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SOURCE OF DATA

## Method of Study

A three-year study of the organization and management of a selected group of farms in Winona County was started on March 1, 1935. This study is being conducted under the supervision of the Division of Agricultural Economics of the University of Minnesota in conperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. Farms which were representative of the better managed farms of the area wore chosen with the aid of the county agricultural agent, Mr. H. C. Pederson. The farmers cooperating in this study keep a complete record of cash receipts and expenses, a daily record of the labor used on each crop and class of livestock, and a record of farm produce used in the house. Theso records are checked at least twice per month by a field man and supplemented with inventories, feed records, reports of cropping practices and yields, bnd other significant facts about the form business. The data collected are sent to the contral office at Univorsity Farm, St. Paul, where a detailed set of rocords for each farm is kept. This report on farmers' carnings and crop and livestock retarns for 1936 was prepared from these formerg' records.

## Description of the Area

Winona County lies in the southeostern part of the state. The tppography varies from gently rolling to very hilly. Much of the county is covered with a deposit of very productive loossial material. The surface soil is defictent in lime, but lime deposits underlie it at a relntively shallow depth. The soll washes easily, with the stceper slopes subject to considorable orosion. The growing season varies from 140 to 160 days. The average rainfall is approximately 29 inches, 70 per cent of which is received during the months of April to September, inclusive. Livestock and livestock products constituto the major source of income.

[^0]The average size of the farms studied in 1936 was 301 acres, and of those studited in 1935, 334 acres. The average size of all Winona County farms in 1934 was 170 acres, as given in the 1935 census. A larger proportion of the lond was in legumes on the farms studied than for the county as a whole. Other facts about the prganization and production of these farms are presentod on page 3.

There is a soil erosion problem on most of the farms studiod. Most of the pperators are conperating with the Federal Soil Conservation Service in an erosion control program. Since they have not yet had time to put this program into full operation, fow of the effects are apparent in this report.

## Doscrintion of the Crop Seasons

Heavy precipitation, plus the moisture from the winter snows on unfrozen ground, provided sufficient moisture for good yiolds in 1935. Heavy summer rains, hovepor, interfered with the curing of hay and drying of grain in the shock. Moisture was plentiful during the early part of the 1936 soason, but scant rains and high tomperatures during July roduced yields of grain and corn. Seeding began in 1936 almost two weoks later than in 1935. Grain harvest, however, began almost a veek errlier in 1936.

NETHODS OF COMPUTING AND PRESTNTING DATA

## Financial Statenents

Average earnings, inventories and houschold and personal expenses are presented on pages 4 to 6 for all farmers, for the five farmers with the highest labor carnings, and for the five farmers with the lowest.

Some of the farms studied were othor partly or entirely rented. The rental contracts varied. In order to have the data for these farms comparable with the owned farms, they were adjusted to a full ownership basis. All farm property, regardless of ownership, was included in the inventory. Oosh rent was excluded from the expenses and the landlord's expenses wore included. The landlord's share of the crops was included in the receipts. The value of farm produce used in the house was included in recoipts and the value of board furnished hired laborers was included in expenses. Board for hired labor was charged at $\$ 15$ per month. Wages for unpaid family labor were calculated at 20 cents per hour. All interest actually paid was omitted and five per cent interest was charged on the total inventory.

The returns to capital and fenily labor is the anount left as pay for the use of the farm capital and for the labor of the farm operator and his family. Farily labor earnings is what is left as pay for the labor of the operator and his farily, after deducting an allowance for interest on the investment from the returns to copital and fanily labor. The operator's labor earnines is the anount left to the farm operator as pay for his labor and nanagement after all farm expenses, interest on the investment and an allowance for the unpaid fanily labor have been paid. A minus ( - ) onerator's labor earnings indicates the extent to which the roceipts were insufficient to cover tho expensos.

## Iivestock Statoments

The comparative costs and returns for cach of the different classes of livestock maintained in 1936 are prosented in this preliminary report. All data are slown on the basis of a standard unit such as one head or 100 pounds gain in weicht. Both quantities--pounds of foed, days of pasture, man and horse hours,

