original surver tabulation, these were designated as "large metropolitan centers."
b. Small cities, and suburis.--The suburbs of the rities in $a$, and all other rities and their suburbs in areas defined in the 1950 census as urbanized (thickly populated). In the original survey tabulation, these were designated as "suburbs and small metropolitan centers."
c. Towss.-All urban places (outside urbanized areas included under $a$ and $b$ ) with populations of 2,500 or more. In the original survey tabulation, these were designated as "small cities."
d. Rural areas. - All rural places with populations of less than 2,500 and all open country. In the original survey tabulation, these were designated as "rural territory."

It should be noted that the percentages in this households table (like those in following tables on number of fishermen and hunters) are pereentages of the total number in the United States or in the region or population-density grouping (rol. 1). For example, as shown in column 2 of the opposite table, 34.8 percent of all the households in the United States had at least one person who fished, or hunted, or fished and hunted during 1955. It should be kept in mind also that the "Total households with fishermen" (col. 5) and the "Total houscholds with hunters" (col. 7) both include the households in which one or more persons fished and hunted (col. 3); consequently the sum of columns 5 and 7 exceeds the total in column 2.

## NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH PERSONS 12 YEARS OLD AND OLDER WHO FISHED, OR HUNTED, OR FISHED AND HUNTED IN 1955

| Grouping | Column 1 <br> Total number of households in U. S. | Column 2 <br> Total houspholds with fishermen and/o. hunters |  | Column 3 <br> Households with fishermen and hunters |  | Column 4 <br> Households with fishermen only |  | C'olumn 5 <br> Total houscholds with fishermen (col. 3plus col. 4). |  | Column 6 <br> Households with hunters only |  | Column $\gamma$ <br> Total households with hunters (col. 3 plus col. (i). |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cont } \end{aligned}$ | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Weifihted United States Tutal Gensefs cemomaphe sections: | 48,389 | 16, 848 | 34.8 | 6, 712 | 13.9 | 7, 217 | 14.! | 13,929 | 28.8 | 2,919 | 6. 0 | 9,631 | 19. 9 |
|  | 3, 125 | 839 | 26.9 | 321 | 10. 3 | 387 | 12. 4 | 708 | 22.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Atlantic. | 10, 120 | 2, 540 | 25. 1 | $74!$ | 7.4 | 1,271 | 12. 6 | 2, 020 | 20. 0 | 520 | 5. 1 | 1, 269 | 12. 5 |
| East North Central . | 10, 650 | 3, 725 | 35. 0 | 1,511 | 14.2 | 1,538 | 14. 4 | 3, 049 | 28. 6 | (i76 | 6. 4 | 2, 187 | 20. 5 |
| West North Central. | 3, 790 | 1, 841 | +8. 6 | 876 | 23.1 | ${ }^{6} 630$ | 16. 6 |  |  | 3335 | 8. 9 | 1,211 | 32.0 |
| South Athantic East South Central | 5, 545 | 2, 223 | 40. 1 | 892 | 16.1 | 1,001 | 18.1 | 1, 893 | 34.1 | 330 | 5. 9 | 1, 222 | 22.0 |
| Wast South Central West South Central | 3, 043 | 1, 296 | 42. 6 | 643 | 21. 1 | 456 | 15.0 | 1, 099 | 36.1 | 197 | 6. 5 | 840 | 27.6 |
| West Sonth Central | +, 250 | 1, 644 | 38. 7 | ${ }^{676}$ | 15.9 | 709 | 16. 7 | 1, 385 | 32. ${ }^{0}$ | 259 | 6. 1 | 935 | 22.0 |
| Pacific . ${ }_{\text {M }}$. | 5,989 | 1,874 | 46. 3 31.3 | ${ }_{617}^{427}$ | 22.8 | 282 9.3 | 15. 15.8 | 1, ${ }^{709}$ | 37.9 26.0 | 157 314 | 8. 4 | 584 931 | 31.2 15.5 |
| Population-denstity groupings: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Big cilios . . . | 9, 003 | 1, 558 | 17.3 | 301 | 3. 3 | 1, 113 | 12. 1 | 1, 414 | 15. 7 | 1.44 | 1. 6 | 445 | 4. 9 |
| Small cities, and suburlos. | 14,354 | 4, 116 | 28. 7 | 1,252 | 8.7 | 2, 398 | 16.7 | 3,650 | 25.4 | $\pm 66$ | 3. 3 | 1,718 | 12. 0 |
| Towns. . | 8,995 | 3, 526 | 39. 2 | 1, 638 | 18. 1 | 1, 341 | 1+.9 | 2, 972 | 33. 0 | 554 | 6. 2 | 2, 185 | 24.3 |
| Rural areas | 16,037 | 7,648 | 47. 7 | 3, 528 | 22.0 | 2,365 | 14. 8 | 5,893 | 36.7 | 1, 755 | 10.9 | 5,283 | 32.9 |

## NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO FISHED AND HUNTED

The table opposite shows the number of persons who fished, or hunted, or fished and hunted, as projected from the cross-section sampling of the United States.

The Census geographic sections have been explained on page 30. The proportion of the population ( 12 years of age and over) that fished and hunted varied considerably among these geographic sections, as shown by the maps pictured here.

These regional percentages are from columns 5 and 7 of the table opposite. It should be kept in mind that the "Total who fished" (col. 5) and the "Total who hunted" (col. 7) both include the figures for persons who fished and hunted (col. 3) ; consequently the sum of columns 5 and 7 exceeds the total in column 2.

Under "Adults, by sex" are shown separate tabulations for men and for women, 18 years of age and over.

Separate tabulations were made for significant age divisions of the population. The age groups are as follows:

12-17 years. Teen-agers or older children.
18-24 years. The getting started age-young aclults, premarriage and early marriage, college students, and job starters.
$25-34$ years. Young married people, the begiming of accumulation, carly parenthood.
35-44 years. Parents of older chikern, establishment of economic status.
$45-64$ years. Parents of marrying and married children, stabilization of economic status.
65 years and over: Retirement age.

