SIZE AND GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF

CORPORATIONS

1. THE SIZE OF ENTERPRISE AND ITS MEASUREMENT

IT IS frequently contended that larger corporations earn profits at higher rates than smaller ones. Indeed, this alleged greater efficiency of large-scale enterprise is held, by some persons, to constitute the *raison d'être* of the trend towards concentration which so markedly characterized post-War industrial development through 1929.[a] Others, while agreeing in their impressions as to the greater profitableness of

[a] See, for descriptions of this trend, Gardiner C. Means, *American Economic Review,* March 1931, The Large Corporation in American Economic Life; Charles S. Tippetts and Shaw Livermore, *Business Organization and Control* (1932), especially Ch. XVI, The Recent Modern Merger Movement; and Harry W. Laidler, *Concentration of Control in American Industry* (1931). Statistical measures of the relation between size and the rate of return on sales volume in various retail trades have been given in the several bulletins of both the Harvard and Northwestern University Bureaus of Business Research; and data on size of capital and the return upon investment in certain manufacturing industries, of limited scope, in papers by Ralph C. Epstein: Industrial Profits in 1917, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (February 1925); Profits and the Size of Firm in the Automobile Industry, *American Economic Review* (December 1931). More recently, in an admirable paper in the May 1932 *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* A Comparison of the Rates of Large-Scale and Small-Scale Industries, H. B. Summers gives data for manufacturing industries that lead him to the conclusion reached in this chapter. Summers' data are compared below with our own.

On geographical location, see W. L. Crum, *Corporate Earning Power* (1929).

the larger firms, have asserted that not superior productive effectiveness but monopolistic advantages—resulting in the ability to charge 'good prices'—underlie the higher relative earnings of the larger establishments.

Nevertheless, many observers have urged that although in many industries, plants of *certain* sizes are undoubtedly more efficient than smaller ones, this affords no evidence that there do not exist limits beyond which further growth becomes relatively less profitable. In any particular industry such an optimum might be either tangible or intangible; it might pertain to the size of the actual plant or to a financial or corporate unit which operates or controls several establishments.

The data which we shall analyze in this chapter afford no definite answers to these questions, either in terms of what this optimum may be in any particular branch of industry or as to the causes of varying profitableness in enterprises of different size. They do, however, offer both for Manufacturing as a whole, and for three of its major groups—Foods, Chemicals and Metals—fairly comprehensive facts as to the size of the corporate unit and the rate of earnings. It is to be noted that the data pertain simply to *corporate* units, not to *physical production* units. While a large number of the corporations included perhaps do operate only single plants, many others own two or several establishments. Our comparisons, therefore, are of financial and not necessarily physical or engineering magnitudes.

The measure of size employed, in all cases, is the fundamental one of the amount of total capital invested. This, it will be noted,[2] includes the capital contributed by bondholders as well as by shareholders, and is a better index of size, for most comparative purposes of this sort, than would

[2] See Ch. 2; also Glossary.

c

be capitalization alone. Although from the accountant's point of view, interest upon borrowed capital is regarded as a cost, while that upon owned capital is not, both returns are income upon a corporation's capital in an economic sense; and differences of capital structure between enterprises, even though less marked on the whole in Manufacturing than in other industrial divisions (notably public utilities), ought not to be allowed to influence size comparisons.[3] For this reason, total capital and not capitalization is employed as the basis of all our size classifications; but for corporations of any given size of total capital, the net return upon either total capital or simply capitalization can, of course, be shown.

It might be possible to employ as a still more inclusive measure of size, total assets instead of total capital. Such data, however, are not here available. Were they at hand, they would provide a somewhat better measure of size in some ways, and a poorer one in others, than do total capital figures. From the point of view of managerial accounting, total assets afford a somewhat better basis for comparison —they include working capital borrowed for short periods from the banks, etc. But from the point of view of the permanent investment of capital in the business by its owners