Facts About the Organization and Production of the Farms


|  | farms | farms | highest | lowest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |
| Daity products | \$1049 | \$1360 | \$1262 | \$1065 |
| Cattle | 771 | 671 | 837 | 517 |
| Hogs | 725 | 1169 | 906 | 1105 |
| Shepp and wool | 93 | 102 | 211 | 6 |
| Pouttry and eggs | 310 | 528 | 415 | 1041 |
| Horses | 110 | 111 | 76 | 16 |
| Barley | 344 | 560 | 981 | 191 |
| Wheat | 147 | 96 | 244 | 34 |
| Flax | 36 | 19 | 47 | - |
| Other crops | 99 | 275 | 732 | 43 |
| Income from work off the farm | 2.52 | 151 | 126 | 147 |
| Miscellaneous | 143 | 536 | 754 | 136 |
| Agricultural Conservation and A.A.A. payments | 105 | 231 | 293 | 138 |
| Fotal Gash Farm Receipts | 4184 | 5809 | 6854 | 4439 |
| Farm Produce Used in House | 363 | 384 | 415 | 326 |
| Increase in Inventory | 14 | 1009 | 2019 | 435 |
| FOTAL FARM RECEIPTS | 4561 | 7202 | 9318 | 5202 |
| EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Catkle bought | 153 | 334 | 466 | 58 |
| Hogs bought | 45 | 95 | 87 | 70 |
| Sheep bought | 7 | 16 | 49 | - |
| Poultry bought | 29 | 38 | 39 | 225 |
| Horses bought | 64 | 65 | 82 | 39 |
| Feed for livestock | 292 | 698 | 464 | 983 |
| Other livestock expenso | 37 | 48 | 45 | 53 |
| Crop expense | 199 | 215 | 263 | 214 |
| Hired labor | 366 | 360 | 359 | 289 |
| Reaf estate | 213 | 425 | 134 | 321 |
| Machinery | 355 | 384 | 566 | 303 |
| Tractor | 307 | 313 | 431 | 17 |
| Truck | 121 | 126 | 252 | 30 |
| Auto | 83 | 95 | 95 | 122 |
| Electricity | 40 | 39 | 31 | 19 |
| Taxps | 244 | 268 | 349 | 180 |
| Insprance | 39 | 55 | 71 | 52 |
| Miscellaneous | 29 | 29 | 31 | 29 |
| Total Cash Farm Expenses | $2526$ | 3653 | 3816 | 3004 |
| Board for Hired Labor | 167 | 156 | 179 | 110 |
| TOTAL FARM EXPENSES | 2593 | 3309 | 3995 | 3114 |
| Returns to Capital and Family Labor | - 1868 | 3393 | 5323 | 2088 |
| Interest on Farm Inventory | 862 | 900 | 1134 | 664 |
| Family Labor Earnings | 1006 | 2493 | 4189 | 1424 |
| Weyses for Unpaid Family Labor | 338 | 453 | 544 | 511 |
| OPERATOR'S LABOR RARNINGS | 668 | 2040 | 3645 | 913 |



Fousehold and Personal

## Inventories:

Ilquse, woodshed and smokehouse
Frrnishings and equipment
C othing, jewelry, etc. Enectric plant and motors* Gets engine* Auto and truck*

Total
Cash Expenses:
Food
Oferating end supplies
Furnichines arc oquipment
Addithons are rerairs on house
Hifred rols
Enectrivitum
Glothing and materials
Health
Sohorl exponses
Rodaing matoriels
Ciurch, charity, etc.
Rucreation
Fersone?
Life insurance and savings
Auto ond truck*
Total cash expenses
Ooch Receipts:

*Household and personal share.
Tncrease in inventory.

| 1936 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 5 with | 5 with |
| farms | highest earnings | lowest eornings |
| \$2614 | \$3020 | \$2792 |
| 415 | 354 | 515 |
| 218 | 245 | 200 |
| 7 | 14 | 9 |
| - | - | - |
| 233 | 407 | 183 |
| 3487 | 4040 | 3699 |


| 292 | 312 | 294 | 358 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 39 | 50 | 39 | 72 |
| 59 | 95 | 130 | 100 |
| 53 | 171 | 35 | 5 |
| 22 | 19 | 12 | 14 |
| 30 | 33 | 31 | 19 |
| 141 | 134 | 94 | 185 |
| 47 | 50 | 12 | 65 |
| 21 | 17 | 34 | 26 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| 39 | 47 | 41 | 56 |
| 18 | 19 | 19 | 45 |
| 136 | 128 | 160 | 247 |
| 144 | 126 | 86 | 115 |
| 314 | 296 | 652 | 190 |
| 1361 | 1502 | 1614 | 1503 |

1361
$\frac{1935}{\text { A11 }}$
farms
pounds produced, etc.--and money costs and returns are shown. The amount of feed, with the exception of pasture, are given in pounds rather than in bushels or tons. All corn has been reduced to a shelled corn basis. The nan hours include both regular daily chore labor and irregular labor such as tending sick animalp, marketing livestock and livestock products, and hauling feed and bedding. The horse hours likewise include both regular and irregular work.

Local prices were used, insofar as possible, in detormining the costs and returns. Marketable feeds wore charged at local prices and non markotable feeds on a comparative-feeding-value basis. No charge was made for straw or for corn stalk pasture. Man labor was figured at 20 cents per hour and horse work was charged to the individual farm at the rate determined for that. farm. The sheltor chnce was based on the annual cost of the buildings housing livestock, prorated on the basis of the space occupied. The equipment charge mas based upon the annual copt of the particular equipment used by that class of livestock. The expense for poptable brooder houses and hog houses was includod in the equipment charge and omitted from the shelter charge. The equipment charge also includes a charge for the wse of the auto and truck in connection with the livestock work. Interest was calculated at five per cent on the average of the begiming and ending inventories. Mipcellaneous cash costs include such cash expenses cs vetcrinory fees, modicine, salt, minerals, hatching expense, fuel for brooders, incubators and tank heaters, horse-shoeing, sheep-shearing, etc. In arriving at the manure credit, consideration was given to the kind and the amount of feed consumed and the proportion of the fertil elements returned in the manure. Credit was allowed for manure produced, less of whether or not it was utilized.