FISHING


HUNTING


## NUMBER OF PERSONS 12 YEARS OLD AND OLDER WHO FISHED, OR HUNTED, OR FISHED AND HUNTED IN 1955

[In thousands. Percentages are percentages of totals in column 1]

| Grouping | Column 1 <br> Total number of persons 12 and over in U.S. | Column 2 <br> Total persons who fished and/or hunted |  | Column 8 <br> Persons who fished and hunted |  | Columen 4 <br> Persons who fished only |  | Column 5 <br> Total persons who fished (col. 3 plus col. 4) |  | Column 6 <br> Persons who hunted only |  | Column 7 <br> Total persons who hunterd (col. 3 plus col. (i) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Num- } \\ & \text { ber } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { Ner }}{\substack{\text { Num- }}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | Percent | $\underset{\substack{\text { Num- } \\ \text { ber }}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cent } \end{aligned}$ |
| Weichted United States Total. | 118,366 | 24, 917 | 21. 1 | 7,680 | 6. 5 | 13, 1:33 | 11.1 | 20,813 | 17. 6 | t, 104 | 3.5 | 11,784 | 10.0 |
| isus geoghaphit sections: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Cingland. | 7, 919 | 1,224 | 15. 4 | 367 | 4. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 635 | 8. 0 | 1,002 | 12. 7 | 222 | 2. 8 | 589 | 7. 4 |
| Middle Atlantic. | 24, 869 | 3,539 | 14. 2 | 880 | 3.5 | 1, 931 | 7.8 | 2, 811 | 11.3 | 728 | 2. 3 | 1, 608 | 6. 5 |
| West North Central | 25, $9,3,3$ 9,201 | 5, 2 2,913 | 21.3 | 1, 638 | (10. 5 | 2, 1,379 | 11.5 1.5 | 4, ${ }^{\text {2, }} 3816$ | 17.8 | ${ }^{9} 96$ | 3.5 | 2,538 | 9.9 |
| South Atlantic | 1.4, 3:36 | 3, 223 | 22. 5 | 1, 0:31 | 7. 2 | 1, 774 | 12.4 | 2, 805 | 19. ${ }^{5}$ | 418 | 2. 9 | 1,449 | 10. 1 |
| Bast South Central | 7, !5! | 1,963 | 24.7 | (6) 1 | 8. 7 | 97.1 | 12. 2 | 1, 665 | 20.9 | 298 | 3. 8 | 989 | 12. |
| West South Central | 10, 250 | 2, 560 | 25.0 | 842 | 8. 2 | 1,395 | 13. 15 | 2, 237 | 21.8 | 32.3 | 3. 2 | 1,165 | 11.4 |
| Mountain | 4, 529 | 1,369 | 30. 2 | 539 | 11.9 | 573 | 12. 6 | 1,112 | 24. 6 | 257 | 5. 7 | 796 | 17. (i) |
| Pacifie | 13, 570 | 2,637 | 19. 4 | 731 | 5. 4 | 1,521 | 11. 2 | 2, 252 | 16. 6 | 385 | 2. 8 | 1, 116 | 8. 2 |
| Population-density mrouplnas: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Bjg cities }}$ | 21,010 | 2, 169 | 10. 3 | 325 | 1. 5 | 1,677 | 8. 0 | 2,002 | 9.5 | 167 | 8 | 492 | 2. 3 |
| Suall cities, and suburbs | 34, 26.3 | 6, 001 | 17.5 | 1, 427 | 4. 2 | 3, 986 | 11. ti | 5,413 | 15. 8 | 588 | 1. 7 | 2, 015 | 5.9 |
| Towns . . | 21, 729 | 5,337 | 24. 5 | 1,901 | 8. 7 | 2, 64.4 | 12. 2 | 4,550 | 20.9 | 787 | 3. 6 | 2, 688 | 12.4 |
| Rural areas | +1,36.1 | 11,410 | 27. 6 | 4, 027 | 9.7 | +,821 | 11.7 | 8,848 | 21.4 | 2, 56 j 2 | (i. 2 | 6,589 | 15. ! |
| Adults (18 AND (0YER) by sex: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men. | 50, 082 | 16, 293 | 32.5 | (3, 320 | 12. 6 | 6, 618 | 13. 2 | 12,938 | 25. 8 | 3,355 | 6. 7 | 9,675 | 19.3 |
| Wumen | 53, 705 | 4,836 | 9.0 | . 271 | . 5 | 4,418 | 8. 2 | 4,689 | 8. 7 | 147 | . 3 | 418 | . 8 |
| Asfa grobips: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12-17 years | 14, 579 | 3, 788 | 26. 0 | 1, 1889 | 7. 5 | 2, 0997 | 14. 4 | 3, 186 | 21.9 | 602 | 4. 1 | 1,691 | 11. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ |
| 18-2.4 years | 12, 130 | 2, 517 | 20.8 | 892 | 7.4 | 913 | 7. 5 | 1, 805 | 14.9 | 712 | 5. 9 | 1,604 | 13. 2 |
| 25-34 years | 21, 7 ! 0 | 5, 104 | 23. 4 | 1, 912 | 8. 8 | 2,382 | 10.9 | 4, 294 | 19.7 | 810 | 3. 7 | 2, 722 | 12.5 |
| 35-44 years | 23, 730 | 5, 978 | 25. 2 | 1,873 | 7.9 | 3, 304 | 13.9 | 5,177 | 21.8 | 801 | 3. 4 | 2, 674 | 11. 3 |
| 45-64 years | 33, 220 | 6, 272 | 18.9 | 1, 6167 | 5. 0 | 3, 592 | 10. 8 | 5, 259 | 15.8 | 1,013 | 3. 1 | 2, 680 | 8.1 |
| 65 years and over | 12,917 | 1,258 | 9. 7 | 247 | 1.9) | 845 | (6. 5 | 1, 092 | 8.5 | 166 | 1. 3 | 413 | 3. 2 |

## FRESH-WATER AND SALT-WATER FISHERMEN AND BIG-GAME, SMALL-GAME, AND WATERFOWL HUNTERS

The tables opposite show fishing and hunting in 1955 according to particular classifications.

The age groups have been explained on page 32.

## FISHERMEN

In the survey, each person who stated that he had fished in 1955 was asked questions separately about fresh-water fishing and about salt-water fishing. The following definitions of fresh-water and salt-water fishing were used:

Fresh-water fishing.-All fishing in inland streams, lakes, ponds, or reservoirs, and all fishing in coastal streams above the tide limits.
Salt-water fishing.-All fishing in the ocean, in coastal bays and estuaries, and in coastal streams below the tide limits.
Of the salt-water fishermen, the number who fished on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and the number who fished on the Pacific coast were as follows (note that the percentages here are the percentages of the salt-water fishermen):


Many fishermen fished both in fresh water and in salt water: Consequently, in the fishermen table, the sum of the number of fresh-water fishermen (col. 3) and the number of salt-water
fishermen (col. 4) exceeds the total number of fishermen (col. 2).
It should be noted that the percentages in columns 2, 3, and 4 of the fishermen table are percentages of the total number of persons 12 years of age and over as shown in column 1 .

