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A study of farm labor and farm costs was begun on a selected group of farms in southern Minnesota on January 1, 195j. This is part of a broad study of farm organization and factors affecting earnings of farmers in Minnesota. The apocific objectives of this phase of the study are: (1) to determine the labor requirement and factors affecting labor efficiency on farms: (2) to compare the costs and returns for different crops and livestock enterprises, and (3) to obtain data on the costs of operating farm machinery.

Data were obtained from 32 farms, scattered over the southern quarter of the state. All of these men were members of the Southeast and Southwest Minnesota Farm Management Services. In connection with those services they kept records of their inventories, purchases, sales, crops produced, feeds fed, livestock changes, and farm products used in the house. In addition they kept records of the use of their labor and power and of the operations performed on their crops. These records were kept by the farmers, but were checked at intervals by the research workers to insure uniformity.

The counties in which these farmers were located, and the number in each were:

| Rock --- 2 | Jackson --m | LeSueur --- 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nobles - 5 | Faribault - 2 | Goodhue -- 3 |
| Murray - 1 | Freeborn -- 4 | Mabasha --m 2 |
| Redwood- 2 | Steele ---- 2 | Winona ---- |

Some of the data obtained in 1951 are presented in this report. Data for 1951 and 1952 will be published in 1953.

This report presents mostly averages for the various items. For some tables the farms are divided into two groups -- those with emphasis on dairying and those with emphasis on feeder cattle and hogs. Other analyses are made for some of the entries. These data will serve as a source of information for any persons interested in agriculture. They will provide useful information in planning farming operations.1/

Only direct costs have been used in the calculation of enterprise costs and returns and of the machinery and power costs. Some of the overhead costs and joint costs which can be allocated only arbitrarily have been omitted. Therefore, the enterprise costs presented in the report do not represent the total costs of production. These summaries of the more direct costs and returns provide data which the farmer can use for comparison with his own business. Since the data for different enterprises have been calculated on a comparable basis they can also be used in the selection of alternative enterprises.

[^0]
## Description of the Farms

Records were obtained from 32 farms. Dairy cattle provided a major source of income on 21 of these farms; 17 of them were in southeastern and 4 in southwestern Minnesota. Feeder cattle or hogs or both were the major source of income on 10 of the farms - all in southwestern Minnesota. One farm had a beef breeding herd. Since the type of farming is not comparable with the others, this farm is not included in Tables $1-4$.

The use of land on these farms is shown in Table l. The feeder cattle and hog farms are larger than the datry farms. They raise more corn and cash crops.

The amount of livestock on these farms is summarized in Table 2. The farmers on the feeder cattle and hog farms had more livestock than the dairy farmers, but they also operated larger farms. The intensity of stocking, as measured by antmal units per 100 acres was approximately the same for the two groups.

The average inventories of these farms are presented in Table 3. The values used are those which the farmers carry in their accounts, and are somem what conservative. In most cases land is carried on the books at cost, and building and machinery are carried at cost depreciated to present age. Much of the land and buildings and some of the machinery could.be sold today for more than the value shown here. Many of the dairy herds also are valued at less than current market value.

The average earnings of these farms are oresented in Table 4. These data are presented here in order that the reader will be able to interpret more accurately the information presented in the remainder of this report. They do not constitute evidence that dairy farms generally are more profitable than feeder cattle-hog farms. At least two lmportant factors cause the earnings of these feeder cattle-hog farms to be low. First, four of these ten farmers have Just begun to farm, and have not had time to develop their effictency to the level of established farmers. Among the dairy farmers, 19 of the 21 are well-established farmers. Second, the cool summer and early frost of 1951 reduced the yield of corn more on the feeder-cattle-hog farme in the southwestern part of the state than on the dairy farms, most of which are located in the southeast. Corn yields averaged 34 bushels to the acre on the feeder cattle-hog farms and 52 bushels on the dairy farms. Normally the yields would be approximately the same in the two areas.