The value of livestock production was determined by adding the sales, the products used in the house and the ending inventory and then doductind from this sum the sum of the beginning inventory ond purchases. In the case of the different classes of cattle, transfers from one group to another were considered the same as purchases and sales. The weight produced was colculated in the same manner as the value produced excopt that veights mere used instead of volkes.

The returns have been expressed in several ways. The gain is the amount loft after deducting all the charges listed in the table. The return ovof feed cost is what is left after doducting the feed cost from the value of the product, excluding manure. In othor words, the roturn over feed cost and the manure are what the farmer has to pay him for his labor, the horse mork, shelter, equipment, interest and miscellancous cash costs. In each case a minus (-) indicates a failure to meet the particular expenses involved.

In considering the returns from livestock, one should keep in mind that these are comparative figures and include some charges which do not represent acturl cosh outlay. The feed, man labor, horse work, use of buildings and equipment, and interest on the investment have been charged to the enterprise, although they may reprosent very little direct cash expense. Therefore, a minus return means that the perticular class of livestock has failed to pay the usual market prices charged for the different factors. There may be no other more profitable alternative use for the buildings, much of the labor, or for the non-marketable feeds. A return above the price of marketable feeds and cash expenses may justify continued prom duction although these figures fail to shov a gain.


The costs and returns are for cows only. They neither include any foed or expense for the bull nor any credit for calves born. Due to tho fact that calves were in some cases allowed to nurse for a short time, it was necessary to estimate their consumption of whole milk whilo nursing. It was assumed that the calves that were nursing received two gallons of milk per day. The value of the dairy products fed includes all milk and skimmilk fed to calves as well as to the other classes of livestock. The butterfat per cow was calculated by dividing the total butterfat utilized (including that sold, used in the house, and fod to livestock) by the average number of cows in the herd.

## Cost and Return per Head of Other Cattle




## All Cattle

Expenses and returns per unit of all cattle, including cows and other cattle, are presented. One cow, one bull, two yearlings, three calves six months to one year old, or four calves under six months were considered as one unit. In this statement any milk used by the calves was included in the feed and in the credit for dairy products fed to livestock.

*Thrce pounds of silage considered as one pound of roughage.

## Shecp

The cost and return per head for sheep are presented above. The number of head of sheep is the average number of mature head for a year when twa lambs up to six months of age are considered equal to one mature sheep. The fleace weight was calculated by dividing the total clip by the number of sheop sheared. The per cent death loss is based on the total number of sheep and lambs, regardless of the length of time that they were on the farm. The lambs raised per awe is the number of lambs raised to six months of age divided by the number of ewes at lambing time.

Cost and Return Der 100 Pounds of Hoss Produced

|  | 1936 |  | 1935 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Range for specified items | Average | Average |
| Nurbet of farms |  | 24 | 19 |
| Poinds produced per farm | 3345 to 37700 | 13124 | 9741 |
| Man labor, hours | 2.1 to 6.0 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Fo-a work, hours |  | .3 | . 3 |
| C., 3 , ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| Brad |  | \$6.62 | \$4.94 |
| Mem labor |  | . 67 | . 57 |
| Hoyse work |  | . 03 | . 03 |
| Sholter |  | .20 | .24 |
| Equipment |  | . 09 | .19 |
| Interest at 5\% |  | . 15 | . 18 |
| Mipcellaneous cash |  | . 06 | . 05 |
| Total cost | \$5.94 to \$10.34 | \$7.82 | \$6.20 |
| Maqure credit | . 27 to .46 | . 35 | . 37 |
| Net cost | 5.48 to 9.79 | 7.47 | 5.83 |
| Averase selling price, per cwt. | 8.05 to 12.12 | 9.18 | 8.99 |
| Returic over all costs | -1.42 to 6.62 | 1.71 | 3.16 |
| Retum over feod | -. 48 to 8.18 | 2.56 | 4.05 |
| Average weight of hogs sold | 113 to 428 | 226 | 235 |
| Pigs faised por litter | 2.3 to 8.2 | 6.0 | 5.9 |
| Feedis: |  |  |  |
| Corn, lb. |  | 214 | 236 |
| Small grain, lb. |  | 147 | 151 |
| Commercial feed, lb . |  | 12 | 17 |
| Total concentrates, 1b. | 133 to 486 | 373 | 404 |
| Skimmilk equivalent,* ib. | 217 to 1605 | 578 | 597 |
| Pasture, days | 0 to 45 | 27 | 27 |

## Eogs

The cost and return per one hundred pounds of hogs are presentod above. The number of pigs per littor was colculatod by adding togother the number of pigs raised to six months of age and those that were sold or butchered at an earlier age. This sum was divided by the number of litters farrowed. The average market weight and the price received per hundrod pounds are based on the total sales of hogs and pigs. The pounds of hogs produced include any gain in weight of breeding hogs and likewise the expenses include the cost of maintaining the breeding herd. The return over all costs is the difference between the net cxpenses per hundred pounde and the selling price. It does not include any receipts from corn-hog benefit payments. The return over feed is the differonco betroon the feed cost and the selling price.