## HUNTERS

Each person who stated that he had hunted in 1955 was asked questions separately about big-game hunting, small-game hunting, and waterfowl hunting. The following lists were used as indientions of the kind of hunting meant:

Big game.-Antelope, bear, deer, clk, javelina (peccary), moose, mountain goat, mountain sheep, wild boar, wild turkey.
Small game.-Fox, opossum, rabbit, raccoon, squirrel, dove, grouse, partridge, pheasant, pigeon, prairic chicken, quail, rail, snipe, woodcock.
Waterfowl.-Coot, duck, gallinule (marsh hen), goose.
Many hunters hunted more than one kind of game. Consequently, in the hunters table, the sum of the number of big-game hunters (col. 3), the number of small-game hunters (col. 4), and the number of waterfowl hunters (col. 5) exceeds the total humber of hunters (col. 2)

The percentages in columns $2,3,4$, and 5 of the hunters table are percentages of the total number of persons 12 years of age and over as shown in column 1.

## number of persons who fished in fresh water and in salt water

[Percentages are percentages of totals in cohman 1]


NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO HUNTED BIG GAME, SMALL GAME, AND WATERFOWL
[Percentages are percentages of totals in column 1]


## FISHING AND HUNTING TRIPS, MAN-DAYS, AND MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS

The tables opposite, and those below, show some of the details about fishing and hunting trips in 1955.

## NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO TOOK SPECIFIED NUMBERS OF FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS IN 1955

Each fisherman or hunter interviewed was asked to state the number of times he went fishing or hunting in 1955. Based on the replies given, the projected distribution of all fishermen and hunters in the Thited States, according to the number of separate trips, is shown in the table opposite.

## NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO TRAVELED SPECIFIED DISTANCES ON FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS IN 1955

Each person interviewed was asked the distance he traveled on his fishing or hunting trips. From the replies, the projected distribution of all fishermen and hunters in the United States, according to the total distance each traveled for fishing or hunting in 1955, is shown in the table opposite.

## PERSONS WHO TOOK FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS LASTING MORE THAN 1 DAY

Each person interviewed was asked how many days he fished or hunted on each trip (a fishing day or hunting day thus being defined as any day or part of a day on which he fished or hunted). From the replies, the projected numbers of fishermen and hunters in the United States and in various groupings, who took trips of more than one day, are shown in the table opposite. The percentages in this table are of the total number of persons 12 years of age and over as shown in column 1.

## MAN-DAYS OF FISHING AND HUNTING

As projected from replies to interviews, the total number of days spent in 1955 in the different types of fishing and hunting in the United states aggregate as follows:

| Fishing: | Man-duys |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fresh water | 338, 826, 000 |
| Salt water | 58, 621, 000 |
| Total | 397, 447, 000 |
| Hunting: |  |
| Big game. . | 30, 834, 000 |
| Small game. | 118, 630, 000 |
| Waterfowl | 19, 950, 000 |
| Total | 169, 423, 000 |
| Total fishing and | 566, 870, 000 |

The total number of man-days of fishing $(397,447,000)$ divided by the total number of fishermen $(20,813,000)$ gives an average of 19 days per fishorman, but this average is unduly influenced by a small number of fishermen who fished a very large number of days. The typical fisherman fished on $91 / 2$ days during the year (this is the median, that is, half the fishermen fished less than $9 \frac{1}{2}$ days and half fished more than $91 / 2$ (lays).
The typical hunter hunted on $8^{1 ⁄ 2}$ days in 1955.

## MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS

The persons interviewed were asked about membership in fishing or hunting clubs of any kind. The projected total for the United States is as follows:

| Number who betonged to fishing and | 371,000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Percent of all fishermen and hunters | 5. |
| ercent of all persons 12 years of age and | 1.2 |

NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO TOOK SPECIFIED NUMBERS OF FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS IN 1955

|  |  | Persons who <br> fisherl |  | Persons who <br> hunted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO TRAVELED SPECIFIED DISTANCES ON FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS IN 1955

|  | Persons who fished |  | Persons who hunted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Weighted United States Total. | 20,813,000 | 100.0 | 11,784,000 | 100.0 |
| Reported traveling No miles . | 2, 0662, 000 | 9.9 | 1, 656,000 | 14.1 |
| 100 miles or less | 4, 271,000 | 20. 5 | 2, 853, 000 | 24. 2 |
| 101-250 miles | 3, 093, 000 | 14.9 | 2, 105, 000 | 17.9 |
| 251-500 iniles | 2, 838, 000 | 13.6 | 1, 712,000 | 14.5 |
| 501-750 miles | 1, 768,000 | 8. 5 | 946, 000 | 8. 0 |
| 751-1,000 miles. | 1, 328, 000 | 6. 4 | 685, 000 | 5. 8 |
| 1,001-2,000 miles | 2, 966,000 | 14.3 | 1, 172,000 | 10.0 |
| 2,001-3,000 miles | 1, 165, 000 | 5. 6 | 369,000 | 3.1 |
| 3,001-5,000 miles | 818,000 | 3. 9 | 235,000 | 2. 0 |
| Over 5,000 miles . | 504, 000 | 2. 4 | 51,000 | 4 |

## PERSONS WHO TOOK FISHING OR HUNTING TRIPS LASTING MORE THAN I DAY

[Percentages are percentages of totals in column 1]