[3] If only capitalization were considered as the measurement of size (and the ratio of net income *after* interest payments on long-term debt were then related to it) most misleading results might ensue. Of two corporations, one might have its total capital all in the form of common stock; another, with exactly the same investment, might have one-third of its capital represented by a bonded debt bearing 5 per cent interest. Both might earn, say 10 per cent on total capital, but the corporation with the bond issue would show a net return of 12.5 per cent upon its capitalization exclusive of bonded debt. It may be desirable to show the return upon capitalization, after charges, for corporations of different sizes, as well as that upon total capital before fixed charges; but, both to avoid difficulties arising from variations in capital structure and also because the capital contributed by bondholders is as much a part of the corporation's capital as that supplied by stockholders, the basic *classification* by size rests upon the total capital of each corporation, as above stated.

or other security-holders, total capital figures give a more realistic picture than do total assets; for in a balance sheet of either an enterprise or an industry, short-time advances cancel out—that is, the 'receivables' of one corporation constitute the 'payables' of another. For our purposes, therefore, total capital probably provides the most satisfactory measure of the size of the corporate unit in terms of the permanent investment made by those who receive incomes upon it, whether they be stockholders or bond-holders.

2. EARNINGS RATES BY SIZE OF CORPORATIONS: ALL MANUFACTURING

Our data as to size consist of the 2,046 large manufacturing corporations series for which other analyses have been made in previous chapters. The data are available only for the two years 1924 and 1928. In each of these years these 2,046 concerns have been grouped into seven classes, according to the amount of total capital possessed by each company. The lowest class includes those with capitals of less than half a million dollars; the highest, those with capitals of over fifty million. The number of corporations falling into any one class in either year ranges from about 65 to 600.

The results seem rather conclusive. In both years, in Manufacturing as a whole, by far the highest percentage of profit to capital is earned by the smallest corporations— those with investments of less than $500,000. In 1924 the 230 companies belonging to this class show aggregate profits of 20.3 per cent, upon an aggregate investment of 82 million dollars. (The average investment per firm of the corporations in this class, it should be noted, is substantially less than $500,000, the mean figure being about $350,000).

In 1928 almost exactly the same rate of return, as well as the same average investment figure, characterizes this group.

Conversely, the largest corporations of all—those with capitals of over fifty million each—earn the very lowest rate of return in 1924 and almost the lowest rate of all in 1928. In the former year the concerns in this highest class—66 in all—show an aggregate return of only 8.1 per cent, upon their aggregate investment of over 14 billion dollars, as against 20.3 per cent for the smallest concerns.

In 1928 the very largest companies—now numbering 82, all with capitals over fifty million each—earn 9.8 per cent, as compared with 20.2 per cent for the smallest concerns. Thus, in both years the companies with capitals of under half a million dollars show earnings rates that are double or more those of the companies with capitals of over fifty million.

A less extreme comparison of sizes, however, is to lump together the two classes having capitals under one million, and likewise to consolidate all classes containing firms with capitals of over one million. When this is done, the 'Under $1,000,000' group in 1924 shows earnings of about 18 per cent while the '$1,000,000 or over' group shows profits of only 9 per cent. In 1928 the first group earns about 15 per cent, the second group 10 per cent.

So much for the general summary. Beyond question, among manufacturing corporations of all sizes of capital from $250,000 [4] to over $50,000,000, the smaller corporations earn profits at higher rates than the larger ones. Table 26 gives these results in detail. It will be noted that the rate of return regularly falls as the capital class in-

[4] The frequency distributions of total capital for the 2,046 corporations (see Appendix C) show that less than 2 per cent have capitals of under $250,000; but in 1924 and 1928 about 12 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively, have capitals of under $500,000.

TABLE 26

EARNINGS RATES, 2,046 MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS
BY CAPITAL CLASSES, 1924 AND 1928