## Cost and Return per 100 Fens


*A minus ( - ) indicates a loss, or a failure to cover the charges. 'One pound of meat scrap or tankago considered as 17 pouncs of skimmilk,

## Chickens

The data for chickens are presented on this page on the basis of one hundred hens. In a few instances, a small number of ducks or geese were raised. In such cases the feed, labor and other expenses, and the receipts for ducks and geese are included. Portable brooder houses were considered as equipment in arriving at the costs for shelter and equipment. The division of the costs between the production of eggs and the production of poultry was made on the basis of the income from each.

## Cost of Horse Work per Horse

|  | 1936 |  | $\frac{1935}{\text { Average }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Range for specified items | Average |  |
| Nuriber of forms |  | 24 | 19 |
| Horses per farm | 3 to 9 | 6 | 6 |
| Crop acres per horse | 19 to 72 | 33 | 34 |
| Man Inbor, hours | 34 to 93 | 63 | 54 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |
| Foed |  | \$40.12 | \$40.87 |
| Labor |  | 12.56 | 10.78 |
| Shelter |  | 8.44 | 10.14 |
| Equipment |  | 4.82 | 5.49 |
| Interost at 5\% |  | 5.20 | 4.91 |
| Miscellaneous cash |  | 1.02 | . 79 |
| Depreciation |  | 9.00 | 6.50 |
| Total cost | \$52.39 to \$143.42 | \$81.16 | \$79.48 |
| Creaits: |  |  |  |
| Hanure |  | 4.15 | 5.50 |
| Appreciation |  | 0 | 0 |
| Total credit | \$2.21 to \$19.73 | \$4.15 | \$5.50 |
| Net cost | 39.47 to 138.77 | 77.01 | 73.98 |
| Hours worked | 616 to 1151 | 848 | 887 |
| Cost per hour, cents | 4.8 to 16.2 | 9.1 | 8.3 |
| Feed: |  |  |  |
| Grain, lb. | 433 to 4012 | 2326 | 2286 |
| Hay, fodder and stover, lb. |  | 4498 | 3808 |
| Silage, lb. |  | 115 | 794 |
| Fotal roughnge,* lb. | 2564 to 9013 | 4536 | 4073 |
| Pasture, days | 7 to 146 | 82 | 70 |

*Three pounds of silage considered as one pound of roughage.

## Work Horses

Average cost per horse and per hour of horse work are presented on this pace. Tractors wore uscd for drawbar power on eighteen of the frams in 1936 and on fifteen in 1935. As the cost per hour of work was practically the same on the nom-tractor farms as on the trector farms, all farms were included in colculating the averagos presented.

Automobiles and Trucks
The cost per mile of operation of automobiles and trucks is shown on pace 15. The labor charge is the value, at twenty cents per hour, of the time the regular farm workers spent in repairing and servicing the machines. It also includes a charge for nny use of horses or automobile in repairing them. cellaneous cash costs include the cost of the license, repairs, parts, tires, insurance and also greasing whon it was done at a service station. Tho miles driven are based on a check of the speedometer reading at the beginning and end of the year.

## Costs per Mile for Automobiles and Trucks

|  | Automo | les | True |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1936 | 1935 | 1936 | 1935 |
| No. of farms | 23 | 18 | 14 | 12 |
| Miles driven per car | 8422 | 7409 | 4792 | 4126 |
| Miles per gallon of gasoline | 15.0 | 14.0 | 12.4 | 12.7 |
| Cost per mile of operation: |  |  |  |  |
| Labor | \$.001 | \$. 001 | \$.002 | \$.004 |
| Gasoline and oil | . 012 | . 013 | . 017 | . 016 |
| Repairs, etc. | . 012 | , 013 | . 022 | . 026 |
| Depreciation | . 005 | . 008 | . 009 | . 011 |
| Interest at 5\% | . 002 | . 002 | . 004 | . 004 |
| Total cost | . 032 | . 037 | . 054 | . 061 |
| Range for specified items, 1936: |  |  |  |  |
| Miles driven per car | 1274 to | 26256 | 700 to | 12553 |
| Miles per gallon of gasoline | 9.5 to | 18.8 | 3.1 to | 18.4 |
| Cost per mile of operation | \$. 017 to | \$. 055 | \$.030 to: | \$. 131 |
| Costs | for Trac | ors |  |  |
|  | TwomPlow | Practors | Throe-Plon | Practors |
|  | 1936 | 1935 | 1936 | 1935 |
| Number of farms | 9 | 4 | 9 | 9 |
| Hours worked per year: |  |  |  |  |
| Drawbar | 194 | 292 | 443 | 372 |
| Belt | 59 | 79 | 137 | 183 |
| Total | 253 | 371 | 580 | 555 |
| Per 100 hours of operation: |  |  |  |  |
| Labor, hr . | 10.6 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 10.7 |
| Fuel, gal. | 235 | 192 | 245 | 252 |
| Oil, gal. | 6.2 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 8.8 |
| Cost per hour of operation: |  |  |  |  |
| Labor | \$.021 | \$.029 | \$.021 | \$. 021 |
| Fucl and oil | . 366 | . 284 | . 352 | . 295 |
| Repairs, etc. | . 033 | .066 | . 053 | . 195 |
| Use of euto, truck and horses | . 003 | . 005 | . 002 | .005 |
| Depreciation | . 085 | . 108 | . 087 | . $002{ }^{*}$ |
| Interest at 5\% | $\frac{.099}{607}$ | $\frac{0.6}{578}$ | $\frac{.056}{571}$ | . 050 |
| Totel cost | . .607 | . 538 | . 571 | . 564 |
| Range for specified items, 1936: |  |  |  |  |
| Total hours worked per yoar | 52 to | 510 | 33 to | 934 |
| Frel per 100 hours, gal. | 170 to | 455 | 194 to | 335 |
| Oil per 100 hours, grl. | 2 to | 17 | 5 to | 10 |
| Cost por hour of operation | \$. 432 to | \$. 882 | \$. 382 to. | \$. 774 |