| Grouping | Column 1 <br> Total number of persous 12 and over in U. S. | Fished on trips lasting more than 1 day |  | IIunted on trips lasting more than 1 day |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Per- <br> cent | Number | Percent |
| Whighted United Stathes total. . | 118,366, 000 | 6, 584, 000 | 5. 6 | 2, 445, 000 | 2. 1 |
| Census geomraphic secTIONS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| New England | 7, 919,000 | 2!2, 000 | 3. 7 | 103, 000 | 1. 3 |
| Middle Atlantic . | 24, 869,000 | 687, 000 | 2. 8 | 367, 000 | 1. 5 |
| East North Central. | 25, 7:33, 000 | 1, 731, 000 | 6. 7 | 527, 000 | 2. 0 |
| West North Central. | 9, 201, 000 | 763, 000 | 8. 3 | 226, 000 | 2. 5 |
| South Atlantic | 14, 336,000 | 524,000 | 3. 7 | 125, 000 | . 9 |
| East South Central | 7,959, 000 | 295, 000 | 3. 7 | 58, 000 | 7 |
| West South Central. | 10, 250, 000 | 719, 000 | 7. 0 | 157, 000 | 1. 5 |
| Mountain | 4, 52!, 000 | 515, 000 | 1. 1 | 205, 000 | 5 |
| Pacific | 13, 570, 000 | 1, 058, 000 | 7. 8 | (677, 000 | 5. 0 |
| PoPULATION-DENSITY GROUPINIAS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Big cities | 21, 010, 000 | 645, 000 | 3. 1 | 206, 000 | 1. 0 |
| Small cities, and suburbs. | 34, 263, 000 | 12,071, 000 | 6. 0 | 655, 000 | 1.9 |
| Towns . | 21, 729, 000 | 1, 607, 000 | 7. 4 | 576, 000 | 2. 7 |
| Rural areas | 41, 364, 000 | 2, 261, 000 | 5. 5 | 1, 008, 000 | 2. 4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ADULTS ( } 18 \text { AND OVER) BY } \\ & \text { SEX: } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 50, 082, 000 | 4. 333), 000 | 8. 7 | 2, 110,000 | 4. 2 |
| Women . | $53,705,000$ | 1, 441, 000 | 2. 7 | 116,000 | . 2 |
| By age groups: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12-17 years | 14,579, 000 | 804, 000 | 5. 5 | 219, 000 | 1. 5 |
| 18-24 years | 12, 130, 000 | 500, 000 | 4. 1 | 305, 000 | 2. 5 |
| 25-34 y ears . | 21, 790, 000 | 11, 338, 000 | 6. 1 | 631, 000 | 2. 9 |
| 35-44 years. | 23, 730, 000 | 1, 899,000 | 8. 0 | 698, 000 | 2. 9 |
| 45-64 years | 33, 220, 000 | 1, 783, 000 | 5. 4 | 544, 000 | 1. 6 |
| 65 years and over. . | 12, 917,000 | 260, 000 | 2. 0 | 48, 000 | 4 |

## EXPENDITURES FOR FISHING AND HUNTING

In the tables on the next six pages are shown the projections for the United States of expenditures for fishing and hunting in 1955. Fishermen and hunters interviewed were asked detailed questions about their expenditures in connection with their sport. Some had spent almost nothing, others had spent a great deal (one sportsman spent $\$ 12,190$ ). Expenditures were limited to those of the individual respondent, and except for those under 16 no person reported for anyone else. The several tables show the national figures for the different kinds of fishing and hunting, according to various classes of expenditures.

## EQUIPMENT

Equipment expenditures included the cost and maintenance of equipment used specifically for fishing or hunting and of other equipment used primarily for fishing or hunting. Expenditures for purchase of equipment were included only if the equipment had been acquired by purchase or gift in the United States in the calendar year, primarily for fishing or hunting, and they were prorated among the types of fishing and hunting in which the sportsmen participated.

Fishing equipment included rods, poles, reels, lines, harness, nets, seines, minnow buckets, seales, ice-fishing gear, spear-fishing gear, and all other equipment used specifically for fishing.

Hunting equipment included guns and rifles, shells and cartridges, bows and arrows, gunsights, targets, decoys and calls, and all other equipment used specifically for hunting.

Other equipment (listed only if used primarity for fishing or hunting) included tents and sleeping gear, cooking and eating utensils, special fishing and hunting clothing, lanterns, binoculars, boats and boat accessories, motors, trailers, cabins, and other equipment if used primarily for fishing or hunting.

As projected from the cross-section sample, the total number of persons ( 12 years of age and over) who bought or received equipment used for fishing or hunting (equipment purchased in the United States in 1955) was as follows:

Number who bought or received equipment
Percent of all fishermen and hunters
Percent of all persons 12 years of age and over
Percent of all persons 12 years of age and over. . . . 15.3

## TRIP EXPENDITURES

Trip expenditures were included only if the trip was made primarily for fishing or hunting, and in the case of a party trip they included only the expenditures of the person interviewed.

For meals purchased during tishing and hunting trips, only that portion of the meal cost in excess of the average cost of home meals was included ( $\$ 6.50$ per person per week, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Household Economics Research Branch, September 1955).

Automobile transportation expense for fishing and hunting trips was computed at $3 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a mile to cover actual operating costs (gasoline, oil, maintenance, and tires) but not depreciation, insurance, or licenses (American Automobile Association Information Bulletin No. 93, March 1955). If four persons went together in an automobile, on a fishing trip, and one did not fish, the automobile expense applicable to each fisherman was the total divided by three, or $1 / 6$ cents a mite.

Other trip expenditures included transportation other than by automobile, refreshments, bait, guide fees, rentals, entrance fees, charter fees, and pack-trip fees.

If a trip was not made primarily for fishing or hunting, the transportation, lodging, food, and refreshment costs were excluded.

## LICENSE AND LEASE FEES

In order to be recorded as a license holder in the survey, a person had to have purchused a fishing or hunting license during the calendar year 1955. Booklets describing the various licenses in each state were used as memory aids. If the initial interview in a household reveuled that a certain member of the family had not fished during the year, that person was not interviewed as a

1955 fisherman and was not asked whether he hotd a 1955 fishing license (and similarly for hunting).
Duck-stamp purchases are shown separately in the tables of expenditures of all persons who fished and/or hunted, of all persons who hunted, and of waterfowl hunters.

The survey indicated that $1,986,000$ people hunted waterfowt during ealendar year 1955. These waterfowt hunters purchase $1,662,000$ duck stamps. Since 272,000 waterfow hunters were in the 12-17 age group, it is presumed that the majority of the 324,000 waterfowl hunters not purchasing duck stamps were below 16 years of age. Any of these not under 16 yoars of age would of course be hunting iltegally.
Although persons who hunted waterfowl during 1955 purchased only $1,662,000$ duck stamps, an additional 395,000 hunters purchased these stamps but, for some unexplained reason, did not go waterfowl hunting in ealendar year 1955. Thus, the surver indicates that a total of $2,057,000$ duck stamps were purchased by hunters during the year. Reports of duck-stamp sales indicate that approximately $2,236,000$ stamps were sold in 1955 (including sales to stamp collectors).

## OTHER EXPENDITURES

Under other expenses are ineluded club dues, subscriptions to magazines primarily for fishing and hunting, and all other expenditures not specifically classified but incurred as a part of fishing or hunting activities.
Expenditures for dogs kept primarily for hunting are shown separately in the table on all hunting expenditures. In the tables on big-game hunting, small-game hunting, and waterfowl hunting, and in the table on all persons who fished and/or hunted, the expenditures for dogs are inchuded in other expenditures.