Table I. Use of Land
Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Parms - 1951

| Crops | 21 Dairy Farms : 10 Feeder Cattle-Hog Farms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number growing this crop | Average acres per farm | Number growing this crop | Average acres per farm |
| Oats | 19 | 33.9 | 10 | 35.2 |
| Barley | 7 | 6.2 | 6 | 17.8 |
| Flax | 4 | 4.2 | 5 | 22.4 |
| Other small grain Total small grains | 3 | $\frac{3.4}{47.7}$ | - | $\frac{-}{75.4}$ |
| Corn (husked) | 21 | 42.5 | 10 | 81.5 |
| Corn silage | 6 | 7.4 | 3 | 9.4 |
| Soybeans | 5 | 8.2 | 5 | 17.1 |
| Other intertilled crops | 2 | 1.1 | 1 | 1.7 |
| Total intertilled crops |  | 59.2 |  | 109.7 |
| Alfalfa mixtures | 21 | 33.1 | 10 | 25.9 |
| Other tame hay | 3 | 1.2 | 2 | 6.3 |
| Legume or grass seed Total hay and seed harvested | 1 | $\frac{.2}{34.5}$ | 1 | $\frac{.5}{32.7}$ |
| Tillable pastures | 20 | 22.3 | 9 | 23.2 |
| Tillable land not cropped Total tillable acres | 3 | 164.6 | 2 | $\frac{6.6}{247.6}$ |
| Non-tillable hay and pasture | 15 | 17.5 | 5 | 22.3 |
| Farmstead |  | 6.5 |  | 10.4 |
| Timber, waste, and roads |  | 13.1 |  | 13.4 |
| Total acres in farm |  | 201.7 |  | 293.7 |

Table 2. Livestock and Livestock Production per Farm
Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

| Item | 21 Dairy Farms |  | :10 Feeder Cattle-Hog Farms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number producing this 117estock | Average | ```: Number pro- : ducing this : I1testock``` | Averace |
| Average acres per farm | : $\quad$ : | 202 | - | 294 |
| Number of dairy cows | 21 | 20.3 | 6 | 1.5 |
| Animal units of other dairy cattle | 21 | 11.6 | 6 | . 8 |
| Pounds of beef produced | 2 | 314 | 9 | 17,154 |
| Pounds of pork produced | 18 | 24,009 | 10 | 48,691 |
| Number of hens | 16 | 189 | 10 | 136 |
| Total animal unite per farm |  | 55.2 |  | 83.7 |
| Animal units per 100 acres |  | 27.4 |  | 28.5 |

Table 3. Summary of Farm Inventoriee per Farm
Southern Minnebota Detailed Accounting Farme - 1951

| Item | 21 Dairy Farme |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \text { Feeder } \\ & \text { Cattle-Hog Farms } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jenuary 1 | December 31 | January 1 | December 31 |
| Size of farm (acres) | 202 | - $\quad . .$. | 29 |  |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows | \$ 2,756 | \$ 3,091 | \$ 218 | \$ 261 |
| Other dairy \& dual purpose cattle | 1,796 | 2,282 | 88 | 99 |
| Beef cattle (incl. feeders) | 96 | 442 | 6,572 | 9.556 |
| Hogs | 1,249 | 1,501 | 2,721 | 2,945 |
| Sheep (including feeders) | 153 | 194 | 317 | 534 |
| Poultry (incliding turkeys) | 247 | 250 | 150 | 146 |
| Productive livestock (total) | $(6,297)$ | $(7,760)$ | $(10,066)$ | (13.541) |
| Horses | 39 | 30 | 46 | 50 |
| Crop, seed, and feed | 4,598 | 4,581 | 9.541 | 7,493 |
| Power mach. (farm share) | 2,707 | 2,979 | 3.942 | 4,323 |
| Crop and general mach. (farm share) | 3.246 | 3.895 | 3.702 | 4,333 |
| Livestock equipment \& supplies | 675 | 650 | 512 | 611 |
| Mach. \& equipment (total) | $(6,628)$ | $(7.524)$ | $(8,156)$ | $(9,267)$ |
| Buildings, fences, etc. | 11,526 | 12,283 | 10,743 | 10,878 |
| Land | 11,434 | 11,434 | 20.251 | 20,251 |
| Total farm capltill | \$ 40.522 | \$ 43,612 | \$ 58,803 | \$61,480 |