*Appreciation resulting from extensive ropairs.
Tractcrs
The number of hours tractors werc operated and the cost per hour of operation are presented above for both twomplow and threc-plow tractors. The labor of the regular farm workers used in servicing and opairing is charged at twent $f$ conts per hour. The use of the automobile, truck end horses in repairing or servicing is chargod at the rates found on the farm involvod. Miscellnnoous ensh costs
include the cash cost of repairing, parts, etc. Interost is calculatod on the average of the beginning and onding invontories.

## Grop Statements

Summaries of costs and returns for crop production are presented on this and the following four pages. The data from these farms show a wide variation in the efficiency with which labor was used in crop production. The average amount of $\operatorname{man}$ labor used per acre in 1936 and 1935 in performing the different crop operations with varying sizes of power units follows. The range in amount for each item in 1936 is also presonted.

Sumary of Hours of Man Labor Used per Acro in Performing Crop Oporations

|  | 1936 |  | $\frac{1935}{\text { Average }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Range for oach item | Averare |  |
| Scedbed preparation: |  |  |  |
| Hlowing: |  |  |  |
| 4 horses | 2.1 to 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| 5 horses | 1.7 to 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| 2-plow tractor | .9 to 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| 3-plow tractor | .8 to 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| Disking: |  |  |  |
| 3-plor tractor | . 1.6 to . 34 | . 24 | . 27 |
| \$oringtoothing \& field cultivating: |  |  |  |
| 3 horses | .62 to 1.06 | . 84 | - |
| 4 horses | .59 to .88 | .72 | . 78 |
| 2-plon tractor | .42 to . 93 | . 60 | - |
| 3-plow tractor | .19 to . 79 | . 45 | .50 |
| Horroving: - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| 3 horses | .25 to . 93 | . 41 | . 39 |
| 4 horses | .24 to . 46 | . 32 | . 31 |
| Seeding and harvesting grain: |  |  |  |
| Drilling: |  |  |  |
| 3 horses | . 55 to 1.12 | . 81 | .80 |
| 4 horses | .52 to . 86 | . 63 | .62 |
| Qutting: |  |  |  |
| 4 horses | . 49 to 1.02 | . 76 | . 88 |
| 2-plor tractor: |  |  |  |
| Man hours | - to | - | 1.24 |
| Practor hours | - to | - | . 71 |
| 3-plow tractor: |  |  |  |
| Man hours | - to - | - | . 99 |
| Troctor hours | - to - | - | . 50 |
| Shocking | .6 to 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Throshing: |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 1.1 to 3.7 | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| Horse hours | 1.8 to 7.7 | 3.4 | 3.8 |
| Planting and harvesting corn: |  |  |  |
| Planting | .4 to 1.4 | . 9 | . 9 |
| Cultivating (horses): |  |  |  |
| 1-row | 1.1 to 2.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| 2-rom | . 8 to 1.6 | 1.1 | - |
| Cutting ( 3 horses) | 1.4 to 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Shocking | 1.4 to 5.0 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| Filling silo: |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 3.8 to 9.2 | 6.0 | 9.1 |
| Horse hours | 5.6 to 13.8 | 8.4 | 13.1 |
| Husking by hand | 8.4 to 15.9 | 11.3 | 11.8 |

Summary of Hours of Man Labor Used per Hour for Crop Operations (continued)


The comparative cost and return for 1936 and 1935 for each of the principal crops grown on these farms are presented on poges 18 and 20 . The costs presented are relative rather thm absolute costs. Because many of the cost items, such as the farmer's own labor and the use of his own land, machinery and equipment, do not represent actual current "out-of-pocket" cash expense, it was necessary for purposes of comparison to estimate their value.

The factors of cost were charged at local prices. Man labor was charged at twenty cents per hour. Horse work was charged at eight cents per hour, a twoplow tractor at forty-five cents per hour in 1935 and fifty cents in 1936, and a three-plow tractor at sixty cents in 1935 and sixty-five cents in 1936. Seeds were charged at purchase prices, or at farm prices plus the cost of cleaning. Mnnure Wूs charged at fifty cents per ton plus the cost of application. Forty per cent of the cong mas charged to the land covered and the balance was prorated on an acre basis to the remaining land normally receiving manure. Flat charges per acre were mado for seed for hay crops, machinery and land.