## EXPENDITURES OF PERSONS WHO FISHED AND/OR HUNTED $\operatorname{IN} 1955$

The fotal number of fishermen andlor hunters (12 and over) in United States was 24,917,000.

| Expenditure item | Fishermen and/or hunters with expenclitures |  | Total spent | Average spent per fisherman and/or hunter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all fishermen and/or hiniters |  |  |
| Equipment: <br> Hunting and fishing equipment Other | $17,664,000$ $7,072,000$ | 70.9 28.4 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 594,584,000 \\ (587,708,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23.86 \\ 27.60 \end{array}$ |
| Trip expenditures: 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Food. . | 8, 795.000 | 35. 3 | 144,587, 000 | 5. 80 |
| Lodging . . . . . | 3, 675,000 | 14.7 | 88, 951, 000 | 3. 57 |
| Transportation (atuto expenses) | 122,328,000 | 89.6 | $305,799.000$ | 14. 68 |
| Other . | 118, 441,000 | 74. 0 | (699, 457, 000 | 28.08 |
| License and lease fees: |  |  |  |  |
| Licenses and stamps. | 17, 698,000 | 71. 0 | 77, 175,000 | 3. 10 |
| Teases and privileges. | 113,000 | . 5 | 3, 299, 000 | . 13 |
| Juck stamps . . | 2, 057,000 | 8. 3 | 4,114,000 | 16 |
| Other expenditures (includes hunting dogs). | 6, 803, 0000 | 27. 3 | 185, 305, 000 | 7. 44 |
| Weighted United States total. | $2,850,979,000$ |  |  | 114. 42 |

## EXPENDITURES OF PERSONS WHO FISHED IN 1955

The total number of fishermen (12 and over) in United States was 20,813,000.

| Expenchiture item | Fishermen with expenditures |  | Total spent | Averuge spent per fisher11th |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all fishermen |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Fishing equipment | 13, 193, 000 | 63.4 | \$243, 626. 000 | \$11.70 |
| Other . . . | 5, 155, 000 | 24.8 | 550, 037, 000 | 26. 48 |
| Trip expenditures: |  |  |  |  |
| Food . . . . | 6, 828, 000 | 32. 8 | 106, 101,000 | 5. 10 |
| Loodging . . . . . . | 2, 981, 000 | 14.3 | 73, 080, 000 | 3. 51 |
| Transportation (anto expenses) | 18, 751, 000 | 90.1 | 271, 827. 000 | 13. 66 |
| Other . . . . . . . . | 16,723, 000 | 80. 3 | 596, 700, 000 | 28. 67 |
| License and lease fees: |  |  | 37. 240,000 |  |
| Leases and privileges | 13, 54, 000 | 6). 3 | 37. 836,000 | 1. 0.4 |
| Other expenditures.. | 4,904, 000 | 23. 6 | $34,845,000$ | 1. 68 |
| Weighted United States Total. |  |  | , 91.4, 292, 000 | 91. 98 |

## EXPENDITURES OF FRESH-WATER FISHERMEN

The total number of fresh-water fishermen (12 and over) in United States was $18,420,000$.

| Expenditure item | Fishermen with expenditures |  | Total spent | A verage spent per fisherman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all freshwater fishermen |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Fishing equipment. | 11,788,000 | 64. 0 | \$189, 168,000 | \$10.27 |
| Other . | 4,604, 000 | 25. 0 | 359, 080, 000 | 19.49 |
| 7 'rip expenditures |  |  |  |  |
| Foorl . . . . | 5, 482,000 | 29. 8 | 80, 8633, 000 | 4. 39 |
| Lodging | 2, 494, 000 | 13.5 | $54.819,000$ | 2. 98 |
| Transportation (anto expenses) | $16,656,000$ | 90.4 | 228, 999, 000 | 12. 43 |
| Other . . . . . | 14.315,000) | 77. 7 | 450, 646, 000 | 24. 47 |
| License and lease fees: |  |  |  |  |
| Licenses | 13.501,000 | 73. 3 | 35, 791,000 | 1. 91 |
| Leases and privileges . | 52,000 | . 3 | -792, 000 | . 04 |
| Other expenditures. | 4, 485, 000 | 24. 3 | 25, 195, 000 | 1. 37 |
| Weiciuted I'NTHED States Total. |  |  | 1, 425, 35:3, 00)( | 77. 38 |

## EXPENDITURES OF SALT-WATER FISHERMEN

The total number of salt-water fishermen (12 and over) in United States was 4,557,000.

| Expenditure item | Fishermen with expenditures |  | Total spent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { spent } \\ & \text { per fish- } \\ & \text { ermant } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all saltwater fishermen |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Fishing equipment | 2. 602, 000 | 57.1 | \$54, 458, 000 | \$11.95 |
| Other . | 1, 079,000 | 23. 7 | 190, 957, 000 | 41. 90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Food <br> Lodging | $\begin{array}{r} 1,870,000 \\ 578,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41. } 0 \\ & 12.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,238,000 \\ & 18,261,000 \end{aligned}$ | 5. 54 4. 00 |
| Transportation (auto |  |  |  |  |
| penses). | 3, 841, 000 | 84.3 | 42, 828, 000 | 9. 40 |
| License and lease fees: Licenses Leases and privileges Other expenditures | 4, 074, 000 | 89.4 | 146, 054, 000 | 32. 05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\text { 782, } 000$ | 17. 2 | $1,449,000$ 44,000 | .32 .01 |
|  | 1, 183, 000 | 26.0 | 0, 650, 000 | 2. 12 |
| Weighted C-nited States Total |  |  | 488, 939, 000 | 107. 29 |

## EXPENDITURES OF ATLANTIC AND GULF

 COAST SALT.WATER FISHERMENThe total number of salt-water fishermen (12 and over) on Atlantic and Gulf coasts was 3,420,000.

| Expenditure item | Fishermen with expenditures |  | Total spent | Average spent per fisherman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all Atlantic and Gulf coast salt-water fishermen |  |  |
| Equipment: <br> Fishing equipment <br> Other | $\begin{array}{r} 1,904,000 \\ 786,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55.7 \\ & 2.3 .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 35,165,000$ $80,745,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.28 \\ 23.61 \end{array}$ |
| Trip expenditures: Food Lodging | $1,423,000$ 430,000 | 41.6 12.6 | $21,592,000$ $15,693,000$ | 6. 31 4.59 |
| Transportation (auto expenses) <br> (Other | $2,723,000$ $2,184,000$ | 79.6 87.3 | 34, 3:35, 000 <br> $118,102,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.04 \\ & 34.53 \end{aligned}$ |
| License and lease fees: <br> licenses <br> Leases and privileges | 92,000 2,000 804 | 2.7 .1 2.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 102,000 \\ 44,000 \end{array}$ | 03 .01 +78 |
| Other expenditures . | 804, 000 | 23. 5 | 6, 084, 000 | 1. 78 |
| Weichted United States Total. |  |  | 311, 862, 000 | 91. 18 |