SIZE OF CAPITAL (in dollars)	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL
		1924			*1928*	
Under 500,000	230	20.4	20.3	187	20.3	20.2
500,000 to 999,999	461	17.9	17.7	376	13.5	13.4
1,000,000 to 2,499,999	596	15.6	15.4	607	13.8	13.6
2,500,000 to 4,999,999	310	13.1	12.9	351	14.3	14.0
5,000,000 to 24,999,999	315	9.8	9.5	376	10.0	9.7
25,000,000 to 49,999,999	68	13.0	12.6	67	12.3	11.8
50,000,000 and over	66	8.6	8.1	82	10.5	9.8

creases, with the exception of but one class interval, in which a slight recovery occurs.[5] For comparative purposes, the percentages of net income to capitalization are given in the table together with those for the rate upon total profits to total capital. That the two do not greatly differ is because of the relatively small amount of funded debt that characterizes manufacturing generally. Certain individual corporations, of course, possess enormous funded debts; that is the reason for having made total capital and not capitalization the basis of our size classification. But in the aggregate the combined long-term borrowed capital of our 2,046 companies constitutes slightly less than 10 per cent of their combined total capital figures, in both 1924 and 1928.

With these results for our 2,046 manufacturing corporations we may compare the broad findings of a similar analysis undertaken by H. B. Summers[6] for a smaller

[5] It is to be observed that the class intervals are unequal and that the somewhat broad range covered by the limits of this particular class may not disclose some variation within these limits themselves.

[6] *Op. cit.*

sample of 1,130 companies. His data are based on pub-
lished reports as presented in Moody's and Poor's Manuals
and not upon Government data; but broadly speaking, his
definition of income and investment are the same as our
own. His investigation, however, covers the twenty-year
period 1910–29 inclusive, and his series is not one of identi-
cal corporations. The earnings rates that he develops are
averages for this twenty-year period. With these reserva-
tions in mind, we may note that his results show a higher
earnings rate for the corporations with capitals of under
$2 million than either for those with capitals from 50 to
100 million or for those with capitals of 100 million and
over. The discrepancy—the figures are 11.6 per cent as
compared with 9.8 and 9.5 per cent respectively—is not
nearly so large as that between our size groups, but the
two samples, drawn from different sources as they are,
serve to confirm each other.[7]

3. EARNINGS RATES BY SIZE OF CORPORATIONS: MAJOR GROUPS

Unfortunately, we are not able to present these size data
by minor industrial groups or even by all major groups.
For three major fields—Foods, Chemicals, Metals—sepa-
rate figures are, however, available.

a. Foods
In both 1924 and 1928 the largest corporations of the

[7] The less decisive discrepancy in Summers' results may well be due not
only to the fact that his sample is half the size of ours, but also, because,
as stated in his paper, it contains an inadequate representation of the
smaller companies among the enterprises which we have termed 'large
corporations'. Relatively few corporations with capitals of under $500,000
have published financial statements; and beyond question, Summers' 'under
two million' group, which is his lowest separate category, contains few if
any corporations possessing capitals of from $250,000 to $500,000.

Foods group show earnings rates of less than half those shown by the smallest concerns. In 1924 the companies with capitals of over $50 million earned 8.8 per cent on their investment, while those with capitals of under $500,000 earned 24.3 per cent. The 1928 figures are almost the same —9.5 per cent for the larger companies, 22.6 per cent for the smaller ones.

When narrowed by major groups and further divided into class intervals, the number of corporations in the sample, however, sometimes becomes small. Thus there are in the Foods group only 12 corporations with capitals of over $50,000,000 in the sample for 1924, and 14 in 1928. Our broad results for this major group, therefore, will be more certain if we enlarge the comparison by combining the two classes with capitals of under one million, and likewise the six classes with capitals of over that amount. This gives, in 1924 for example, 74 Food Corporations in the 'small' companies group and 141 companies in the 'large' group. The 'small' group, thus defined, in 1924 earns 21.0 per cent, while the 'large' one earns only 9.9 per cent. In 1928, the one group earns 16.3 per cent, the other 10.3. Full data for these two broad sizes of capital classes are presented in Table 27.

b. Chemicals

The Chemical corporations with capitals of less than $500,000 in 1924 earned 42.1 per cent upon their investments, while those with capitals of over $500,000 earned 7.9 per cent. In 1928 the figures were 68.4 and 10.6 per cent respectively. The exceptional figure of 68 per cent for the 14 smaller companies with capitals of less than $500,000 suggests that something may be wrong with the sample. On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that certain small chemical concerns, possessing secret formulae or patented