The local farm price on December 1 was used in determining the returns. The value of crops, such as silage, which have no regular market price, were computed by comparing their feeding value with other crops for which local market prices were avallable. The data for cach farm were computed as if the farmer was a full owner.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre for Small Grain Crops


|  | Oats \& Barley |  | $\frac{\text { Rye }}{1935}$ | $\frac{\text { F1ax }}{1935}$ | Husked Corn |  | Shredded Corn |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1935 | 1936 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1935 | 1.936 | 1935 | 1936 |
| Number of farms | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 11 |
| Acres per farm | 18 | 19 | 27 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 10 |
| Costs and returns: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mon labor | \$1. 52 | \$1. 83 | \$1.39 | \$2.78 | \$4.45 | \$4. 62 | \$4.84 | \$4.68 |
| Horse and tractor | 1.90 | 2.04 | 1.50 | 3.01 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.01 |
| Seed | 2.00 | 1.28 | 1.84 | 1.57 | .42 | . 76 | . 48 | . 64 |
| Pwine | . 16 | . 22 | . 17 | . 02 | - | $\cdots$ | .27 | . 25 |
| Threshing ${ }^{+}$ | .67 | . 82 | .36 | 1.48 | . 19 | - | 1.74 | 1.49 |
| Manure | . 35 | 1.59 | . 65 | . 38 | 1.80 | 3.12 | 2.48 | 3.08 |
| Machinery | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.55 | 1.55 | 2.50 | 2.48 |
| operating costs | 7.65 | 8.83 | 6.96 | 10.29 | 12.81 | 14.21 | 16.39 | 16.63 |
| Land | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| TOTAL COSTS | 11.15 | 12.33 | 10.46 | 13.79 | 16.31 | 17.71 | 18.715 | 18.05 ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ |
| Crop value (December 1) | $\underline{6.60}$ | 15.95 | 5.21 | $\underline{9.48}$ | 16.38 | 31.40 | 13.89 |  |
| CROP VAIUE LESS COST* | $-4.55$ | $3.62$ | -5.25 | -4.31 | . 07 | 13.69 | -4.82 | 9.85 |
| Yield, bushels | 21.37 | $27.5^{\text { }}$ | 12.4 | 6.0 | 38.1 | 31.4 | 32.3 | 27.5 |
| Cost per bu.: Avorage | \$. 52 | \$. 45 | \$. 84 | \$2.30 | \$. 43 | \$. 56 | \$. 58 | \$. 64 |
| Lowest | . 35 | .34 | . 60 | 1.33 | . 26 | . 35 | . 40 | . 33 |
| Highest | .83 | . 86 | 1.59 | 4.59 | 1.07 | 1.90 | 1.38 | 2.21 |
| December 1 price | . 31 | . 58 | .42 | 1.58 | .43 | 1.00 | .43 | 1.00 |
| Physical requirements: To harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor, hrs . | 3.3 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 5.6 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 10.5 |
| Horse work, hrs. | 12.6 | 12.0 | 6.1 | 17.5 | 28.1 | 24.3 | 28.1 | 24.1 |
| Tractor work, hrs. | . 5 | .8 | . 8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.4 | . 9 | 1.2 |
| Harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man lebor, hrs. | 4.3 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 8.3 | 10.4 | 11.3 | 12.2 | 12.9 |
| Horse work, hrs. | 4.0 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 11.3 | 17.0 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 17.7 |
| Tractor work, hrs . | . 5 | . 5 | . 3 | . 4 | .3 | $\cdots$ | - | . |
| Soed, bushels | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.7 | . 8 | . 19 | .20 | . 19 | . 19 |
| Troine, pounds | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.3 | - | - | - | 4.4 | 3.2 |

TA ninus ( - indicates a cost greater than the volue of the crop. Includes also charges for mechanicol husker and shredder Set cost after deducting stovor credit of $\$ 1.18$ in 1935 and $\$ 2.08$ in 1936.韩t 40 pounds per bushol

Comparative Cost per Acre for Roughage Crops

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Silage } \\ & \text { Corn } \end{aligned}$ | Alfalfa Eay | Clover=1936 Clover |  |  | TimothySeed | Wild Soy- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Hay | Eay \& | and |  | Hay | bean |
| 19351936 | 19351936 | only | seed | Timothy | 1936 | 1935 | Hay |
|  |  |  |  | 1935 |  |  | 1935 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { Number of farms } & 20 & 22 & 19 & 15 & 14 & 13 & 7 & 5 & 10 & 5 \\ \text { Acres per farm } & 13 & 18 & 15 & 11 & 18 & 20 & 12 & 9 & 4 & 6\end{array}$
Costs and returns:

$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}\text { Yield, bughels } & - & - & - & - & - & .61 & - & 4.1 & - & - \\ \text { tons } & 7.4 & 5.1 & 3.1 & 1.9 & 1.3 & 1.3 & 2.3 & -1 & 1.5 & 1.7\end{array}$
 (or ton) $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}\text { Lowest } & 2.02 & .96 & 2.29 & 2.35 & 4.68 & - & 2.76 & 1.15 & 2.10 & 5.85 \\ \text { Eighest } & 3.96 & 5.68 & 8.68 & 13.43 & 13.37 & - & 5.34 & 5.57 & 12.69 & 16.65\end{array}$