Table 4. Summary of Farm Farnings per Farm Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951


## Comparative Costs and Returns for Crope

Data on costs and returns for the principal crops grown on these farms are presented in Table 5. As stated previously, only those items which aid in determining the most profitable combination of crops are presented. The overhead cost of management. for example, is not included.

The methods used in computing these data were:
Man labor was charged at a unfform rate of 80 cents per hour for all labor. This rate is the average of what farmers in the area paid, or estimated they would have to pay, to a married man. It includes a charge for house, garden, and a certain amount of farm produce.

Tractor power was charged at cost for each individual farm. A weighted average was used for all tractor hours wherever the farmer used more than one tractor.

Truck was charged at 10 cents per mile.
Auto was charged at 6 cents per mile.
Horse power was charged at cost for individual farms.
Seed was charged at cost. In the cases where seed was home grown the average 1951 market price plus a cleaning charge was used.

Manure was charged at one dollar per ton plus the cost of hauling. The charge was distributed to the crops in the following way: $40 \%$ to the field to which the manure was applied, and $60 \%$ to other fields normally receiving manure.

Commercial fertilizer was charged at cost excluding F.M.A. refunds. The entire charge was made to the crop to which the fertilizer was applied.

Crop machinery was charged according to the number of acres on which each machine or group of machines was used for a particular crop.

Iand charge. A uniform charge of $\$ 10$ per acre was used. This represents a close approximation of the average cash rent for land without buildinge in 1951.

Building charge. No building charge was made for the storage of crops.
Prices used in determining value produced represent an average of 1951 prices received in the area.

Weighted averages are presented here. That is, the total costa or returns for all farmers have been divided by the total acres.

Table 5. Selected Costs and Returns for Crop Production Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