TABLE 27

EARNINGS RATES IN FOODS, CHEMICALS AND METALS,
BY BROAD CAPITAL CLASSES

| | 1924 | | 1928 | |
MAJOR GROUP AND CAPITAL CLASS	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL
1: Foods				
Under $1,000,000	74	21.0	59	16.3
$1,000,000 and over	141	9.9	156	10.3
8: Chemicals				
Under $1,000,000	62	31.5	48	26.0
$1,000,000 and over	148	8.7	162	11.1
10: Metals				
Under $1,000,000	187	16.2	151	14.6
$1,000,000 and over	461	9.1	497	10.4

processes, might in some years earn 100 per cent or more upon their investments, and thus raise the average rate for those 14 concerns to something over 50 or 60 per cent. Very probably this is indeed the case, for a frequency distribution of the *individual* rates of profit to capital earned by the 210 corporations of our entire Chemical group sample actually shows, for 1928, 8 Chemical companies with profit rates of over 68 per cent, 6 with rates of over 90 per cent, and 3 with rates of over 200 per cent each; and, if these happen to be included in our 14 companies with capitals of under $500,000, an average rate of 68 per cent upon investment in 1928 is entirely possible.[8]

But to be more certain of the broad tendencies involved, we may again combine the 'under one million' classes and

[8] These individual frequencies, for the higher earnings rates brackets in Chemicals in 1928, are shown on p. 40 of the *Source-Book*. They appear, but with classes of '30 per cent and over' lumped together, in Ch. 17 of the present volume. It may be added that Summers presents data for the chemical industry in the paper previously cited, and his results show chemical corporations of under two million dollar capitals as earning 24.5 per cent (average for a 20 year period) whereas for all those with capitals of over that amount, the average rate is 12.0 per cent.

also merge the several classes with capitals of over that amount. The result, in 1924, is that the 62 smaller Chemical companies belonging to the first group earn 31.5 per cent while the 148 concerns of the second group earn only 8.7 per cent. In 1928 the figures are 26.0 and 11.1 per cent respectively.

c. Metals

The Metals group sample contains 648 corporations, a far greater number than either of the two major groups already discussed. Of these 648 companies 61 had capitals of less than $500,000. Upon their investment these 61 companies earned 16.9 per cent. In the same year the Metals corporations with capitals of over $50 million—29 in number—earned only 8 per cent. About the same situation prevailed in 1928, the figures being 16.7 per cent and 9.6 per cent respectively.

Combining the capital classes of 'under one million' and similarly combining all those of over that amount, in 1924 we see the 187 smaller Metals companies of the first group earning 16.2 per cent, while the 461 larger concerns of the second group earn but 9.1 per cent. In 1928 the figures for the two groups are 14.6 and 10.4 per cent respectively.

Complete data for all three major groups are presented in Table 28.

4. CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL AND INCOME

In a recent study Gardiner C. Means estimated that the 200 largest non-financial corporations of the country control 44 per cent of all non-financial corporate gross assets. Our figures upon corporate size will not enable us to develop, for the Manufacturing division or for any of its specific major groups, such striking evidence as this con-