Physical requirenents:
To harvest or first
cutting:
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrr}\text { Man labor, hrs. } & 10.1 & 11.3 & 7.6 & 6.6 & 7.2 & 6.9 & 7.2 & 4.4 & 9.1 & 7.7 \\ \text { Horse work, hrs. } & 24.0 & 24.8 & 11.4 & 10.0 & 10.8 & 9.6 & 11.8 & 3.7 & 13.0 & 19.4 \\ \text { Tractor work,hrs. } & 1.1 & 1.5 & .2 & .1 & .4 & .4 & .2 & .5 & - & 1.2\end{array}$
Harvest or second cutting:
$\begin{array}{lllllllllrr}\text { Man labor, } \mathrm{hrs.} .11 .6 & 8.3 & 5.2 & 3.8 & .1 & 3.7 & 1.3 & - & .7 & 9.6 \\ \text { Howse work, hrs. } 19.0 & 14.4 & 7.6 & 6.3 & .1 & 5.1 & 3.2 & - & 1.4 & 11.2 \\ \text { Tractorwork, hrs. } & - & .2 & .1 & - & - & - & - & - & 1\end{array}$
Third cutting:

Seed, bushels $4^{24} \quad .22$ - $\quad-\quad$ - $\quad$ - 1.0
Twine, pounds 4.83 .0 - $\quad 4 \quad$ - $\quad$ - 1.7 - 2.1

[^1]
## SOME FACTORS AFFBCTING BARNINGS

The data presented in this report show a wide variation among farms in the operator's labor earnings. These variations, in large part, are the result of differences in the size of business, in the selection of crop and livestack enterprises and in the efficiency with which the individual enterprises are conducted.

## Size of Business

Then conditions are such that farming is profitable, the larger farm business, within limits, tendsto yicld the larger earnings. This is illustrated by the data from the farms studied in 1936 (see Table 1). In this table the size

Table 1
Size of Business and Operator's Labor Earnings

|  | No. of <br> farms | Total <br> Size of farm |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |

## *Productive man work units.

of farm is measured in terms of the number of productive men work units. A prom ductive man work unit is the average amount of productive work on crops or livestock, accomplished per man in 10 hours or 10 hours of work off the farm for pay. As such, it serves as a moasure of either crop or livestock enterprises or both. On the average, the farmers with a large business had larger earnings than the farmers with a small business, When conditions are such that farming is unprofitable, the operators of large farms may be expected to incur somewhat larger losses.

## Selection of Crops

The comparative return per acre varios among the different crops. The differences among crops from the standpoint of economy in the production of feed are indicated by the data in Table 2. This table shows the production per acre and

Table 2
Production per Acre and Relative Cost per Hundred Pounds of Digestible Nutrients - Winona County

| Crop | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { yield } \\ & (1917-35) \end{aligned}$ | Totel lbs. digestible nutrients ${ }^{+}$ | op protein is of total nutrionts ${ }^{+}$ | Cost per 100 lbs. of total nutrients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grains: | bushel |  |  |  |
| Corn | 37.4 | 1711 | 8.7 | \$7.00 |
| Barley | 26.4 | 1006 | 11.3 | 1.22 |
| Oats | 35.8 | 806 | 13.8 | 1.42 |
| Wheat | 17.0 | 808 | 11.1 | 1.50 |
| Roughages: | ton |  |  |  |
| Alfolfa | 2.6 | 2652 | 20.8 | .43 |
| Clover and timothy | 1.7 | 1676 | 10.3 | . 55 |
| Silage | 7.8 | 2621 | 7.2 | . 79 |

*Yields of alfalfa, clover and timothy, and silage estimated from available data. All other yields from annual reports of State Department of Agriculture.
tanclysis of feeds from "Feeding the Dairy Herd", by Bekles, Minnesota Bulletin 218 (1932).
the relntive cost per hundred pounds of digestible nutrients for the common feed crops based on nineteen-ycar average yields and the avorage costs obtained on the farms studied, adjusted for differences in yield.

On the basis of past yields and present costs, the lowest cost feed-grain crop is corn. It produces move nutrients per acre and at a lower cost than either oats, bapley or wheat. Barley is next to corn in the amount of feed produced and in cheapness. When the higher percentage of protein in barley and the greater susceptibility to erosion of land in corn are considered, the difference between these two crops in the cost per 100 pounds of digestible nutrionts becomes loss significent.

Alfalfa, on the basis of the above dat:, is the chempest source of roughage. It also has the further edvantages of producing the largest quantity of nutrients per acre and of containing the highest percentage of protein. Silage has the disadvantage of a high cost and a very low protein content. However, it offers a method of utilizing the entire corn crop.

