

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

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

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

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

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

SUMMARY REPORT of the SOUTHWESTERN MINNESOTA FARM MANAGEMENT SERVICE 1940-1942

---0---

University of Minnesota Department of Agriculture

United States Department of Agriculture Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the

County Extension Services of Brown, Cottonwood. Faribault, Jackson, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Murray, Nobles, Redwood, and Watonwan Counties Cooperating

---0---

Cooperator:

Mimeographed Report No. 142 Division of Agricultural Economics University Farm St. Paul, Minnesota November 1943

600 11-43

3

£

S.

F

#

INDEX

	Page
Introduction	1
Summary of Farm Inventories	-
Net Worth Statement	3
Summary of Farm Earnings on 92 Farms by Years	
Summary of Farm Earnings (Cash Statement)	5
Summary of Farm Earnings (Enterprise Statement)	7
Family Living from the Farm	ģ
Household and Personal Expenses	8
Analysis of the Reasons for Differences in Operator's Earnings	9
Effect of Well Balanced Efficiency on Operator's Earnings	13
Measures of Farm Organization and Management Efficiency	14
Thermometer Chart	15
Distribution of Acres in Farm	16
Yield of Crops	17
Source and Disposal of Feed Grains	17
Average Price of Feeds, 1940-1942	18
Summary of Amount of Livestock	19
Variation in Returns from Livestock	20
Feed Costs and Returns from Dairy Cows	22
Feed Costs and Returns from Other Dairy Cattle,	23
Feed Costs and Returns from All Dairy Cattle	23
Feed Costs and Returns from Dual Purpose Cows	24
Feed Costs and Returns from Other Dual Purpose Cattle	25
Feed Costs and Returns from All Dual Purpose Cattle	25
Feed Costs and Returns from the Beef Breeding Herd	26
Feed Costs and Returns from Feeder Cattle	27
Feed Costs and Returns from Native Sheep	28
Feed Costs and Returns from Feeder Sheep	28
Feed Costs and Returns from Hogs	29
Feed Costs and Returns from Chickens	30
Feed Costs and Returns from Turkeys	31
Feed Costs for Horses and Other Power Expense Items	31
Explanation of Term "Work Units"	32

Summary Report of the Southwest Minnesota Farm Management Service for the Years 1940, 1941, and 1942

Prepared by T. R. Nodland and G. A. Pond

INTRODUCTION TO A SECOND OF THE SECOND

The Division of Agricultural Economics and the Division of Agricultural Extension of the University of Minnesota, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture and the county extension services of several southwestern Minnesota counties are cooperating with the Southwest Minnesota Farm Management Association in maintaining a farm management service. This Association was organized in the fall of 1939 by farmers in that part of the state for the purpose of studying the farm business thru farm records. Each farmer pays an annual fee which covers a part of the cost. The balance of the cost is defrayed by the University of Minnesota.

The data included in this report were secured from the records of those farmers who cooperated in the Service continuously during the three year period, 1940 to 1942. The 92 farms included in this report were located in the following counties: Brown, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Murray, Nobles, Redwood and Watonwan.

The cooperators were assisted and supervised by Mr. Ross Huntsinger, who was field agent during the period covered by this study. The records included inventories, each receipts and expenses, a report of feed consumed by the various classes of livestock and a record of the family living secured from the farm.

The data in this report are presented very largely in terms of 3 year averages in contrast with the annual reports containing information for a single year. These three year average figures are somewhat more stable than the annual figures since to a considerable extent the effect of minor uncontrollable factors that may cause considerable variation in net returns or in efficiency of production for an individual year are reduced or eliminated. The data in this report should serve as a more stable basis for farm planning than that shown in annual reports.

Because the farmers included in this study are, in general, above the average in managerial ability and operate larger and more productive farms, they have returns materially higher than the average for this section of the state. There were, nevertheless, wide variations in the methods and practices followed by these men. It is reasonable to assume that similar variations occur among all farmers in the area. To the extent that this is true, this report should be of value to all farmers and to others interested in agriculture in that it illustrates how farm records may be used as a basis for making an analysis of a farm business and for improving the management of a farm.

Description of the Area

The soils range from dark brown to heavy black loam. The major part of the area is undulating to gently rolling land interspersed with almost level tracts. In the western part of the area the surface ranges from undulating to sharply rolling. Nearly all of the land is tillable and well drained.

The farms in this area have a wide diversity of enterprises. All classes of livestock are important although livestock kept for meat production tends to predominate. The sale of crops constitutes an important source of income. The principal feed crops grown are corn, oats, barley, and hay. In addition wheat, sweet corn, canning peas, and flax are grown to a limited extent as cash crops.

Description of the Cropping Seasons

In general, weather conditions during the three years 1940 to 1942 were very favorable for crop production. Unfavorable weather conditions in the early spring of 1940 delayed the seeding of small grain; however, the growing conditions in May and June were favorable. Corn was injured to some extent by dry weather in the latter part of July. However, conditions in September and October were very favorable for late crops and pasture.

In 1941 a considerable acreage of small grains were not seeded until early May. This was offset by favorable growing conditions during May and June. Beginning about July first, a series of hail storms devastated portions of the area. Hot, dry weather during July and August damaged small grains and pasture but was favorable for corn. In 1942 cool wet weather in May retarded the growth of vegetation, and the planting of corn and other late crops was delayed. Small grains and grasses did well in July. Heavy rains in the summer delayed having, harvesting and threshing, and caused some damage to grain in shocks and to hav. Henvy rains, heavy snows and freezing temperatures in late September damaged late maturing corn and soybeans.

	Table 1.		ly and	Annual	Depart	ure fro	m Norm	al Pred	cipitati	on	٠.
x	Worthing								Redw		
	1940 1941			1941	1942	1940	1941	1942	1940	1941	1942
	医神经医学 医肾炎 医阴茎			98 372		STRAND, Y	OEASS.	Will Sec	X 270 1 3 11 /2	400	
¥	ATTERNATION OF	- pomiling		Inches	other in	Ton use	MP DUI	1137,40	plea year		
# IL	OF SEA WATER	G 1970 - 58	307.01	ATTAL	1 604	IN SECO					
Jan.	-0.63 -0.02	-0.44	-0.57	+0.06	+0.75	-0.41	-0.36	-0.93	-0.60	-0.01	-0.7
Feb.	+0.05 +0.01	-0.36	-0.27	-0.24	-0.75	+0.50	+0:41	-0.71	-0.07	-0.15	-0.5
Mar.	+0.70 -0.12	+3.29	0:06	-0.17	+0.86	+1.89	-0.15	+3.06	+0.68	-0.53	+1.5
Apr.	+0.67 +2.00	-0.82	-0.66	+1.28	-0.79	-0.29	+1.38	-0.46	-0.30	+1.00	-0.3
May	-2.74 -3.33	+2.42	-1.93	1.77	-0.22	-1:91	+1.36	+2.64	-0.38	-0.73	+1.7
June	+1.38 +1.43	+1.28	+0.50	+1.84	-1.28	+2.67	+1.60	-1.67	+0.26	+1.06	-1.9
July	-3.05 -0.70	+0.75	-2.96	-1.14	+0.89	-3.16	+0.73	-0.27	-2.13	+2.44	-1.20
Aug.	-0.99 -1.69	+0.76	+5.06	-1.71	+0.96	+6.52	-3.02	-2.15	+4.20	-2.58	-1.50
Sept.	-2.84 +1.51			+1.25			-	+3.07	-2.37	-0.34	+1.7
Oct.	+1.12 +1.22		+1.53	+4.42	-0.85	the state of the state of the state of	and the second second	-1.90		+1.95	
Nov.	+1.55 +0.52	-0.66	or the Manual and the	:+0.37		and the Management of the Control of		-0.83		-0.71	
Dec.	+0.15 +0.26	Carllin Children Co. Co. Sec. 100	and the second second	-0.26	The second secon		and the same of the same of	+0.38	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	-0.30	-
and the second	-4.63 +1.09	-	-	+3.93			Continue of the last of the la	+0.23		+1.10	
	4.00% Ration 4	a oldal	121 16		Tang Was	digital of		30 150 3	F. 0.7	(FILE	

La della del resultablesso el Smitaros III - alla della della elec-

ero rasionali magnas until spund die la rivola it muore tieta utan spans s

The Advisor of the part of the contract of the

. The same of the contraction of

A TOOLS LAAS TESTES TO LANGUE TO LANGUE TO LANGUE TO THE STATE OF THE

Table 2. Summary of Farm Inventories, 1940-1942*

Items	Table 2. Summary	Your farm	Average of 92 farms	18 most profitable farms	18 least profitable farms
	arm (acres)		305 623	490 925	237 472
Size of bi	usiness (work units)**	Charles Camping	623	920	7/2
	Average In	ventory - Be	ginning of	Year	
Horses	,	\$	\$381	\$500	\$412
	e livestock (total)	· ·	5128	11651	3175
	and dual purpose cows		581	479	551
	dairy & dual pur. cattl	.е	371	395	376
	attle (incl. feeders)		2578	7744	1005
Hogs			940	1490	721
	(including feeders)		524	1429	391
	y (including turkeys)		134	114	131
	d, and feed		141455	7670	3013
	quipment (total)		3027	4880	2364
	mach. (f. share)		1155	1803	940
Crop &	gen. mach. (f. share)		1/180	2 ¹ +35	1073
Livest	ock equip. & supplies		392	642	351
	, fences, etc.		7676	10370	7.089
Land	1 01 1		16180	28083	12693
Total far	m capital		36814	63154	28746
	Average	Inventory - I	End of Yea:	r	
					h
Horses		<u></u>	\$3 7 3	\$510	\$388
	e livestock (total)		6558	15120	3784
	& dual purpose cows		621	530	600
	dairy & dual pur. catt	Le	398	345	454
	attle (incl. feeders)		3123	9484	1171
Hogs	(1 2 3 1 2 2 3)		1532	2381	1030
	(including feeders)		710	2230	363
	y (including turkeys)	×	174	150	166
• • •	ds, and feed		4856	8545	3078
	quipment (total)		3312	5337	2501
	mach. (f. share)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1248	1942	1002
	gen. mach.		1630	2713	1129
	ock equipment & suppli	38	434	682	370
	, fences, etc.		7795	10592	7102
Land	4		<u> 16180</u>	28083	12693
Total far	m capital	7 M C F M M	39074	68187	29546

^{*} For the purpose of comparison the inventories as shown in this table and the earnings as shown elsewhere in this report are presented on a full-owner basis. The assets, expenses and receipts of the landlord were included in the statements for rented farms.