TABLE 28

EARNINGS RATES IN FOODS, CHEMICALS AND METALS,
BY DETAILED CAPITAL CLASSES

MAJOR GROUP AND CAPITAL CLASS (in dollars)	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	PERCENTAGE PROFIT TO TOTAL CAPITAL
		1924			1928	
1: Foods						
Under 500,000	28	25.0	24.3	27	22.9	22.6
500,000 to 999,999	46	20.2	20.0	32	13.9	13.6
1,000,000 to 2,499,999	57	16.5	16.1	55	12.4	12.2
2,500,000 to 4,999,999	30	10.7	10.5	39	15.3	14.9
5,000,000 to 24,999,999	29	10.5	10.3	37	9.2	8.8
25,000,000 to 49,999,999	13	13.3	12.7	11	14.3	13.6
50,000,000 and over	12	9.6	8.8	14	10.4	9.5
8: Chemicals						
Under 500,000	19	42.5	42.1	14	69.1	68.4
500,000 to 999,999	43	30.0	29.4	34	18.5	18.0
1,000,000 to 2,499,999	68	17.9	17.7	71	15.9	15.7
2,500,000 to 4,999,999	24	11.8	11.7	33	20.9	20.6
5,000,000 to 24,999,999	33	12.2	11.8	30	13.8	13.6
25,000,000 to 49,999,999	8	12.6	12.2	9	11.8	11.5
50,000,000 and over	15	8.0	7.9	19	11.1	10.6
10: Metals						
Under 500,000	61	16.9	16.9	47	16.8	16.7
500,000 to 999,999	126	16.2	16.0	104	14.3	14.2
1,000,000 to 2,499,999	196	14.8	14.7	185	15.9	15.7
2,500,000 to 4,999,999	107	15.4	15.2	124	15.8	15.4
5,000,000 to 24,999,999	99	9.2	9.1	123	11.0	10.6
25,000,000 to 49,999,999	30	13.2	12.9	29	13.0	12.6
50,000,000 and over	29	8.6	8.0	36	10.3	9.6

cerning the degree of concentration existing in Manufacturing; but we may nevertheless utilize the data of the preceding sections for what they are worth in this connection.

For Manufacturing as a whole the 82 corporations in our sample with capitals of over $50 million each in 1928 possessed a combined capital of about $19 billion. In num-

ber, these 82 corporations constitute only 0.1 per cent of all manufacturing corporations in the country, but their capital equals 31 per cent, and their total profit amounts to 39 per cent of the aggregate figure for the country. That the share of the total profit received by these 82 corporations is somewhat larger than their share of the total capital does not contradict our previous figures showing that large corporations earn lower rates of return than smaller companies. In our size comparisons, we considered companies that had capitals of over $250,000 (with but few exceptions) and compared them with one another. Here, in discussing concentration, the comparison is of these 82 largest companies with *all* corporations in the country, many of which, of course, have capitals of much less than $250,000.

For the three major groups—Foods, Chemicals, Metals—separate data are available. In Foods the 14 corporations of the sample with capitals of over $50 million in 1928 number 0.1 per cent of all Food manufacturing corporations in the country. They possess, however, 26 per cent of all the capital and receive 30 per cent of the total profit. In Chemicals 19 corporations with capitals of over $50 million constitute 0.3 per cent of all Chemical corporations by number, but account for 52 per cent of the capital and 59 per cent of the income. Finally, in Metals the 36 corporations of the sample having capitals of over $50 million constitute only 0.2 per cent of all Metal manufacturing companies in number but possess 42 per cent of the total capital and 44 per cent of the total income.

These measures, it should be noted, are not necessarily indicative of the maximum degree of concentration in each group, that is, the 14 Food corporations of our sample with capitals of over $50,000,000 may not include *every* Food company in the country having a capital of that amount. All we can say is that 14 of the larger Food companies

(or 0.1 per cent of the total number) own *at least* 26 per cent of the country's corporate investment in the Food manufacturing industry, that 0.3 per cent of the Chemical firms have *at least* 52 per cent of the aggregate investment, and that 0.2 per cent of the Metals corporations possess *at least* 42 per cent of the country's total investment in that industry; while for Manufacturing as a whole (which includes such other major groups as Textiles, Rubber and Leather, as well as Foods, Chemicals and Metals), 0.1 per cent of all the corporations in the country own *at least* 31 per cent of the aggregate corporate investment in all manufacturing industry, and receive *at least* 38.5 per cent of the total profit. In some major groups for which separate data are not available, however, concentration is not so high as the average figures for Manufacturing as a whole imply.

5. EARNINGS BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS

The companies belonging to our large manufacturing and trading corporations series may be classified upon the basis of geographical location, and the earnings rates for these several regions compared. While such a classification is subject to substantial qualification because a given corporation, whether consolidated or otherwise, may possess production units located in two or more geographical regions, it is nevertheless of interest to note whatever broad differences prevail between those regions for which the sample contains a sufficient number of corporations to seem at all significant. But it is to be borne in mind that classification is based upon the place at which the corporation has its head office.[9] The country is divided into seven regions

[9] See Ch. 46 for further discussion of this important qualification.

based upon the classification employed by the Census: New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain and Pacific. The states included in these regions are shown in Table 29. Our data pertain to the years 1924 and 1928.