## EXPENDITURES OF PACIFIC COAST SALT.WATER FISHERMEN

The total number of Pacific coast salt-water fishermen (12 and over) was 1,137,000.

| Expenditure item | Fishermen with expenditures |  | Total spent | Average spent jer fisherman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all $\mathrm{Pa}-$ cific coast salt-water fishermen |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Fishing equipment. | 698, 000 | 61.4 | \$19, 293, 000 | \$16. 97 |
| Other . . . | 293, 000 | 25. 8 | 110, 212, 000 | 96. 93 |
| Trip expenditures: |  |  |  |  |
| Food . . . . . | 447,000 | 39. 3 | 3, 646,000 | 3. 21 |
| Lodging . . . . . . | 148, 000 | 13. 0 | 2, 568, 000 | 2. 26 |
| Transportation (auto expenses). | 1, 118,000 | 98. 3 | 8, 493, 000 | 7. 47 |
| Other . . . . . . . . | 1, 090, 000 | 95. 9 | 27, 952, 000 | 24. 58 |
| License and lease fees: Licenses <br> Leases and privileges. | 690, 000 | 60. 7 | 1, 347, 000 | 1. 18 |
| Other expenditures | 379, 000 | 33. 3 | 3, 566, 000 | 3. 14 |
| Weighted United States Total |  |  | 177, 077, 000 | 155. 74 |

## EXPENDITURES OF PERSONS WHO HUNTED IN 1955

The total number of hunters (12 and over) in United States wos $11,784,000$.

| Expenditure item | Hunters witl expenditures |  | Total spent | Average spent per hunter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all hinters |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Hunting equipment | 9, 555, 000 | 81.1 | \$350, 958,000 | \$29. 78 |
| ()ther | 3, 438,000 | 29. 2 | 137, 371,000 | 11. 68 |
| Trip espenditures: <br> Foud | 3, 187, 000 | 27. 0 | 38, 48(3, 000 | 3. 27 |
| Lodging | 862,000 | 7.3 | 15, 871, 000 | 1. 35 |
| Transportation (auto expenses) | 10, 128, 000 | 85.9 | 93, 972,000 | 7. 97 |
| Other | 4, 927,000 | 41.8 | 102, 757, 000 | 8. 72 |
| License and lease fres: |  |  |  |  |
| Lieenses and stamps. . | 9, 951,000 | 84. 4 | 39, 935, 000 | 3. 39 |
| Leases and privileges . | , 78,000 | .7. 7 | 2, 4(33, 000 | . 21 |
| Duck stamps. . | 2, 057,000 | 17.5 | 4, 111, 000 | . 35 |
| What they spent for dogs | 2, 113,000 | 17.9 | 124, 388, 000 | 10. 56 |
| Other expenditures . . | 4,530,000 | 38.4 | 26, 072, 000 | 2. 21 |
| Weinhted Uvited <br> States Total. |  |  | 936. 687, 000 | 79.49 |

## EXPENDITURES OF BIG-GAME HUNTERS

The total number of big-game hunters (12 and over) in United States was 4,414,000.

| Expenditure item | Hunters with expenditures |  | Total spent | $\begin{gathered} \text { Aver- } \\ \text { age } \\ \text { spent } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { hunter } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent <br> of all <br> big-game hunters |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Hunting equipment | 3, 147,000 | 71. 3 | \$125, 304, 000 | \$28. 39 |
| Other | 1, 878, 000 | 42. 5 | 64, 046, 000 |  |
| Trip expenditures: |  |  |  |  |
| Lodging | 1, 637, 000 | 14.4 | 10, 413, 000 | 2. 36 |
| Transportation (auto ex- penses) | 4, 187, 000 | 94.9 | 31, 739, 000 | 7. 19 |
| Other . . | 2, 209, 000 | 50.0 | 42, 342, 000 | 9. 59 |
| License and lease fees: |  |  |  |  |
| Licenses and stamps. <br> Leases and privileges | $\begin{array}{r} 4,223,000 \\ 47,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.7 \\ 1.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19,602,000 \\ 1,939,000 \end{array}$ | 4. 44 |
| Other expenditures (including dogs) | 1,933, 000 | 43.8 | 11,505, 000 | 2. 61 |
| Weighted United States Total. |  |  | 323, 009,000 | 73. 38 |

EXPENDITURES OF SMALL-GAME HUNTERS
The total number of small-game hunters (12 and over) in United States was 9,822,000.

| Expenditure item | Hunters with expenditures |  | Total spent | Average spent per hunter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of all sinallgame hunters |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  |  |  |
| Hunting equipment | 8, 031,000 | 81. 8 | \$186, 274, 000 | \$18. 97 |
| Other | 2, 341,000 | 23. 8 | 46, 113, 000 | 4. 69 |
| Trip expenditures: Food | 1, 605, 000 | 16. 3 | 16, 6:32, 000 | 1. 69 |
| Lodging | 162,000 | 1. 6 | 3, 910, 000 | . 40 |
| Transportation (anto expenses). | 8, 014,000 | 81. 6 | 50, 182, 000 | 5. 11 |
| Other License and lease fees: | 3, 218, 000 | 32. 8 | 45, 741,000 | 4. 66 |
| Licenses and stamps. Leases and privileges | $\begin{array}{r} 8,084,000 \\ 20,000 \end{array}$ | 82. .3 .2 | $\begin{array}{r} 18, \\ \begin{array}{r} 195, \\ 290,000 \\ 2 \end{array} \end{array}$ | 1.85 .03 |
| Other expenditures (including clogs) | 3, 867, 000 | 39. 4 | 126,687,000 | 12. 90 |
| Weighted United States Total | . . . . | . . . | 494, 033, 000 | 50. 30 |

## EXPENDITURES OF WATERFOWL HUNTERS

The total number of waterfowl hunters (12 and over) in United States was 1,986,000.