^{**} See page 32 for an explanation of the term "work units".

Table 3. Net Worth Statement for those Farmers Who Kept a Complete

	[4-1] [-42	20 Tg	Assets an		33	19 part-	13
24.7.12	hy-Te-2	nortu'i			owned farms	owned farms	rente
*****				arm	raims	raims	Lains
1	Net	Worth Sta	tement, Ja	nuary 1	1940		X .
	2.00		tomono, oa		, 1).0		
otal acres in fa	arm	· s second	A3 - TO		236.5	405.5	214.5
Owned					236.5	208.8	-
Rented		1516			_	196.7	214.5
							* 4
Total farm capita	al	- 12	\$	\$	28410	\$29298	\$7337
counts receiva					569	615	274
lousehold and pe		ets	_		2840	: 3951	1985
Total assets			-	\$	31819	\$33864	\$9596
					JJ	1,5,5,5,5	. ,,,,,,
otal liabilitie	S				12625	12032	2310
Real estate m					8715	7648	
Chattel mortg			•		999	832	558
Sealed grain					914	1228	614
Notes			S11 1		1602	1869	679
Accounts paya	hle	5	*anathri		395	.455	1459
ricco di va pava	010.	21			222		1))
Farmer's net wor	+h		\$	d	19194	\$21832	\$7286
armor 6 new wor	OII	2:	<u> </u>	······· '	-)-)	461076	+1200
	Net	Worth Stat	ement, Dec	ember 3	1, 194	2	
Total acres in f		Worth Stat	ement, Dec	ember 3	٠.		217.0
Total acres in f		Worth Stat	ement, Dec	cember 3	237.8	405.6	217.0
Owned		Worth Stat	ement, Dec	cember 3	٠.	405.6 240.9	-
		Worth Stat	ement, Dec	cember 3	237.8	405.6	217.0
Owned Rented	arm	Worth Stat	ement, Dec		237.8 237.8	405.6 240.9 164.7	217.0
Owned Rented Total farm capit	arm	Worth Stat	ement, Dec		237.8 237.8 -	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511	217.0 \$11975
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receiva	arm al ble	** .	ement, Dec		237 • 8 237 • 8 - 333675 509	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219	217.0 \$11975 81
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe	arm al ble	** .	ement, Dec		237 • 8 237 • 8 237 • 8 533675 509 4098	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606	217.0 \$11975 81 4446
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receiva	arm al ble	** .	ement, Dec		237 • 8 237 • 8 - 333675 509	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219	217.0 \$11975 81
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receiva Household and pe Total assets	arm al ble rsonal ass	** .	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 -533675 509 4098 338282	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receiva Household and pe Total assets Total liabilitie	arm al ble rsonal ass	** .	ement, Dec		237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 38282 11419	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receiva Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land	arm al ble rsonal ass s Bank	** .	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 333675 509 4098 338282 11419 3506	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 66C6 \$48336 10935 3210	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com	arm al ble ersonal ass es Bank missioner	ets	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 - 333675 509 4098 338282 11419 3506 265	\$40.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 66C6 \$48336 10935 3210 157	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es	arm al ble bronal ass Bank missioner tate mortg	ets ages	sement, Dec		237 • 8 237 • 8 237 • 8 333675 509 4098 338282 11419 3506 265 4584	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr	arm al ble rsonal ass Bank missioner state mortg	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 - 333675 509 4098 38282 11419 3506 265 4584 217	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr Other chattel	arm al ble rsonal ass Bank missioner state mortg	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 38282 11419 3506 265 4584 217 945	\$405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502 3507	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567 - 400 79
Owned Rented Fotal farm capit Accounts receiva Household and pe Total assets Fotal liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr Other chattel Sealed grain	arm al ble rsonal ass Bank missioner state mortg	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 38282 11419 3506 265 4584 217 945 521	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 66C6 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502 3507 495	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567 - 400 79 376 366
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Total liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr Other chattel Sealed grain Notes	arm al ble ersonal ass Bank missioner state mortg redit Assoc mortgages	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 338282 11419 3506 265 4584 217 945 521 1160	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502 3507 495 1111	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567 - 400 79 376 366 207
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receiva Household and pe Total assets Total liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr Other chattel Sealed grain	arm al ble ersonal ass Bank missioner state mortg redit Assoc mortgages	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 38282 11419 3506 265 4584 217 945 521	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 66C6 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502 3507 495	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567 - 400 79 376 366
Owned Rented Total farm capit Accounts receival Household and pe Total assets Total liabilitie Federal Land Land Bank Com Other real es Production Cr Other chattel Sealed grain Notes	arm cal ble ble bronal ass Bank missioner btate mortg cedit Assoc mortgages	ets ages iation	sement, Dec		237.8 237.8 237.8 533675 509 4098 338282 11419 3506 265 4584 217 945 521 1160	405.6 240.9 164.7 \$41511 219 6606 \$48336 10935 3210 157 1758 502 3507 495 1111	217.0 \$11975 81 4446 \$16502 1567 - 400 79 376 366 207

Table 4. Summary of Farm Earnings on 92 Farms by Years*

Items 1000	1940 1941	1942
EADM DVDDWCDC		1-1
FARM EXPENSES Horses bought	\$ 31 \$ 29 \$	E2
7		52 114
Beef cattle bought (including feede	1000	
Beel cattle bought (including jeede	rs) 1988 2278 103 221	2320
riogs bought	103 at least 221	333
Sheep bought (including feeders)	541 588	966
Poultry bought (including_turkeys)		118
Miscellaneous crop expenses	272 315	401
Feed bought	1214 1886	2313
Power machinery (farm share) (new)	426 479	266
Power machinery (farm share) (upkee)		561
Custom work hired	144 142	190
Crop and general machinery (new)	341 438	394
Crop and general machinery (upkeep)	77 92	146
Livestock equipment (new)	76 107	118
Livestock equipment (upkeep)	TALL TO SECURITY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY O	50
Miscellaneous livestock expense	20 33 74 97	144
Buildings and fencing (new)		
		336
Buildings and fencing (upkeep)	102 136	193
Hired labor	521 629	700
Taxes	345 347	370
Insurance	18 35	. 38
General farm	5856	65
(1) Total farm purchases	\$7369 \$9079 \$	10188
(2) Decrease in farm capital		-
(3) Board furnished hired labor	155 171	1.153
(4) Interest on farm capital	1751 1894	2046
(5) Unpaid family labor	214267	368
(6) Total farm expenses (Sum of (1)		12755
FARM RECEIPTS	19(6), 39 (0)	
Horses	\$ 36 \$ 43 \$	50
Dairy and dual-purpose cattle	Advantage and the second and the sec	-
Dairy products		460
Beef cattle (including feeders)	561 693	863
Home	3375 3941	5216
Hogs	1276 2365	4367
Sheep and wool (including feeders)		1252
Poultry (including turkeys)	305 392	568
Eggs	214 348	627
Corn	511 446	683
Small grain	817 1161	1182
Other crops	220 320	472
Power machinery sold	176 214	50
Crop and general machinery sold	82 66	56
Miscellaneous	405 186	7.75
Income from work off the farm		110
Agricultural Adjustment payments	the second secon	T40
(7) Total farm sales		254
(8) Increase in farm capital	\$9560 \$12066 \$	16/24
	1675 3339	1767
(9) Family living from farm	(a) <u>504</u> <u>545</u>	624
(10) Total farm receipts (7) + (8) +		19115
(6) Total farm expenses (11) Operator's labor earnings (10) -	9489 () 11411	12755
LII Unerator's labor comings (10)	(6) 2250 4539	6360

The financial statements differ in that the unpaid family labor rate was \$45 per month in 1940, \$50 in 1941 and \$60 in 1942; and the board for hired labor was calculated at \$18 per month in 1940, \$20 in 1941 and \$25 in 1942.

Summary of Farm Earnings (Cash Statement), 1940-1942 Average 18 most 18 least Your of 92 profitable profitable Items farm farms farms farms FARM EXPENSES Horses bought 37 46 32 43 25 Dairy and dual-purpose cows bought 40 28 53 Other dairy & dual-pur.cattle bought 680 Beef cattle bought (incl. feeders) 2195 7118 219 383 Hogs bought 2622 Sheep bought (including feeders) 699 223 264 65 Poultry bought (including turkeys) 102 552 329 Misc. crop expenses 1804 Feed bought Power mach. (farm share) (new) Power mach. (farm share) (upkeep) 390 496 761 383 159 180 Custom work hired Crop and general mach. (new) 391 741 Crop and general mach. (upkeep) 181 79 105 137 68 Livestock equipment (new) 100 .34 65 .30 Livestock equipment (upkeep) Misc. livestock expense 105 175 81 422 Buildings and fencing (new) 144 201 Buildings and fencing (upkeep) 617 1182 Hired labor 626 281 Taxes 354 Insurance 30 45 - 21 50 General farm \$21662 (1) Total farm purchases \$8878 (2) Decrease in farm capital 327 108 (3) Board furnished hired labor 159 3284 .. (4) Interest on farm capital 1897 360 (5) Unpaid family labor 284 (6) Total farm expenses (Sum of (1) to \$ \$11218 (5) FARM RECEIPTS 68 Horses 43 31 Dairy and dual-purpose cows 159 159 142 623 699 706 Dairy products 114 Other dairy and dual-purpose cattle 182 13104 1374 4177 Beef cattle (including feeders) 2669 4201 1877 Sheep and wool (including feeders) 908 2948 460 422 198 Poultry (including turkeys) 1500 3.24 396 308 Eggs 247 Corn 546 883 430 1054 2171 Small grain 337 499 211 Other crops 219 150 105 Power machinery sold 38 68 153 Crop and gen. mach. sold 496 255 Misc. Income from work off the farm 120 169 542 Agricultural Adjustment payments \$12783 (7) Total farm sales \$28472 030 5033 800 (8) Increase in farm capital 2260 (9) Family living from farm 558 \$15601 (10) Total fam receipts (7)+(8)+(9)\$ \$34184 8346 6626 (6) Total farm expenses 11218 25633 4383 (11) Operator's labor earnings(10)-(6)