TABLE 29

CODE FOR GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS

New England
 Maine
 New Hampshire
 Vermont
 Massachusetts
 Rhode Island
 Connecticut
Middle Atlantic
 New York
 New Jersey
 Pennsylvania
East North Central
 Ohio
 Indiana
 Illinois
 Michigan
 Wisconsin
West North Central
 Minnesota
 Iowa
 Missouri
 North Dakota
 South Dakota
 Nebraska
 Kansas
South Atlantic
 Delaware
 Maryland
 District of Columbia

South Atlantic (continued)
 Virginia
 West Virginia
 North Carolina
 South Carolina
 Georgia
 Florida
East South Central
 Kentucky
 Tennessee
 Alabama
 Mississippi
West South Central
 Arkansas
 Louisiana
 Oklahoma
 Texas
Mountain
 Montana
 Idaho
 Wyoming
 Colorado
 New Mexico
 Arizona
 Utah
 Nevada
Pacific
 Washington
 Oregon
 California

For Manufacture the West South Central region in both years shows the highest rates of return upon capitalization: 14.4 per cent in 1924 and 14.7 per cent in 1928.

The region showing the lowest return in 1924 is New England with an earnings rate of 8.3 per cent, while the lowest rate in 1928 is for the Pacific region, 6.3 per cent. The number of corporations contained in the sample for the Pacific region is less than 100, so the figures may be accepted with some reservation.

In both years, however, certain disparities persist. The New England region is near the bottom of the list and shows earnings rates of about 8 or 9 per cent, while the East North Central region, for example, shows rates of nearer 12 per cent. It is, of course, to be remarked that these disparities in part reflect differences in the industrial composition of the several sections of the country. Much New England manufacturing consists of Textiles in which the trend of earnings rates has been downward, while the East North Central region (containing the state of Michigan) has a large number of Metals establishments and includes virtually the entire automobile industry, in which the earnings rates were relatively high during the years in question. Table 30 gives the data, except for the Mountain

TABLE 30

EARNINGS RATES, 2,046 MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS
CLASSIFIED BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS, 1924 AND 1928[1]

	1924		1928	
REGION	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION
New England	268	8.3	269	8.7
Middle Atlantic	681	8.8	680	11.3
East North Central	648	12.7	651	11.2
West North Central	126	12.7	121	13.4
South Atlantic	133	9.5	134	13.4
East South Central	50	13.3	49	8.4
West South Central	57	14.4	57	14.7
Pacific	74	9.2	75	6.3

[1] Mountain region omitted, see text.

region. Earnings rates for that region have not been computed because of the small number of corporations contained in the sample.

In Trade somewhat different results prevail. New England does not appear towards the bottom of the list in either year. The highest rate of return in both years is earned by the Middle Atlantic region: 15.5 per cent in 1924 and 12.2 per cent in 1928. The lowest rates of return are earned by the West North Central section: 7.1 per cent in 1924 and 9.6 per cent in 1928. For 1928, however, the several differences in these earnings rates for Trade are much slighter than in Manufacturing. Table 31 makes pos-

TABLE 31

EARNINGS RATES, 664 TRADING CORPORATIONS CLASSIFIED
BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS, 1924 AND 1928[1]

	1924		1928	
REGION	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION	NUMBER OF CORPORATIONS	PERCENTAGE INCOME TO CAPITALIZATION
New England	60	12.6	59	11.9
Middle Atlantic	152	15.5	152	12.2
East North Central	148	13.5	147	12.0
West North Central	94	7.1	96	9.6
West South Central	61	11.5	61	10.8
Pacific	64	13.5	65	11.3

[1] South Atlantic, East South Central and Mountain regions omitted, see text.

sible a detailed comparison. Three of the nine regions, however, are here omitted: the South Atlantic, the East South Central and the Mountain sections. In the first case the figures contained in the *Source-Book* suggested errors in either the original data or the tabulation, while in each of the last two cases the number of corporations contained in the sample is too small to be significant.