Many farms raise some crops for sale. One important consideration in selecting these must be the not returns per acre. It is impossible to predict with ant assurance, what the prices for crops will be in the future. However, it is possible to calculate the relative profitableness of the various crops, י1sing avorage crop vields and prices and 1935-36 costs on the farms studied. The results of such a calculation are shown in Table 3.

$$
\text { Table } 3
$$

Comparative Returns per Acre of Crops
Winona County

|  | Melting barley | Flox | Corn | Finter wheat | Spring wheat | Oats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost per acre | \$12. 25 | \$15.30 | \$17.00 | \$12.50 | \$11.80 | \$11.50 |
| Yield (1917-35) bushel | 26.4 | 12.0 | 37.4 | 1.8 .2 | 15.8 | 35.8 |
| Price per bushol (1926-35) | \$. 69 | \$1.71. | \$. 55 | \$. 83 | \$. 86 | \$. 32 |
| Net return per ecre | 5.97 | 5.22 | 3.57 | 2.61 | 1.79 | -. 04 |

## Selection of Livestock Enterprises

The data presented in this roport show differences in profitability among the different classes of livestock. Data for several years, hovever, are needed in order to determine accurately the most profitable combination of livestock enterprises for a particular farm, especially in view of the abnormal feed situation that existed in 1935 and 1936.

## Fificiency in Conducting Enterprises

The net returns from the individual enterprises will determine the operator"s labor earnings. Efficient operation gill increasc the net return of the enterprises.

High crop yields winl, within limits, increase the cash crop income or the quantity of feed produced, with a less than proportional incroase in costs. The offect of yicld upon tho cost per acre and per bushel of producing barley is shown in Table 4. A fem things that favor a large yiold of crops per nere are (1) a well prepared seedbed, (2) early seeding, (3) the use of the varieties best adopted to the farm, and (4) the plenting of clean seed of high vitality.

Table 4
The Yield, Cost per Acre, and Cost per Bushel of Barley Winona County

|  | Number | Average | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | of farms | yield, bughols | Per acre | Per buchel |
| Under 1.3 bushels | 6 | 11 | \$11.00 | \$1.00 |
| 13 to 19 bushels | 7 | 15 | 11.54 | . 77 |
| Over 19 bushels | 6 | 25 | 12.71 | . 51 |

Return over feed cost is a valuable measure of livestock efficiency. Fced is usually the largest single item of cost for livestock, A large part of the feed is either purchased or markatable. Shelter, equipment, and some labor involve no cash outlay during most yoars; they frequently have no profitable use except for livestock. Feed is, therefore, the most important item of cost that can be chenged from year to year by the farmer.

Increased butterfat production per cow tends to increase return over feed cost (see Trole 5). Naturally, there is a limit beyond which greater production

## Table 5

Butterfat Production and Return over Feed Cost per Cow

| production | No. of <br> farms | Averace <br> production | Feed <br> cost | Return over <br> feed cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 190 pounds | 9 | 160 | $\$ 24.61$ | $\$ 45.68$ |
| $190-239$ pounds | 8 | 208 | 39.90 | 50.54 |
| 240 pounds and over | 7 | 276 | 51.35 | 68.20 |

can be obtained only at an additional cost which exceeds the value of the additional product. Increased production requires the feeding of a higher proportion of concentrates, which will usually increase the average cost of nutrients. This is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6
Butterfat Production per Cow and Cost por 100 Pounds of Totcl Digestible Nutrients Fed

| Production | No. of farms | Average production | Totil digestible nutrients fed | Cost per 100 <br> 10s. total. <br> digestible <br> nutarients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jnder 190 pounds | 9 | 160 | 2652 | \$. 69 |
| 190-239 pounds | 8 | 208 | 3563 | 1.01 |
| 240 pounds and over | 7 | 276 | 4358 | 1.13 |

One of the important fectors affecting return over feed cost for hogs is the number of pigs raised per litter. According to Table 7, the return over feed cost is groator for the herds where tho greatest number of pigs per littar were scved.

## Table 7

Pigs per Litter and Return over Feed Cost per 100 Pounds of Pork Produced

| Pigs per litter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. ô } \\ & \text { forms } \end{aligned}$ | Average no. pies sared. | Return over feed cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 6.0 | 11 | 4.5 | \$2.17 |
| 6.0 and over | 13 | 7.2 | 2.89 |
| Increased egg production per hen tends to increase the return over feed cost. The cight flocks with less than 110 eges per hen yielded very little return over the cost of feed (see Table 8). |  |  |  |
| Table 8 |  |  |  |
| Beg Production and Return over Feed Cost nor Hen |  |  |  |
| Eggs per hen | No. of farms | Average no. of egrs | Return over feed cost |
| Under 110 | 8 | 82 | \$. 16 |
| 110-139 | 8 | 124 | . 70 |
| 140 and over | 7 | 162 | 1.50 |

Numercus other factors affect the cost and roturn for the various farm enterprises and thereby affect tho operator's earnings. A careful comparison of the duta for his farm contained in this report and in mimeographed reports nos, 81 and 85 with that for the other farmers should onable each cooperator to improve his mothods and increase his earnings.


[^0]:    Note: Completion of thds project was made possible by workers supplied on Foderal Student Work Project, 1936-37, Project Numbor 39-100. Sponsor: University of Minnesota.

[^1]:    *Includes also hulling and threshing charges.
    tNet cost after deducting credit for corn knocked off by binder of $\$ .80$ in 1935 and $\$ 3.35$ in 1936.