and Oct in 1982; and the restrict

-1 252 han the fit oss to the fit of the top sale to the fit of th

tems		ATON S	Your farm	Average of 92 farms	tement), 1940 18 most profitable farms	18 least profitable farms
CPENSES AND NET	DECREASES	9.7		i simila Tanàna manggara	Vitaa	Van tar
Total power	- DEGITE SEC	84	g	\$ 828.	\$1268	\$ 672
Horses			·	162	262	142
Tractor	H4 3 Ga () 3	# 811	711	. 303	.483	234
Truck	Li . L	131	15.4	101	226	73
Auto (farm	share)	10	<u> </u>	, 150	166	129
	(farm share)		10	3	2	3
Elec. plant		(farm share)	1200	. 37	48	33
'Hired power		,	1 111	, 72	81	58. : 4
Crop and gene:	ral machiner	v		. 283	475	223
Livestock equi		14		, 85	152	68
Buildings, fer		ling		315	381	299
Misc. product				.100	174	68
Labor	20, 11,0190	1		1093	1908	767
Real estate to	axes	* 1710 *		287	492	227
Personal prop				67	134	54
Insurance	1 2 3 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		***************************************	30	45	21
General farm		*	***********	60	72	50 ×
Interest on fa	arm capital			1897	3284	1457
(1) Total exp		decreases	\$1.00 1.		\$8385	\$3906
(1) Total exp	enses & net	decreases	\$		Andrew Control of the	\$3906 \$5083
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv	enses & net INCREASES e livestock	aed to star	\$\$	\$5045	\$8385	- 10 m
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d	INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose	cows	\$	\$5045 \$8085	\$8385 \$16317	\$5083
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp	cows	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876	\$8385 \$16317 803 283	\$5083 904
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd	cows	\$\$ \$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367	\$8385 \$16317 803	\$5083 904 425
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd	cows	\$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138	\$5083 904 425 181
(1) Total exp ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le	cows	\$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184	\$5083 904 425 181 725
(1) Total exponents and NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt Hogs	INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock	cows	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127
(1) Total exponents and NET All productive Dairy and do Other dairy Beef breedings Sheep - far Sheep - fee	INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock	cows	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127
(1) Total experience of the control	INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock	cows	\$\$ \$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127
(1) Total exponents and NET All productiv Dairy and do Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders	cows	\$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64
(1) Total exponents and NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys Chickens	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders nd feed	cows	\$	\$5045 \$76 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247 561	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64 475
(1) Total exponents and net all productive Dairy and do Other dairy Beef breeding Feeder catte Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys Chickens Crops, seed a	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders nd feed ork off the	cows ose cattle	\$\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247 561 357	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443 -926	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64 475
ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys Chickens Crops, seed a Income from w	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders nd feed ork off the Conservation	cows ose cattle	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247 561 357 169	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443 -926 120	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64 475 -130 84
(1) Total experturns and net all productive Dairy and do Other dairy Beef breeding Feeder catted Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys Chickens Crops, seed a Income from wagricultural	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders nd feed ork off the Conservation	cows ose cattle	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247 561 357 169 542	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443 -926 120	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64 475 -130 84
ETURNS AND NET All productiv Dairy and d Other dairy Beef breedi Feeder catt Hogs Sheep - far Sheep - fee Turkeys Chickens Crops, seed a Income from w Agricultural Miscellaneous	enses & net INCREASES e livestock ual-purpose & dual-purp ng herd le m flock ders nd feed ork off the Conservation urns & net i	cows ose cattle farm a payments	\$	\$5045 \$8085 876 367 409 2136 3099 152 238 247 561 357 169 542 275	\$8385 \$16317 803 283 561 7138 4761 184 948 1196 443 -926 120 943 482	\$5083 904 425 181 725 2155 127 27 64 475 -130 84 377 212

^{*} Cash receipts and expenses are adjusted for changes in inventory for each enterprise and for each item of expense in order to show total receipts and net increases, and total expenses and net decreases. The operator's labor earnings are the same as those in Table 5.

satisate twosted pur producted !

ARAN TERMINA

Table	7. Family	Living	From th	ne Farm	, 1940-1	942	
Your Items farm	Average pr 92 at	most 1 ofit- p	8 leas rofit- ble	t	Average 92 farms	18 most	18 least profit- able farms
No.of persons(Family adult equiv.(Other*	3.6 7	3.9 1.4	3.2 . •5		25843.1	ONE THE TA	W. drag a
Wholemilk Skim milk Cream Farm made butter Eggs Cattle Hogs Sheep Poultry Potatoes Vegetables & fruits Farm fuel Rental vl.of house	1178 qts. 487 qts. 307 pts. 16 lbs. 176 doz. 453 lbs. 545 lbs. 9 lbs. 121 lbs.	797 390 17 208 599 621	978 227 303 19 167 476 451 12 124	\$	\$39.88 1.91 34.32 5.63 34.82 40.23 46.99 .88 15.68 11.26 46.03 20.44 259.59	\$49.99 3.12 43.54 5.22 41.62 58.24 50.91 .33 17.97 12.46 60.88 16.31 318.30	\$32.81 .89 33.89 7.05 32.49 39.23 37.54 .99 15.49 9.88 37.87 17.31 250.10

\$557.66

\$678.89 \$515.54

* Hired help or others boarded.

Total

	Complete Accounts of Th		
Items	Your farm	Average of 60 farms	12 most 12 least profit- prefit- able able farms
Number of persons - family		5.0	5.4 4.1
Number of persons, (Family) adult equivalent (Other* Food and meals bought Operating and supplies Clothing and clothing materia Personal care, personal spend Furnishings and equipment Education, recreation and dev Medical care and health insur Church, welfare, gifts and in Personal share of auto expens Household share of elect.& ga H.H.&pers.shr.of new auto, gas Life insurance and other inve	elopment cance come tax e s eng. exp. eng.& motors bot.	3.9 .7 \$369 141 214 74 128 122 118 133 103 40 73 350	\$4.2 3.2 1.3 .6 \$482 \$285 188 105 312 117 136 36 156 81 234 56 163 81 225 83 148 77 58 32 119 47 585 133
Total household and personal	cash expenses	1865	2806 1133
Food furnished by the farm Fuel furnished by the farm House rental	to took and be a large to the took and the t	294 22 262	354 248 23 13 317 256
Total household and personal	expenses	\$2443	\$3500 \$1650

ANALYSIS OF THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES IN OPERATOR'S EARNINGS

The operator's labor earnings varied widely among the farmers included in this study. The average labor earnings of those farmers ranking in the upper 20 per cent in the range according to earnings was \$8,551 and of those in the lower 20 per cent, \$1,720. This is a range of \$6,831 between the average earnings of these two groups.

There were likewise variations between years on the same farm. The variations between years were determined by ranking the 92 farms from high to low on the basis of the 1940-1942 average earnings and for each of the three years included in this study. The deviations from the 1940-1942 rank were then noted. For example, one farmer was number 15 on the basis of the three-year average earnings, number 22 in 1940, 25 in 1941 and 14 in 1942 or an average deviation of six from the 1940-1942 rank. Another farmer was number 47 on the basis of the three-year average earnings, number 50 in both 1940 and 1941 and 44 in 1942 or an average deviation of 3 from the 1940-1942 rank. Fifty-one per cent of the farmers had an average yearly deviation from their three-year average rank of less than 10 and 90 per cent had less than 20.

In general the yearly deviations from the 1940-1942 rank were relatively small (Table 9). The farmers in the upper and lower 20 per cent in the range according to earnings had an average deviation of 8.7 and 8.1 respectively. The average deviation for all farms was 10.5. In other words, if a farmer ranked 15th in his average earnings and had a yearly deviation of 10, he would be expected to fluctuate between 5th place and 25th place in the rank of earnings during 1940, 1941 and 1942.

Table 9. Deviations	from the]	1940-1942 Ranke	d Earnings
Farms grouped accord	ing	Average devia	
to earnings		the 1940-1942	rank
Highest 20 per cent	ě	8.7	×
Next 20 per cent		11.1	5
Next 20 per cent	·/ · · ·	14.8	,
Next 20 per cent		10.0	
Lowest 20 per cent		8.1	• ,
43.5			•
All farms		10.5	10

It is interesting to note that there was less year-to-year deviation in earnings among the farmers in the upper and lower group than in the intermediate groups. Earnings are high or low in any given year principally because of certain factors that are more or less inherent in the organization of the farm. The farmer with a good farm well organized and skillfully managed is likely to have a consistently high rank in earnings from year to year unless he is a victim in a particular year of some unusual and uncontrollable circumstance. Of the 18 farmers whose earnings ranked in the upper 20 per cent for the three-year period six failed to achieve that ranking in 1940. Three of these six men experienced heavy livestock losses in the November 11 storm and one had low yields of small grain because of rain damage to grain in shocks. Six of these 18 farmers failed to place in the top one-fifth in 1941. Four of these six suffered up to 85 per cent hail loss on crops. Three of these farmers failed to place in the top one-fifth in 1942. Two of the three farmers had severe crop losses because of unfavorable weather conditions.

Those farmers in the lower 20 per cent ranked according to earnings also showed little deviation from year to year. A low ranking in the factors affecting farm success that results from limitation in the size and quality of the farm and in the organization and management keep the earnings consistently low. In 1940 one farmer in this group ranked above the lower 40 per cent in earnings. Otherwise all of the farmers in the low earnings group were consistently low from year to year. In the intermediate group the rankings in earnings are much more variable from year to year.

The more important of these organization and management factors affecting earnings and their relationships with earnings are presented in the following tables.