| Expenditure item | Hunters with expendlitures |  | Total spent | Average <br> spent per <br> hunter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Numiner | Percent of all waterfowl hunters |  |  |
| Equipment: |  |  | - 380 |  |
| Hunting equipment | 1, 626,000 | 81.9 | \$39, 380, 000 | \$19.83 |
| Other | 607, 000 | 30.6 | 27, 512,000 | 13. 85 |
| Trip expenditures: |  |  |  |  |
| Food . | 495,000 | 24. 9 | $4,835,000$ | 2. 43 |
| Lorlging . . . . . | 112,000 | 5. 6 | 1, 548,000 | . 78 |
| Transportation (auto expenses). | 1, 813,000 | 91.3 | 12, 051,000 | 6. 07 |
| Other . . . . . . . | 899,000 | 45.3 | 14,674, 000 | 7. 39 |
| License and lease fees: |  |  |  |  |
| licerises and stamps. | 1,864, 000 | 93. 9 | 2,928,000 | 1. 47 |
| Leases and privileges . | 12,000 | $\cdot 6$ | 225,000 | 11 |
| Duck stamps . | 1, 662,000 | 83. 7 | 3, 324, 000 | 1. 67 |
| Other expenditures (including dogs). | 964, 000 | 48. 5 | 12,268,000 | 6. 18 |
| Wefchted United States Total | - . . . | . . | 118, 745, 000 | 59. 79 |

HOLDERS OF STATE FISHING AND HUNTING LICENSES

| Activity | Column 1 <br> Total number in United States | Column 2 <br> With licenses |  | C'olumn 3 <br> Without licenses |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | l'ercent of column 1 | Number | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per- } \\ \text { cent } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { columis } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| Fishermen |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fished only | 13, 133, 000 | 7, 401,000 | 56. 8 | 5, 672,000 | 43. 2 |
| Fished and lunted (fishing licenses) | 7,680,000 | 6, 276, 000 | 81.7 | 1, 404, 000 | 18. 3 |
| Total who fished | 20,813,000 | 13, 737, 000 | 66.0 | 7, 076, 000 | 34.0 |
| Fished in fresh water Fished in salt water | $18,420,000$ $4,557,000$ | $13,501,000$ 782,000 | 73.3 17.2 | $4,919,000$ $3,775,000$ | 26. 7 82.8 |
| Hunters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hunted only <br> Hunted and fished (hunting licenses) | $4,104,000$ | 3, 274,000 | 79. 8 | 830,000 | 20. 2 |
|  | 7,680, 000 | 6,677,000 | 86.9 | 1,003, 000 | 13. 1 |
| Total who hunterl. | 11, 784, 000 | 9), 951,000 | 84. 4 | 1,833, 000 | 15.6 |
| Hunted big game. Hunted small game Hunted waterfowl | 4, 414, 000 | 4, 223,000 | 95.7 | 191,000 | 4. 3 |
|  | 9, 822, 000 | 8, 084, 000 | 82.3 | 1, 738, 000 | 17. 7 |
|  | 1,986, 000 | 1,864, 000 | 93.9 | 122, 000 | 6.1 |

## FISHING AND HUNTING LICENSES

There are a number of conditions under which fishermen and hunters are not required to purchase licenses in many of the States. Persons under 16 could fish in more than half of the States and hum in a fourth of them withoui a license in 1955. In many States persons over 65 and disabted veterans could hunt and fish without licenses. In some States, women and active servicemen did not need licenses. In many States persons could hunt or fish on their own property without a license. Salt-water fishing did not require a lieconse in most coastal shates during 1955.

The surver indiented that of the $20,81: 3,000$ persons who fished during the calendar year 1955, 13,737,000 purchased fishing licenśes at a cost of $\$ 37,240,000$, and of the $11,784,000$ persons who hunted, 9,951,000 purchased hunting licenses at a cost of $\$ 39,935,000$.

For the fiscal year ending June 30 , 1955, the States reported sutes of $19,625,387$ fishing licenses yielding revenue of $\$ 39,501,838$,
and $16,241,931$ hunting licenses yiclding $\$ 42,790,687$.
In the past there has been a tendeney to treat sitate license figures as though each sale represented an individual fisherman of hunter, even though it was known that many people purchased more than one license. Atthough the sates figures above are for the year ending June 30, 1955, sates were probably of about the same magnitude for the calendar year 1955. A comparison of the license statisties from the survey with those from the State sales reports would indicate that several million dollars worth of licenses were sold to fishermen and hunters who did not use them during 1955. It would also indicate that a great many fishemen and hunters purchased more than one ticense. Of course many of the additionat licenses would be of the nomresident type, or special permits, stamps, or tags required for cerimin game species in some States.

## THE TECHNIQUE OF THE SURVEY

## THE SAMPLING PLAN

To interview every hunter and fisherman in the United states would be an extremely difficult and costly undertaking. Fortunately, with modern sampling methods, this is not necessary. Highly accurate results can be obtained for the United States as a whole from a comparatively small sample. In such sampling, it is the distribution of the sample rather than its size that makes it truly representative of the total population.

Since information was desired from nonlicensed as well as licensed hunters and fishermen, a sample drawn from State license records would not suffice. To obtain the needed information, a representative sample of households throughout the United States was needed. The method used in selecting this sample for the fishing and hunting survey is known as "area probability sampling." It is the method used by the Bureau of the Census and by most national survey organizations and is considered the best sampling procedure yet developed.

Under the probability sampling methodused in this survey, every household in the United States had a known chance of being included in the sample. The households included were selected by statistical formulas rather than by personal choice.
This selection began with the population records of the 1950 census. The 1950 population was divided into segments, and within each segment a large number of small areas ("cells") were assigned, each with specified boundaries but with no specified number of homes. The survey thus became self-adjusting for increases in population since 1950. Where new homes lad been built since 1950, increasing an area's population, the sample took note of this increase. With this automatic adjustment, the sample for the whole country indicated a total of $48,389,000$ houscholds in 1955, containing a total of $118,366,000$ persons 12 years old and older.

On the average, 1 out of every 2,135 households was included in the sample. This provided a sample of about 20,000 households in 1,000 neighborhoods in 48 States. In each of these households all persons 12 years old or older who had fished or hunted in 1955 were eligible for interview.

Although 1 in 2,135 represented the average chance that a household would fall in the sample, the chances actually varied from as high as 1 in 834 for some groups of homes to as low as 1 in 5,579 for others. The reason for sampling different groups of homes at different rates was increased efficiency. When all homes are very much alike, a sample of a few will give a reliable picture of the whole. Where homes differ widely, a larger sample is needed to be sure that the whole range is represented adequately. Where fishing and hunting were very popular activities, homes tended to be fairly uniform in that regard. For purposes of the survey, this meant that the lowest sampling rate was needed where fishing and hunting were most common and the lighest rate was needed where they were least common.