Table 10.	Relation of C	rop Yields t	o Farm Earnin	gs ·
Per cent crop yie	elds		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12 42 5
were of the avera	age			
for all 92 farms	· No	• of	Average	operator's
Group Avera		rms	labor e	amings
		,		
Below 86 77	7	19	\$2,6	658
86-113 101		53	\$2,6	786
114 and above 122	2 *	20	4,	95 1
			16.11	Mill III

High production per acre, up to certain limits, tends to lower the cost per bushel of grain or per ton of hay. Any possible method of management that will increase crop yields and therefore lower cost of production more than the extra expense incurred in securing the higher yields should be given consideration.

Table 11.	Relation	of Choice of Ch	rons to Farm Earnings	
Per cent of ti	llable land	i se di a di	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
in high return	crops*	No. of	Average operat	
Group	Average	farms	labor earnin	igs
Below 33.0 33.0-42.0 42.0 & above	29•8 37•7 45•1	22 49 21	\$3,696 4,140 5,670	

^{*}Crops are marked on page 16 as (A), (B), (C), and (D). All of acres in (A) crops, one-half of acres in (B) crops, and one-fourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.

Farmers' earnings are affected by the choice of crops as well as by the yields of crops. As a rule, on these farms, such crops as alfalfa, clover, canning crops, sugar beets, corm, and flax bring a higher net return per acre than other crops usually grown. Additions can be made to earnings by putting as high a percentage as possible of the tillable land into these higher return crops.

DELL'ESTATE AND GRANT

The second of th

Table 12. Relation of Returns from Productive Livestock to

Index of ret fed to produ	urns for ctive liv	Farm Earn \$100 feed estock*	No. of	Average operator's
Group	2 2710 L IV	Average	farms**	labor earnings
Below 89 89-109	on direct	. 82 . 100	. 20 52	\$3,315 4,525
110 and abov	e.,,	. 118	19-	5,087

^{*} The index is weighted by the number of animal units.

The majority of these farms are livestock farms. A large proportion of the crops raised are fed on the farm and some additional feed is purchased. Feed is the major item of cost in livestock production and livestock constitutes an important source of income on these farms. Hence there is a marked relationship between returns for \$100 of feed and operator's labor earnings on these farms. There are a number of reasons for differences among farms in livestock returns. High productivity per animal and economy in the use of feed and labor are important. Other factors of considerable importance are kind of feed used, quality of pastures, balance of ration, degree of sanitation, and kind of shelter and equipment.

Table 13. Relation of Amount of Productive Livestock to

Productive live units per 100	estock	m Earnings No. of		Average	operator'
Group	Average	- farms		labor	earnings
Below 17.0	13.1	24	1.5 .2	\$3	.566
17.0-29.9	23.0	45	11	3	896
30.0 and above	39.5	23		. 6	,188

^{*}Acres in timber not pastured, roads, waste and farmstead were not included.

On some farms the returns from livestock are so low that they do not cover feed and other costs. Such livestock is unprofitable, especially if there is more than enough to utilize what would otherwise be waste feed. If the livestock is yielding a net return, an increased amount of livestock adds to size of business and the opportunity to increase the farm earnings. Livestock produces manure and aids in keeping up the fertility of the land, and utilizes waste products on the farm. Livestock also helps to provide productive employment throughout the year. Any method that aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capacity should add to the farm income.

Table 14. Relation of Size of Business (Work Units) to

25.0	No. of work		Earnings No. of	Average operator's
	Group	Average	farms .	labor earnings
	Below 400 400-699	345 559	19	\$2,566 3,876

7 1 12 1 7

^{**} One farmer did not raise livestock.

The size of the farming operations is one of the important factors affecting the earnings of farmers. On the average, the farmers with a large business had larger earnings than the farmers with a small business. The size of the farm business is here measured in terms of the number of work units. For farmers operating their farms at a loss, the larger the volume of business, the larger will be the loss; but a farmer who is making a profit could make a larger profit if he increased his size of business, providing that in so doing he does not lower materially the efficiency in some one or more important branches of his business. Those farmers who have large businesses usually have more flexibility of their organization than does the man with a small business, and can utilize more efficiently and to better advantage available labor, power, machinery and buildings. The size of the farm business may be increased by farming more land, by keeping more livestock, or by keeping livestock or growing crops of a more intensive type.

Table 15. Relation of Amount of Work Accomplished per Worker to

A DESCRIPTION OF THE REAL PROPERTY.	F	arm Earnings	t de presente p	O MOTE IN SID
Work units per	worker	No. of	Average	operator's
Group A	lverage	farms	labor	earnings
Below 230	197	24	diverse to the	\$3,226
230-300	263	48	*105 Mar 14 A	4,606
300 and above	336	20		5,237
m, f				

Farmers' earnings are generally higher on those farms on which a large amount of work is accomplished per worker. More days of productive work accomplished per worker reduces the labor charge per unit of business. High labor accomplishment can be secured in several ways. In the first place, the business must be large enough so that there will be at least sufficient work available for the family labor. The farm should be so organized that the labor requirements are well distributed throughout the year. Handling pastures in such a way that as large a proportion as possible of the year's feed for livestock may be obtained from them helps to reduce labor requirements. Proper planning of the farm work and economical use of labor-saving machinery help to increase the work accomplished per worker.

Table 16. Relation of Power, Machinery, Equipment and Building

Expense per work	unit		No. of	12 981	Av	erage operator's
Group	Average	Acres In F	farms	V 40	N. P.	labor earnings
\$2.85 and above		7342	20	r anci	1 2 2 2	\$3,918 4,507
\$2.00 - \$2.85 Below \$2.00	2.39 1.69	G Esp	53	Jenn .	r. đại	4.527

^{*}Includes building, fencing, all crop machinery and livestock equipment, horse feed, and miscellaneous horse expense.

The expense factor does not show as high relationship with earnings when prices are high as when they are low. Some farms are under-equipped. On a few farms, excessive expenses constitute the main factor causing earnings to be very low.

Some of the cash expenses can be kept down by careful management. Oftentimes necessary repairs and improvements can be made by using the available farm labor rather than by hiring extra help. Repairs and overhauling should be done before spring work begins insofar as possible; or on rainy days or in other spare time during the summer. Reducing the number of horses to the minimum required for efficient operation of the farm helps reduce the power expense. In some cases, farmers can offset some or all of the power and machinery expense by using their equipment for outside work.

EFFECT OF WELL-BALANCED EFFICIENCY ON FARM PROFITS

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency. Quite often farm operators show efficient management in one part of the farm business, which is offset by poor results in other phases. These farmers get medium returns while those who fall down all along the line get the lowest returns; and on the other hand those few who can manage to attain high efficiency in all parts of their organization receive returns well above the average. This is well illustrated in Table 17.

Table 17. Relation of Operator's Labor Earnings to the Number of Factors in which the Farmer is Above Average.

No. of factors in which farm excels	No. of farms	Your farm	The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the average operator's labor earnings	Average operator's labor earnings
None or One Two Three Four Five Six or seven	11 18 19 20 11	The second	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	\$2,582 2,784 3,781 4,457 6,574

The array in Table 17 indicates that it will be worth while for each cooperator to study carefully his ranking on pages 14 and 15, and learn his standing in respect to each of the above factors and the elements of strength and weakness in his farm business.

TO BYLLET BELLET AND AND AND THE THE THE TOTAL AND THE TRANSPORT OF THE TAX AND THE TRANSPORT OF THE TAX AND THE T

at 1 and for even bestmined diffe educed which a person of the land of the lan

Measures used in chart on page 15.		Average of 92 farms	18 most profit- able farms	18 least profit- able farms
Operator's labor earnings .	\$. 424	\$4,383	\$8,551	\$1,720
(1) Crop yields*		100	110	88
(2) % of tillable land in high return crops	* taled = za	37.5	39.4	36.6
(3) Ret. for \$100 feed to productive livest	ock***	100	107	94
(4) Productive livestock units per 100 acre	3***	24.4	33.2	22.5
(5) Size of business - work units		623	925	472
(6) Work units per worker	Months to	260	272	236
(7) Pow,, mach., equip., & bldg.exp.per work u	nit\$	\$2.45	\$2.44	\$2.64
		1		
(3) Index of return for \$100 feed from -	*			
Dairy cattle	Jan	100	112	92
Dual-purpose cattle	75 N	100	99	103
Beef cattle - breeding herd		100	95	89
Beef cattle - feeders		100	108	79
Hogs		100	100	99
Sheep - farm flock		100	102	98
Sheep - feeders		100	112	. " н
Turkeys		100	101	96
Chickens		100	102	92
(5) Work units on crops		227	357	169
Work units on productive livestock		354	538	282
Other work units		42	30	21
(6) Total number of workers		2.4	3.4	2.0
Number of family workers Number of hired workers		1.4	1.6 1.8	1.3 .7
(7) Power expense per work unit	\$	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.43
Crop machinery expense per work unit		- 1+14	•50	•46
Livestock equip. expense per work unit		.14	•17	.15
Bldgs. and fencing exp. per work unit		•52	.42	•60

^{*} Given as a percentage of the average.

^{**} Crops are marked in Table 19 as (A), (B), (C) and (D). All of acres in (A) crops, one-half of acres in (B) crops, and one-fourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.

^{***} An index weighted by the animal units of livestock.

^{****} Acres in timber not pastured, roads, waste and farmstead were not included.

Thermometer Chart

Using your figures from page 14 locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for the 92 farms included in this summary are located between the dotted lines across the center of this page.

.: ,	oss the cer		onis pages			7	· ·· ·	. No. P	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Oper. labor earn- ings	Cŕop yíel		duct	pro- uni	Work		s eq., exp.	
	\$9200	132	49.5	132	40.5	1025	380	\$1.25	
	8600	128	48.0	158	38.5	975	365	1.40	
•	8000 =	124	46.5	124	36.5	925	350	1.55	
	7400	120	45.0	120	34.5	875	335	1.70	
	6800	116	43.5	116	32.5	825 -	320 =	1.85	
	6200	112	42.0	112	30.5	775	305	2.00	
	5600	108	40.5	108	28.5	725	290	2.15	
	5000	1014	39.0	104 =	26.5	675	275	2.30	
<i>-</i>	4400	100,	37.5	100	24.5	625	260	2.45	
, , ,	3800	96	36.0	96	22.5	575	245	2.60	
i.	3200	92	34.5	92	20.5	525	230	2.75	
, a	2600	88	33.0	88	18.5	⁴ 75	215	2.90	
	2000	84	31.5	84	16.5	425	200	3.05	
3.	1400	80 =	30.0	80	14.5	375	185	3.20	
ŧ	800	76	28.5	76	12.5	325	170	3•35	
ign -	200	72	27.0	72	10.5	275	155	3.50	
40	. 貝			Ē				E	
		:0) ()d at (

Table 19. Distri	bution	of Ac	ces in F	arm, 1940	1942	
Crop: (A) (B) (C) and (D) refer to ranking used in calculating % of tillable land in High Return Crops (see page 14)	g: tl	rowing nis rop	Y _{our}	Average of 92 farms	18 most profit- able farms	18 least profit- able farms
Canning peas Flax Barley	(A) (B) (C)	9 89 64		1.8 35.8 19.9	2.1 65.0 38.9	5.5 20.7 13.2
Barley and oats Wheat Oats	(D)	19 39 86	32.3	6.5 3.7 33.3	16.2 2.4 34.7	.2 4.9 27.8
Oats and wheat Rye	(D)	10 17		1.3	1.7	2.3
Soybeans for grain Miscellaneous	(D)	62 10		6.7 .4	14.9 .1	1.9 .5
Total Small Grain and Peas		92		110.8	176.3	78.4
Sugar beets, hybrid seed corn, potatoes and truck crops Sweet corn Corn grain Corn and/or sorghum silage	(A) (B) (B) (C)	55 9 92 54		2.3 1.3 64.3	•6 1•5 107•9	2.9 42.7 4.9
Corn and/or sorghum fodder	(D)	54		6.9 2.4	13.9 2.8	4.2
Total cultivated crops		92		77.2	126.7	55•3
Alfalfa hay Sweet clover hay Soybean hay Mixed legumes & non-legumes Legumes for seed Timothy and/or brome Timothy seed Other annual hay	(A) (B) (C) (C) (D) (D)	92 30 57 50 12 32 1 40		20.5 2.0 1.9 4.3 .6 1.9	37.9 2.4 2.1 6.1 1.2 3.2 - 3.9	15.6 2.2 2.3 1.1 1.1 1.3
Total tillable land in hay		92		32.7	56.8	24.5
Alfalfa pasture Sweet clover pasture Mixture incl. alf., sweet clover, b: Other legumes and mixtures Sudan grass and/or rape Other tillable pasture	(A) (B) rome(B) (C) (C) (D)	54 54 42 39 50 73		2.0 8.7 4.6 3.1 2.1 8.9	3.1 14.2 8.0 3.9 2.4 12.1	1.4 7.6 2.0 2.1 1.3
Total tillable land in pastu		91		29.4	43.7	25.8
Tillable land not cropped Total tillable land	(D)	54		2.6	4.5	1.2
Phalaris hay (non-tillable)		6		252.7	408.0	185.2 •3
Wild hay (non-tillable) Non-tillable pasture Timbér (not pastured) Roads and waste Farmstead		41 66 21		5.6 25.6 .8 10.2 9.6	4.4 47.9 .5 17.2 11.8	8.4 25.7 1.8 7.1 8.0
Total acres in farm % land tillable % tillable land in high return cr	ego)		304.7 82.9 37.5	490.1 83.2 39.4	236.5 78.3 36.6

Table 20. Crop Yiel	Your farm	Average of 92 farms	18 most profitable farms	18 least profitable farms
Canning peas, value above seed cost \$ Flax, bu. Barley, bu. Barley and oats, bu.		\$30.71 12.4 32.0 37.9	\$39.22 13.8 36.6 44.8	\$18.19 10.5 26.9
Wheat, bu. Oats, bu. Oats and wheat, bu. Rye, bu. Soybeans for grain, bu.		17.3 45.4 44.0 16.5 11.7	18.0 51.8 44.4 27.1 14.0	12.7 41.0 41.3 14.5 8.1
Sweet corn, tons Corn, grain, bu. Corn and/or sorghum silage, tons Corn and/or sorghum fodder, tons		3.2 53.9 9.3 2.9	4.0 57.2 9.5 3.6	2.3 48.4 8.3 2.4
Alfalfa hay, tons Sweet clover hay, tons Soybean hay, tons Mixed legume & non-legume hay, tons Legumes for seed, lbs.		2.2 1.3 1.5 1.9 129	2.1 1.7 1.5 2.0 99	2.3 .9 1.0 2.2 146
Timothy and/or brome hay, tons Other annual hay, tons Phalaris hay on non-tillable land,ton Wild hay, tons	IS	1.1 1.3 1.2	1.8 1.4 1.4 1.1	.9 1.2 .9

SOURCE AND DISPOSAL OF FEED GRAINS

Corn is by far the most important single feed grain crop on the farms studied (Table 21). Seventy-three per cent of the feed grains fed on these farms was corn. Oats ranked second and barley was third. The other feed grain crops are of minor importance.

Although weather conditions during the period 1940-1942 were, in general, very favorable for crop production there was not much change in inventory carry-over at the end of the year as compared to the average amount on hand at the beginning of the year. Part of this is due to a smaller amount of scaled grain on hand at the end of the period than at the beginning. All scaled grain has been included in inventories and is one of the reasons for the large inventory stocks. Another reason that feed reserves have not increased with increased crop production is that livestock numbers have been increased even more rapidly than feed production. Wheat purchases during the period were larger than usual because of the sale of government-owned wheat to farmers for feed purposes. Crops sold include the landlord's share of the crop on share-rented farms unless it was purchased by the tenant.

Table 21. Source and Disposal of Feed Grains Per Farm*

	Quantit	y availa	ble -	Dis	osal mad	le of	the grains
Crop	On hand Jan. 1	Pur- chased	Raised	Sold	Seeded	Fed	On hand Dec. 31
Corn, bu.	4313	1393	3364	997	16	3748	4309
Oats, bu.	1235	360	1592	251	123	1675	
Barley, bu.	523	56	660	479	46	234	. 480
Wheat, bu.	60	81	63	43	6	82.	73
Oats & barley, bu.	90.	6	154	6	7	145	92
Oats & wheat, bu.	14	2	32	2	2	26	18
Rye, bu.	21.	5 .	16	15	1.	9.	. 17
Scybeans, bu.	33.	24	. 77	49	.18	10	57
Total, tons	158.5.	49.6	143.8	46.8	4.4	143.8	156.9
**	And the second						

^{*} Average for all farms in S. W. Minn. Farm Management Service, 1940-1942.

An average of 352 tons of feed grain was available on these farms, 45 per cent represents carry-over from the previous year, 41 per cent was raised during the year and 14 per cent was purchased. Forty-one per cent of this supply of grains was fed, 45 per cent was held over as inventory stocks, 13 per cent was sold and one per cent was seeded.

Table 22. Average Price of Feeds, 1940-1942

	- 6,016 FF.	-4.01	2,	100 01	- ecus,	-7.0 -7	· I-	
					1940	1941	1942	3-year Average
Ear corn per bu.				,	\$.42	\$.50	\$.65	\$.52
Oats per bu.					.26	.32	.41	• 33
Barley per bu.					•31	39	.52	.41
Bran per cwt.	·*				1.20	1.50	2.10	
Linseed oilmeal per	cw.t.	,	*		1.70	2.00	2.40	2.05
ş •	•				4.5			A A ME I
Soybean oilmeal per	cwt.		DE 18.8		1.70	2.10	2 .7 5	2.20
Tankage per cwt.			. 00	(E) X	2.50	3.20	4.10	3.30
Meat scraps per cwt	•				2.55	3.20	1,10	
Skim milk per cwt.		į		g as	.15	.18	. 22	.18
Alfalfa per ton			4	(a)	7.50	8.50	8,00	8.00
- 1 · · · · ·	7414	. v			i i		9 8 4 5	~ ·
Red or alsike clove	r per ton				6.40	7.25	6.80	6.80
Timothy per ton					4.80	5.45	5.15	5.15
Wild hay per ton					3.75	4.25	4.00	4.00
Toam fodder per ton		Ŧ .	1.	. ,	3.20	3.60	- X	
Curn silage per ton		4.4	a es	x* * , * , .	2.10	2.55	2.75	
		* *		2.1	7.7			

Table 23. Summary of Amount of Livestock

Table 23. Su	ummary of Amo		
	7		18 most 18 least
	Your		profitable profitable
Items	fa,rm	farms	farms farms
			0)10
Average Amou	nt of Livest	ock, 1940-1	942
T 0.		: * - \; -2* '	
No. of horses		4.3	6.1 4.3
No. of colts		1.0	1.3
No. of dairy & dual purpose cows		 8.6	9.1
Head of other dairy & dual purpo			
cattl		9•3	7.1
Head of cattle in beef breeding		9.4	11.8 5.6
Pounds of feeder cattle produced	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	14643	47294 5532
Pounds of feeder sheep produced		1419	5521 341
Litters of pigs	para 2	17.6	214.1 14.3
Pounds of hogs produced		29039	45582 20204
Head of sheep (2 lambs = 1 head)		21.5	28.1
No. of hens	1	183	
10 CT HOLD	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		157 157
Total no.of prod.lvstk.animal un	its	70.5	155.2 47.6
% of total that are:			*_ * * * * *
Dairy and dual purpose cows	M • 4	18.1	7.8
Other dairy and dual purpose	cattle	10.9	5.3. 15.4
In beef breeding herd		11.5	8.6
Feeder cattle		22.1	41.8.
Native sheep	·,	4.8	3.9 5.3
Feeder sheep		3.7	10.5
Hogs	and a second second	23.9	16.2 25.3
Turkeys		1.0	
Hens		4.0	4.1 1.8 4.9
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Average Number of	Livestock on	Hand, Janu	ary 1, 1940
Horses	23.1	4.5	F 0
Colts	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		5.1
Dairy and dual purpose cows	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,•9	.9 1.2
Other dairy and dual purpose cat	+10	8.6	6.6 9.2
Beef breeding herd	ore -		nor set see
		8.7	11.6
		25	73 11
Sheep-farm flock		34	93 60
Hogs Carlott	4.4	18	24 14
Hens	a restrict to the same of	- 16 ¹	106 58
. 10		189	152 210
Average Number of Li	vestock on H	and, Decomb	er 31, 1942
Horses			
Colts		4.1	O • T
Dairy and dual purpose cows		9	1.8
Other dairy and dual purpose cat	+10	8.9	8.6 9.5
Beef breeding herd	<u></u>	9.3	5.7 11.0
Feeder cattle		_ ⁸ •5	9.6 5.6
Sheep - feeders		30	92 15
Sheep - farm flock		59	252 0
Hogs		22	18 30
Hens	-		140 81
220110		267	231 245

VARIATIONS IN RETURNS FROM LIVESTOCK

The variations between years in the return over feed secured from livestock were determined in a manner similar to that for operator's earnings. The farms were ranked from high to low on the basis of the 1940-1942 average return over feed from milk cows, hogs and chickens and for each of the three years included in this study. The deviations or variations from the 1940-1942 rank for each of these three classes of livestock were then noted.