Four steps led the interviewer to the door of the sample household:

1. The United States was divided into 16 parts.
2. A statistical formula picked some communities from each part.
3. A statistical formula picked some neighborhoods from each community.
4. A statistical formula picked some houses from each neighborhood.
"Statistical formula" is a short name for the scientific exercise of impersonal chance. Thie operation of these formulas, coupled with patterns of human behavior which repeat themselves over and over again, makes it possible to find out what happens in millions of homes by examining only a few thousand.

The United States was divided into 16 parts by 4 separations, each in 2 directions. The first separation was made by the density of the population:

1. Rural America
2. Small-town America
3. Big-town and suburban America
4. Large-city America

Inherent inclination to hunt and fish provided the second fourway cut:
a. Heavy hunting-fishing America
b. Better-than-average hunting-fishing America
c. Average hunting-fishing America
d. Below-average hunting-fishing America

The United States was sliced into 16 parts so that a separate subsample could be taken from each part and the results added together. This served to spread out the sample, thereby providing better dispersion and representativeness. It also made possible the differing sampling rates which enhanced the sample's efficiency.
This division was decided upon because it provided the greatest efficiency under two premises:

1. The more urbanized an area, the less its inlabitants indulge in hunting and fishing.
$\cdot 2$. All other things being equal, the inhabitants of some States have a stronger inclination to hunt and fish than those of other States (because of opportunity, customs, and other influences).
To test these premises and measure their importance, a correlation analysis was made of the number of resident hunting and fishing licenses issued by each state against that State's urbanization. This is a statistical procedure that measures and deseribes mathematically the relation between two sets of facts. The relation proved to be quite strong in this case ( 36 percent). The strength of the relation showed that it would be most efficient to sample the large cities, big towns, small towns, and rural areas at different rates.

The statistical formulas did all the work in first picking communities, then neighborhoods, and then houses. A "community" was either a center of population concentration, from the largest city down to the smallest village, or what was left over in a township or county when all of these centers were removed.
Communities and neighborhoods for the survey were drawn from Census Bureau lists by means of statistical formulas. The number of houses to be included in each neighborhood had been previously determined. It varied among the 16 parts of the United States, but it was the same in all communities sampled in any one of the parts. The number of houses was based in large part on the number of hunters and fishermen expected to be present in each particular part.

While the number in each neighborhood was thus predetermined, the selection of the actual sample houses was again a matter of chance selection by statistical formula. The interviewer listed all homes in the neighborhood in a certain order on a special listing form but sampled only those whose listings fell in previously marked lines on the form.

## THE INTERVIEWING

The survey was conducted on a house-to-house basis by trained interviewers of Crossley, S-D Surveys, Inc. Before the actual survey, the elaborate questionnaires, one for fishing and one for hunting, were pretested in a number of areas scattered throughout the United States. Field interviewing for the survey began on January 7, 1956, and continued for approximately 2 months.

A program of advance publicity was carried out before the start of field interviewing. This included official releases to newspapers, magazines, and radio and television stations by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and a number of radio appearances by members of the (rossley firm, all inviting public cooperation.

Field supervisors of the Crossley firm attended training sessions on the survey in the New York office and in turn held similar training sessions for interviewers in their areas. Each interviewer
reecived a complete manual of instructions on the study and was required to pass a written test on the methods and to conduct pratetiee interviews before the start of the surver.
'To assure fullest cooperation and maximum accurac'y, each interview was opened with a statement of the survey purpose and a guarantee to keep the identity of the respondent confidential. It was made clear that law enforecment was not a purpose of the study. Each interviewer carried a number of credentials, including in identification badges, a letter of introduction from the Fish and Wildife Service, and Better Business Bureau identification.

The interviewers visited arch household in the national sample up to four times to establish contact with a responsible adult member and to complete interviews. During the initial contact, the interviewer obtained the composition of the family and the names of those members 12 years of age or over who had hunted or fished in 1955. Each hunter or fisherman in the family was then interviewed. One questionnaire was used to record an interview about fishing and another questionnare to record an interview about hunting.

Since the sportsmen who were interviewed were asked to reall events that had happened during the preeeding vear, memory aids were used. 'These consisted of calendars, lists of fish and game species, lists of equipment items, booktets of lieense requirements, and simplified phrascologry of questions.

As each group of houscholds was completed, the results were sent in to the home offiee where they were checked to be sure that the correct sampling procedure had been followed. Each questionmaire was examined for correct recording in the proper places and for completemess of answers to all questions. In cases of omission and semming inconsistencies the fiold supervisor was notified and the respondent was contacted to supply the missing information or to verify what had bern recorded.

The same high degree of quality eontrol was maintained during the period when information on the questionnaire was being carded and punched on machinc-tabulating cards. Similar care was taken during machine tabutation, and unusual situations were checked immediately for validation.

## RELIABILITY OF THE RESULTS

The statistical reliability of the major findings of the survey is estimated as follows:
EXPENDITURES OF FISHERMIEN AND HUNTERS

| Projection for number of |
| :--- |

NUMBER OF FISHERMEN AND HUNTERS

| Projection for expenditures of- | Estimated total expenditure | Standard error of the total |  | Limits between which the figure from it complete enumoration would fall, with a 19) out of 20 probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Actual | Percent |  |
| Fishermen and/or hu | \$2, 850, 979, 000 | \$127, 154, 000 | 4. 46 | \$2,596,671,000-\$:3,105,287,000. |
| Fishermen | 1, 914, 292,000 | 107, 392, 000 | 5. 61 | \$1,699,508,000-\$2,123,076,000. |
| Hunters | 936, 687,000 | 44, 77.4,000 | 4. 78 | \$847, 135, $0000-\$ 1,026,235,000$. |
| Salt-water fisherme | 488, 9339, 000 | (54, 540, 00) | 13.20 | \$350, 859,000-\$(3) 8.019,000. |
| Fresh-water fisherme | 1, 425, 353, 000 | 58, 582, 0t)0 | 4. 11 | \$1,308, 189, $000-\$ 1.542,517.0000$. |
| Big-game hunters | 323, 909, 00) 1 | 23, 775, 000 | 7. 34 | \$27(6,359, $0000-\$ 371,459,000$. |
| Small-game hunters | 494, 033, 000 | 24,208,000 | 4.90) | \$445, $517,000-\$ 542,449,000)$ |
| Waterfowl hunters. | $118,745,000$ | 10, 937,000 | 9. 21 | \$96,871,000-\$140,619,000. |
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