Seventy per cent of the farmers maintaining milk cows had an average yearly deviation from their three-year average rank of less than 10, and all had less than 20 (Table 24). Thirty-seven per cent of the farmers raising chickens had an average yearly deviation of less than 10 and 85 per cent had less than 20. Only 18 per cent of the farmers raising hogs had an average yearly deviation of less than 10 and 67 per cent had a deviation of less than 20.

Table 24. Distribution of Farms According to Deviation From 1940-1942 Average Return Over Feed From

	Milk Cows, Hog	s and Chic	kens				
Deviation from			Percentage of farms maintaining				
1940-1942		Milk					
rank		Cows	Hogs	Chickens			
Below 5.0		31.7	9.0	12.4			
5.0 - 9.9		38.1	9.0	24.7			
10.0 - 14.9	* · · · · ·	19.1	24.7	25.9			
15.0 - 19.9	* == 0 == 0 == 0 == 0 == 0 == 0 == 0 ==	11.1	24.7	24.7			
20.0 - 24.9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	19.1	8.6			
25.0 and over	1 1 1	0	13.5	3•7			

Except in the case of hogs, the year-to-year deviations in return over feed were less among the farmers in the upper and lower groups than in the remaining intermediate groups (Table 25). In general, the returns secured from the various livestock enterprises are high or low because of differences in the organization and management of the enterprises. A farmer with a well organized and skillfully managed enterprise is likely to have a consistently high rank in return over feed unless some unusual and uncontrollable event occurs.

Table 25. Deviations from the 1940-1942 Return Over Feed From Milk Cows. Hogs and Chickens

Farms Grouped		Average	deviation	from 1940-1942 rank
According to	Personal American	Milk		
Return Over Feed	tempo tempo	Cows	- Hogs	Chickens
	or per in the side			
Highest 20 per cent		4.6	15.9	11.6
Next 20 per cent		9.6	15.3	15.1
Next 20 per cent		9.5	15.5	13.4
Next 20 per cent		9•9	17.2	12.4
Lowest 20 per cent ·		6.7	17.2	10.5
All farms	200	8.0	16.3	12.6
				e e e

The farmers in the upper 20 per cent in the range according to return over feed from milk cows had an average deviation of 4.6 and those in the lower 20 per cent 6.7. The average for all farms was 8.0. Of the 13 farmers in the upper 20 per cent for the three-year period four failed to achieve that ranking in 1940 and 1941 and three in 1942. During the three years only two of these 13 men ranked below the upper 40 per cent in return over feed. Of the 13 farmers in the lower 20 per cent according to the 1940-1942 average return over feed three ranked higher in 1940 and 1941 and four in 1942. There was less year-to-year deviation in return over feed among the farmers in the upper and lower groups than in the remaining groups.

There was more variation in the returns secured from chickens than in the returns from milk cows. Ten of the 15 farmers in the upper one-fifth according to return over feed for the period 1940-1942 failed to achieve that ranking 1940, 5 in 1941 and 7 in 1942. In 1940 four of these farmers ranked below the upper one-half of the entire group of 81 farmers. Five farmers in the lower 20 per cent based on the 1940-1942 average return over feed ranked in the upper 60 per cent in 1940 and one in 1941. There was considerably more fluctuation in ranking in 1940 than in the other two years.

The returns from hogs were much more variable than the returns from milk cows or chickens. Nine of the 13 farmers in the upper one-fifth according to the 1940-1942 average return over feed did not achieve that ranking in 1940; four of the nine ranked in the lower one-half. Eight farmers dropped out of the top one-fifth in 1941 with four going below the upper one-half. Eight also dropped out of the top one-fifth in 1942 with only one going below the 50 per cent mark. Five farmers in the low one-fifth on the basis of 1940-1942 average return over feed ranked higher in 1940, and 1942 and seven ranked higher in 1941.

The more important of these factors affecting the returns secured from livestock are shown in the tables on the following pages.

178.02 187 ... newart as Foundary was the Tillynniste 27,31 NOCEMBELL OF BUILD et diese e such the side of all sections of Chimitaes Intain 1-101 DOLLARSE. WAS NOT THEN THEN MYGHA BUT THE TO DIE HOT BUILD D.O.L (world) About Park of the Devision of 4.0 1.15 (admed) meets arranged in a an the transmit to sale of one of the sale of the (Sained) And the same same of 614 1.5 17.66 1.51 "Fairte willed to red will

And the later and the property of the company of the later and the company of the later and the company of the later and the company of the c

Table 26. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dairy Cows, 1940-1942 poor paner and he dans req CS recorded 68 farms 8 farms Average highest in lowest in Your of 33 butterfat Items farm farms per cow' Pounds of butterfat per cow was and and the Corn of the same stand . 1984 of their and the 1260 of the Small grain and report of arometer be 1307 18 1621 1162 Com. feeds - under 25% protein 32 72 19 Com. feeds - over 25% protein 104 and the third continues accurate the control Legume hay 1-230 remin out all austral all and 3495 3668 Other hay and wall as as falled and land 199 191 Fodder and stover 253 90 oun of all formers. Not former a the le-Total concentrates 3826 2270 2703 Total dry roughages II a mained and med 4110 3776 Silage 5337 5652 6474 Total digestible nutrients* 5140 4746 5962 T.D.N. per 1b. B.F. 22.4 19.6: 18.8 14.5 13.6 % T.D.N. that is protein Feed cost per cow: \$27.20 \$39.66 Concentrates \$22.03 Roughages Pasture 21.80 22.23 21,85 5.82 5.87 TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per cow: B.F. sales \$92.74 \$66.66 \$117.11 8.48 Dairy produce used in house 6.89 6.37 11.88 Milk to livestock 14.27 16.08 Net increases in value of cows 3.12 7.12 1.34 \$117.02 TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED \$146.68 \$88.36 RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER COW \$79.40 \$62.20 \$38.61 RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$220 \$183 \$217 40.9 Price received per lb. B.F. sold (cts.) 39.7 37.1 36.6 As manufacturing cream (cents) 36.•9 37•3 As mkt. mk. & cm. & mk.for cheese(cts.) 57.1 57.7 Feed cost per 1b. B.F. (cents) 20.9 21.2 23.5

% fall freshening

Number of dairy cows**

64.3

13.6

50.3

12.2

51.8

13.1

^{*} Not including nutrients received from pasture.

^{**} All dairy cows which have at some time in the past freshened are included in the dairy herd, and affect the average number of cows used in computing this table. There is some variation in the number of months of dry period per cow; however, this variation is small for the majority of farms.

sturns from Dunl-Turoo's Sous, 1900-1901	Your ** farm	of 32.	butterfat	butterfat
	larm	larms	per cow	per cow
Nour of 30 butterfet buttern				
eeds per head, lbs.:		762	1150	. 657
Concentrates Hay and fodder	-	761	1152	653
		1,478	1359	1201
Silage		1458	1590	1732
Whole milk		417	509	378
Skim milk gard inch		1318,	1294	::1398
7 41	min	donn Ban	renismer of a hone	
Feed cost per head:	100	nanya car	TATE - Shee	A Company
Concentrates	\$	\$7.54	\$11.45	\$6.39
Roughages Call		6.86	7.01	6.37
Milk		8.40	8.97	8.28
Pasture		2.48	2.38	2.63
TOTAL FEED COSTS	\$	\$25.28	\$29.81	\$23.67
Net inc. in value of other dairy cattle	\$	\$42.16	\$53.05	\$36.89
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEAD	\$	\$16.88	\$23.24	\$13.22
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED	\$	\$168	\$177	\$161
Sumber of head of other dairy cattle		13.6	gordfiel sera	13.8
3 State Bauch	urns from	13.6	14.1	13.8
Number of head of other dairy cattle Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu	urns from		ry Cattle	gabago ^O
Number of head of other dairy cattle Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu	urns from	ı All Dair	ry Cattle 8 farms	8 farms
3 Clerky Bauch City		All Dair	ry Cattle g farms highest in	8 farms lowest in
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu	Your	Average of 33	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat	8 farms lowest in butterfat
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu		All Dair	ry Cattle g farms highest in	8 farms
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu	Your	Average of 33 farms	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow	8 farms lowest in butterfat
3 Oleski Bawans 6	Your	Average of 33	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat	8 farms lowest in butterfat
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retuing tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder	Your	Average of 33 farms	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retuitems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates	Your	Average of 33 farms	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder	Your	Average of 33 farms	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retuing tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage	Your	Average of 33 farms	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Feed cost per animal unit: Concentrates	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Feed cost per animal unit: Concentrates	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209
Table 28. Feed Costs and Retu tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Teed cost per animal unit:	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96
tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Teed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Feed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED, COSTS	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1832 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return Tems. Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Feed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED, COSTS Value of produce per animal unit:	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46 \$46.62	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98 5.08 \$57.28	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60 \$41.86
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Teed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per animal unit: Dairy groducts	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46 \$46.62	ry Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98 5.08 \$57.28	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1832 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60 \$41.86
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Teed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per animal unit: Dairy groducts Net increase in value of dairy cattle	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46 \$46.62	7y Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98 5.08 \$57.28	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60 \$41.86
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Feed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per animal unit: Dairy groducts Net increase in value of dairy cattle TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46 \$46.62 \$70.20 28.47 \$98.67	79 Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98 5.08 \$57.28	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1832 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60 \$41.86 \$51.40 24.32 \$75.72
Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems. Teeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Teed cost per animal unit: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED, COSTS Table 28. Feed Costs and Return tems.	Your	Average of 33 farms 2258 3739 4447 \$22.65 18.51 5.46 \$46.62	7y Cattle 8 farms highest in butterfat per cow 3240 3548 5091 \$33.22 18.98 5.08 \$57.28	8 farms lowest in butterfat per cow 1882 3072 5209 \$18.30 17.96 5.60 \$41.86

^{*} One farmer having both a dairy and a beef herd used a beef bull and included all the young stock in the beef herd.

Table 29. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dual-Purpose Cows, 1940-1942 8 farms To The Terra . Average highest in lowest in Your of 30 butterfat butterfat Items farm farms per cow per cow Pounds of butterfat per cow 190 233 Feeds per cow, lbs.: 1134 402 Corn 812 Small grain 1001 1169 762 14 Com. feeds - under 25% protein 6 Com. feeds - over 25% protein 86 36 Legume hay 2605 3219 3158 886 Other hay 529 246 228 Fodder and stover 275 Total concentrates 1855 2403 1175 4023 3640 3719 Total dry roughages 4500 4203 5017 Silage 43.97 .. 4191 3574 Total digestible nutrients* 24.3 T.D.N. per 1b. B.F. 18.9 22.1 % T.D.N. that is protein 14.2 14.1 13.6 Feed cost per cow: \$24.86 Concentrates \$18.64 \$11.71 18.04 Roughages 18.09 19.39 Pasture 6.10 6.38 TOTAL FEED COSTS \$44.13 \$49.28 Value of produce per cow: \$69.45 \$40.82 B.F. sales \$54.82 Dai'ry produce used in house 10.76 8.15 9.78 Milk to livestock 12.97 14.25 11.60 Net increases in value of cows 7.74 7.01 \$84.58 TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED \$68.31 RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER COW-\$40.45 \$32.57 \$49.13 RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$195 \$203 \$193 Price received per 1b. B.F. sold (cts.) 36.5. 36.9 35.9 24.3 Feed cost per 1b. B.F. (cents) 23.2 21.2 % fall freshening 59.6 37.5 Number of dual-purpose cows 11.8 8.3 11.5

the rest ban find tood a base bred tood a bla wild a stoo gairs a -- a

abrush Tond out the the beet here.

^{*} Not including nutrients received from pasture.

edgels in nose or salv a few of the constant over feel ser out to the office general feetons is shown in Table	oun an	Average of 20 farms*	7 farms highest in returns above feed	lowest in returns
they of protein in the P.P.M. (4) and	Date L		savitarii den teneral Savitarii den Union	
eeds per head, lbs.: Concentrates	Jano'l	648	d. 1 - 657/0 -	704
Hay and fodder	6 1 NO. 1 N	1509		1455
Silage		1957	2272	1751
Whole milk	SHIRE I	263	324	268
Skim milk	O MINIOR	1248	1810	782
eed cost per head:	a to the	to a	4.0	
Concentrates	\$	\$6.59	\$6.67	\$7.30
nougnages	1 22 1 2	7.35	8.05	7.04
MIIR	Litera	6.40	8.00	5.92
Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS	d	\$23.09	2.42 \$25.14	3.06
. TOTAL FEED COSTS	φ	φ23.09 ***	φ€9•14	\$23.32
et increase in value	\$ <u></u>	\$39.37	\$50.49	\$30.22
ETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEAD	\$	\$16.28	\$25.35	\$ 6.90
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED	\$	\$178	\$218	\$133
o. of head of other dual-purpose cattle		16.2	12.0 m	18.6

ersta hand avada	ം പുടുതുപ്പേ		Averag	- 8 farms. e highest in	770 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Items		You far	r of '30	returns	
ounds of butterfat	per cow		190	223	162
Feeds per animal un Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage	it, lbs.;		1665 3474 4110	1982 3131 4812	1596 3699 4180
Teed cost per anima Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL FEED CO		\$ \$	\$16.77 16.52 6.05 \$39.34	\$19.46 16.26 6.13 \$41.85	\$15.95 17.81 5.50 \$39.26
alue of produce pe Dairy products Net increase in TOTAL VALUE P	value	\$	\$47.12 29.89 \$77.01		\$34.80 27.28 \$62.08
RETURNS ABOVE FEED : RETURNS FOR \$100 OF	F 1	\$ <u>.</u> -: - \$	\$37•67 \$197	\$53.40 \$229	\$22.82 \$161
Animal units of dua	l-purpose cattle	u 	17.5	15.4	18.7

^{*} Ten farmers having both a dual-purpose and a beef herd used a beef bull and included the young stock in the beef herd.

The farmer who excels in all phases of the management of the milking herd receives a larger return than one who excels in none or only a few of the management factors. The combined effect on return over feed per cow in the milking herd from excelling in a number of management factors is shown in Table 32. The factors included are (1) pounds of butterfat per cow, (2) total digestible nutrients per pound of butterfat, (3) percentage of protein in the T.D.N., (4) price received for butterfat, (5) feed cost per pound of butterfat, and (6) percentage of fall freshening. Seventeen farmers were below the average of the group in all six factors or above the average in only one factor; their return over feed amounted to \$35.78 per cow. Two farmers who were above the average of the group in all six factors received a return over feed of \$96.85 per cow. The difference between these two extremes amounts to \$55.07 per cow or \$688 for the average herd of 12.5 cows.

Table 32. Relation of Return Over Feed per Milk Cow to Number of Management

Factors in Which Farmers Excelled No. of factors No. The length of the shaded lines are in Average in which of return proportion to the average return over farms over feed farmer excels feed per milk cow \$35.78 None or one 17 XXXXXXXXXX 41.97 . 2 8 XXXXXXXXXXXXX 9 50.83 15 57.31 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 12 70.45 96.85

Table 33. Feed Costs and Returns from Beef Breeding Herd, 1940-1942 7 farms highest in lowest in Average Your of 21 returns returns Items above feed above feed farms Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: Concentrates 1425 1075 1296 1850 1324 Legume hay 1767 550 522 839 Other hay 749 434 Fodder and stover 126 3063 Silage . 2879 3868 120 106 Skim milk* 11 Whole milk* Feed cost per animal unit: :\$13.84 \$10.43 \$13.05 Concentrates 12.92 12.59 Roughages 12.01 Milk* .35 .62 .62 5.86 Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per animal unit: \$ \$12.70 \$12.36 \$9.81 42.59 Dairy products 52.31 63.65 Net increase in value of animals \$52.40 \$65.01 \$76.01 TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER ANIMAL UNIT \$ \$32.10 \$46.52 \$20.39 RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$204 \$261 \$172 16.3 Number of cows and herd bulls 20.9 16.0 Number of animal units in the herd

^{*} Several farmers had both dairy or dual purpose cows and beef cows and fed some milk produced by the milking herd to beef calves.

Table 34. Feed Costs and Returns from Feeder Cattle, 1040-1942

Table 34. Feed Costs and Return	8780-	DOGT ed	9 farms highest in	9 farms
Toward on Variable of the Jacobs	Your	of 37	returns	returns
Items 7 78 FF 14 10 14 1	farm	farms	above feed	above feed
Feeds per cwt. beef produced, 1bs.:		702	653	797
Small grain	4 50 4 50 5	99	54	145
Com. feeds - under 25% protein		15,	5	6
Com. feeds - over 25% protein		26	29	14
Legume hay		256	165	,+18
Other hay		54	74	55
Fodder and stover		42	27	79
Total concentrates Total dry roughages		839 352	741 266	
Silage Per cent protein in the T.D.N.*		511	339 11.3	
Feed cost per cwt. beef produced:		A	A	0
Concentrates	\$:\$8.35		\$9.16
Roughages	(192	1.75		2.84 .43
Pesture TOTAL FEED COSTS	\$	\$10.45	\$9.08	\$12.43
Net increase in value of feeders	\$	\$14,21	\$15,42	\$12.77
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER CWT BEEF PROD) . \$	\$3.76	\$6.34	\$.34
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED	\$	\$140	\$170	\$105
Price received per 100 lbs. beef sold	Ş	\$10.50	\$11.16	\$9.23
Price received, per 100 lbs. bought	\$	\$10.37	\$10.32	
No. of animal units		64.6	61.0	17.6
Pounds of beef produced		34,135	36,193	9,1406

^{*} This is an average for 1940 and 1941.

Superior management in the cattle feeding enterprise results in a comparatively high return just as superior management in the dairy herd resulted in a high return over feed per cow. The combined effect on return over feed per 100 pounds produced from excelling in three factors is shown in Table 35. The factors included are: (1) feed cost per 100 pounds of cattle produced, (2) the percentage of protein in the total digestible nutrients, and (3) the price received per 100 pounds sold. The seven farmers who were below the average in all three factors received a return over feed of \$1.23 per 100 pounds of cattle. Six farmers were above the average in the three factors and their return over feed amounted to \$5.15. The difference between the two extremes is \$3.92 or \$1332 for the average production of 34,135 pounds per farm.

Table 35. Relation of Return Over Feed Per 100 Pounds of Beef Cattle Produced to Number of Management Factors in Which Farmers Excelled

	TOURSESSEE TO	admost of water across in which rathers excerted
No. of	factors,	No. Length of shaded lines are in pro- Average
in which	ch	of portion to the average return over return over
farmer	excels	farms feed per 100 pounds of beef cattle feed
11,5	0	17. The xxxxxxxx Antiber subject the x \$1.23
	1	11 3.29
	2	13' xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
	3	6 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Feed Costs and Returns from Sheep. 1940-1942 Farms Farms Average highest in lowest in returns returns Your of all Items above feed above feed farm farms Farm flock: no. of farms: Feeds per head, * lbs.: Concentrates 61 142 Legume hay 188 161 44 Other hay 29 17 16 30 Fodder and stover Silage Feed cost per head: \$1.04 Concentrates \$.84 \$.65 Roughages 1.04 1.00 191 196 Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Value of produce per head! Wool 11.15 \$2.64 \$2.64 \$2:70 4:85 6,94 Net increase in value of sheep 1.96 \$4.66 TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEAD \$4.65 RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$280 \$187 \$378 Price per 100 lbs. of lambs sold \$11.87 \$11.76 Price per 1b. wool sold (cents) 36.4 36.6 36.6 Pounds of wool per sheep sheared 8.7 9.0 9.3 Number of ewes kept for lambing 24 31 36 % lamb crop . 106 116 87 % death loss 18 15 12 60 No. of head of sheep* (farm flock) Feeder sheep: no. of farms Feeds per cwt. sheep produced, 1bs.: 326 Concentrates 724 587 445 291 166 Legume .hay 76 13 Other hay 52 4 Fodder and stover 35 73 Silage 180 323 Feed cost per head: \$8.22 Concentrates \$7.18 \$5.83 Roughages 1.52 1.17 1.95 Pasture .65 .60 TOTAL FEED COSTS \$10.74 \$9.35 Net increase in value of sheep \$16.47 \$7.74 \$5.73 RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER CWT. PRODUCEDS RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$194 \$235 \$156 10.42 \$10.18 \$10.54 Price per cwt. sheep sold Price per cwt. for sheep bought \$10.47 \$10.16 10.36 % death loss 2.7 3.3 3.1 9541 6896 12564 Pounds of sheep produced

* Two lambs under 6 months of age considered as one head.

Table 37. Feed Costs and Returns from Hogs, 1940-1942

Items	Your farm	Contraction of the contraction o	lö farms highest in return above feed	16 farms lowest in return above feed
Feed per cwt. hogs produced, lbs.: Corn Small grain Com. feeds - under 25% protein Com. feeds - over 25% protein		356 118 3 17	297 98 3 16	424 148 2 15
Total concentrates Skim milk and buttermilk		1494 115	: 140 : 714	589 214
Feed cost per cwt. hogs produced: Concentrates Skim milk and buttermilk Pasture TOTAL FEED COSTS Net incr. in value per cwt. hogs prod. \$		\$5.07 20 19 \$5.46 \$10.10	\$4.30 •24 •20 \$4.7 4 \$10.59	\$5.86 .37 .16 \$6.39 \$9.54
RET. ABOVE FEED COST PER CWT.HOGS PROD. \$	 	\$4.64	\$5.85	\$3.15
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED \$ Price received per cwt. hogs sold \$	المساول	\$189 \$9.08	\$224 \$9.57	\$151 \$8.98
No. of spring litters raised No. of fall litters raised Total no. of litters raised No. of pigs born per litter No. of pigs weaned per litter Pounds of hogs produced	4455 45 8518	6.1	16 21 8.2 6.4 37,046	3 13 7•3

High returns are associated with high quality management. The combined effect on return over feed from excelling in a number of hog management factors is shown in Table 35. The factors included are: (1) pounds of concentrates required to produce 100 pounds of hogs, (2) price received for hogs sold. (3) number of pigs born per litter, and (4) number of pigs weaned per litter. Thirteen farmers were below the average of the group in all four factors; their average return over feed was \$3.77 per 100 pounds of hogs. The 18 farmers who were above average in all four factors had an average return over feed of \$5.66 per 100 pounds. The difference between the two extremes amounts to \$1.89 per 100 pounds or \$566 for the average production of 29,931 pounds of hogs on these farms.

Table 33. Relation of Return Over Feed Per 100 Pounds of Hogs to the Number of

The state of the s		Factors in Which Farmers Excelled	
No. of factors in which farmer excels	ATTOFT SANTO	The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the average return over feed per 100 pounds of hogs	Average return over feed
0	13	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	\$3.77
1	12	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	4.14
2	21	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	4.37
3	21	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	4.92
4.	18	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	5.66

* The data from 4 farmers who purchased feeder pigs were omitted from this table.

Table 39. Feed Costs and Items	Your farm	Average of Sl farms	16 farms highest in return above feed	16 farms lowest in return above feed
Feed per hen, lbs.: Grain Commercial feeds Total concentrates Skim milk and buttermilk		102 20 122	96 24 120 40	116 <u>15</u> 131
Feed cost per hen: Concentrates Skim milk TOTAL FEED. COST		\$1.58 .04 \$1.62	\$1.71	
Value of produce per hen: Eggs sold and used in house Net increase in value of chickens TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED	aboxe.	\$2.18	\$2.73 1.22 \$3.95	\$1.58 .46 \$2.04
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEN	tol=	\$1.37	32.24	\$.36
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED Price rec'd. per doz. eggs sold (cents) % of eggs sold on grade basis Eggs laid per hen		21.5 39	\$238 22.2 56 146	20.8
Ave. no. of hens on farm during the yr. Ave. no. of hens at beginning of year % of hens that are pullets		205 241	202 236 83	192 . 227 .

Superior management leads to high returns. The combined effect on return over feed from excelling in a number of poultry management factors is shown in Table 40. The factors included are (1) pounds of concentrates per hen. (2) price received per dozen of eggs sold. (3) per cent of the eggs sold on a grade basis, (4) number of eggs laid per hen. (5) percentage of the hens that are pullets, and (6) the percentage death loss. Although variations between the top one-fifth of the farms and the low one-fifth according to return over feed are not extremely large, the combined effect from excelling in a number of the management factors shows a marked correlation with return over feed.

Table 40. Relation of Return Over Feed Per Hen to the Number of Management Fac-

No. of factors in which farmer excels	No. of farms	The length of the shaded in proportion to the aver over feed per hen		Average re- turn over feed per hen
None or one	13 24	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fit-	\$.57 1.13
3	12	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	LC.	1.47
5 or 6	14 T	**************************************		1.84

#atlut ago	PRILLE REST BORDER WITH BUTTE			10-1942	Average
				Your	of 4
tems	A	A STATE OF THE REAL PROPERTY.	سيستعطا د	farm	farms
eed per cwt. turkeys produced, I	lbs.:	I dans -	J. Len. VI	12 25 A 12 SA	
Grain	was a second way		and the second second	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	222
com. leeds - under 20% protein	committee of the contract of the	const. The same	All the second second	to a second second	: 63
Com. feeds - over 25% protein	1200 000 2	001	1 × ×2.1 =	-	116
Total concentrates				,	514
Skim milk					32
				/	2
eed cost per cwt. turkeys produ	ced		manufer grande bring &	\$	\$8.25
531.00 Store 5100 Stf		2200			
alue of produce per cwt. turkey	s produced		- 20 m - W	e marine are e	
Eggs and poults	Man	ram E. C	2567	\$	0
Net increases in turkeys	77/27 AD	19 10	attales		\$17.93
TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED	Take at	19- 5		9	\$17.93
ETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER CWT.	TURKEYS PI	RODUCED		Ś	\$9.68
The second secon	1100 11	Albu Cha		2. 10 de 10 mm	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
RETURNS FOR \$100 FEED	987 J. T.	100		\$	\$220
		40.0			
rice received per lb. turkey so	ld (cents)	5 0 0			21.3
boursell has been made as a few of	remark.	130			31431
ounds of turkeys produced	51100	70		-	21421
The state of the s	and Milad	155 (2) 3(1) (1)			
able 42: Feed Costs for Horses	and Misc.	Power ar	nd Machine	ry Expense,	1940-194
	The Park Sept	BELON 1	Average	profit-	profit-
		Your		able	able
tens		farm	farms*	farus	farms
eed per horse, ** lbs.:		2 (0 2 101	- (
Grain			1991	2161	1851
Hay			306 7	2695	3116
Fodder and stover			272	528	418

The	Your	of 90	able	able	
Items	farm	farms*	farrs	farms	
Feed per horse, ** lbs.: Grain Hay Fodder and stover		1991 3067 2 7 2	2161 2695 528	1851 3116 418	
Feed costs per horse: Grain Roughage Pasture	\$	\$19.48 9.57 4.10	\$21.31 9.99 4.20	\$17.95 9.26 4.19	
TOTAL FEED COSTS	\$	\$33.15	\$35.50	\$31.40	
Number of work horses Number of colts		4.3	6.1 1.3	4.3	
Crop acres per farm Tractor and horse exp. per crop acre Crop and general mach. exp. per crop acre	\$ \$	226.5 02.25 1.32	364.5 \$2.10 1.36	166.9 \$2.41 1.41	

^{*} Two farms did not have horses. The number of horses, crop acres and expenses per crop acre are averages of 92 farms.

** Two colts equal one horse.

-1.75

EXPLANATION OF TERM "WORK UNITS"

The total "work units" for any one farm is a measure of the size of that farm business. A work unit as used in this report is the average accomplishment of a farm worker in a ten hour day working on crops and productive livestock at average efficiency or ten hours of work off the farm for pay. The number of work units for each class of livestock and each acre of crop are presented in Table 43.

> Table 43. Number of Work Units for Each Class of Livestock and Fach Aaro of Cross

Thomas	No. of	MINING ESTRIPS .:	· No. of	
Item	work units	Item	work units	
Dairy and dual pur. cows	13.5 per cow	Small grain	.7 per acre	
Other dairy & du. pur.catt	le 4.0 per an. unit*	Sugar beets	3.0 per acre	
Beef breeding herd	4.0 per an. unit*	Sweet corn	2.5 per acre	
Feeder cattle	.35 per 100 lbs.	Corn, husked	1.3 per acre	
Sheep - farm flock	1.6 per an. unit*	Corn, hogged	.8 per acre	
Sheep - feeders	.4 per 100 lbs.	Corn, shredded	2.5 per acre	
Hogs	.25 per 100 lbs.	Corn silage	1.9 ner acre	
Turkeys	.7 per 100 lbs.	Corn fodder	1.3 per acre	
Hens	26.0 per 100 hens	Alfalfa hay	1.0 per acre	
Canning peas	2.0 per acre	Soybean hay	1.4 per acre	
Soybeans for grain	.9 per acre	Other hay crops	.6 per acre	

^{*} Animal unit represents one cow, one bull, one feeder steer or heifer, two head of other cattle, seven head of sheep, fourteen lambs, five hogs, ten pigs, 100 hens or 1400 pounds of turkeys produced.

and the street of the

Ata . Mingratura Da . Sala . Inc

Town agreed a

And on the Live of the service of the live of

served suc Lange serve

animan will be the economic over the con-

Wally the survey of the section of the survey of the surve