|  | Oats | Barley | Flax | Soybeans | Corn (Husked) | Corn for Silage | Alfalfa Hay and Silage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms | 29 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 31 | 20 | 30 |
| Acres of crop per farm | 36 | 24 | 32 | 34 | 56 | 12 | 31 |
| Production per acre <br> Costs and returns per acre | 48:5b | .26.3bu. | 8.0bu. | 14.3bu. | 44.6 bu . | 6.3 ton | 2.9 aton |
| Pre-harvest costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 2.53 | \$ 3.14 | \$ 3.20 | \$ - |
| Power | 1.45 | 1.35 | 1.63 | 3.10 | 3.50 | 3.61 | - |
| Seed | 3.27 | 2.79 | 4.06 | 4.55 | 1.70 | 1.75 | 6.06 |
| Manure | 1.71 | . 99 | 1.02 | . 94 | 2.30 | 2.44 | 2.39 |
| Comm. fert. | 1.34 | 1.66 | . 52 | - | 3.12 | . 95 | . 25 |
| Machinery | 3.39 | 2.03 | 2.10 | 2.31 | 3.33 | 3.66 | - |
| Other | . 04 | $\underline{-}$ | . 20 |  | . 29 | $\underline{-}$ | 1.52 |
| Total pre-harvest | \$12.58 | \$10.15 | \$10.99 | \$13.43 | \$17.38 | \$15.61 | \$10.22 |
| Harvest costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | \$ 3.14 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 1.94 | \$ . 79 | \$ 1.97 | \$ 4.44 | \$ 5.53 |
| Power | 2.01 | 1.57 | 1.31 | . 60 | 1.61 | 2.82 | 4.18 |
| Tuine | . 22 | . 08 | . 02 | - | - | . 07 | - |
| Machinery | 3.20 | 2.74 | 3.18 | 2.26 | 2.56 | 5.51 | 8.16 |
| Other | . 62 | . 32 | . 22 |  | . 32 | . 67 | $\underline{-}$ |
| Total harvest | \$ 9.19 | \$ 7.18 | \$6.67 | \$3.65 | \$ 6.46 | \$13.51 | \$17.87 |
| Lend charge | \$10.00 | \$10.00 | \$10,00 | \$10.00 | \$10.00 | \$10.00 | \$10.00 |
| Total cost | \$31.77 | \$27.33 | \$27.66 | \$27.08 | \$33.84 | \$39.12 | \$38.09 |
| Value of crop | \$39.27 | \$32.30 | \$31.62 | \$40.30 | \$60.62 | \$37.80 | \$55.10 |
| Return above costs | \$ 7.50 | \$ 4.97 | \$ 3.96 | \$13.22 | \$26.78 | \$-1.32 | \$17.01 |
| Cost per bushel or ton | \$ . 66 | \$ 1.04 | \$ 3,46 | \$ 1.89 | \$ . 76 | \$ 6.21 | \$13.13 |
| Ave, price (calendar year) Hours of labor and power per | \$ 8.81 | \$ 1.23 | \$ 3.95 | \$ 2.82 | \$ 1.36 | \$ 6.00 | \$19.00 |
| Hours of labor and power per acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | - |
| Tractor | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.8 | - |
| Horse | - | . 1 | - | - | . 1 | . 1 | - |
| Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | 3.9 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 5.6 | 6.6 |
| Tractor | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | . 6 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 4.3 |
| Horse | . 4 | - | - | - | . 1 | - | . 4 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | 5.6 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 6.6 |
| Tractor | 3.7 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 6.9 | 4.3 |
| Horse | . 4 | . 1 | - | - | . 2 | . 1 | . 4 |
| Bu . of seed per acre | 2.6 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | . 13 | . 18 |  |

a) Hay equivalent tons ( 3 tons of hay silage equivalent to 1 ton of dry hay).

The lowest costs per acre were for barley, flax, and soybeans. (Table 5) These are the principal cash crops in the area. The costs for oats and for husked corn were a little higher. The costs per acre for corn silage and alfalfa were the highest among these seven crops. The crops fall into approximately the same groups if classified by hours of man labor per acre.

The value of the crop and the return above the costs listed are shown in Table 5. However, because of variations in crop yields, comparisons based upon the data for one year do not reflect accurately the long time relationship. The data in Table 6 and 7 give a better basis for selection of crops. These show the average yields for all of the members of the Southeast and Southwest Minnesota Farm Management Services for the 10-year period 1942-51.

Table 6. Comparative Costs for Producing Feed Nutrients Southern Minnesota

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { yield } \\ & 1942-51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. D.N. } \\ & \text { per acre } \\ & 1942-51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost per } \\ & \text { acre } \\ & 1951 \end{aligned}$ | Cost per 100 lbs. of T.D.N. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Man hours } \\ \text { per } 100 \\ \text { 1bs, of } \\ \text { T.D.N. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | bushels |  |  |  |  |
| Grain |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn | 48.7 | 2,223 | \$ 34.00 | \$ 1.53 | . 29 |
| Barley | 25.5** | 944 | 30.00 | 3.18 | . 57 |
| Oats | 51.0** | 1,134 | 31.00 | 2.73 | . 49 |
| Roughages | tons |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | 8.5 | 2,856 | 41.00 | 1.44 | . 34 |
| Alfalfa hay | 2.3 | 2.369 | 38.00 | 1.60 | . 28 |

* Total digestible nutrients.
** Yields adjusted to 48 and 32 pounds per bushel from an estimated test weight of 44 and 36 pounds.

Most of the crops produced on these farms are used for feed. Farmers, therefore, will be interested in high production per acre, and in low costs per pound of feed nutrients. These comparisons are shown in Table 6. The costs per acre shown in Table 6 (and 7) are not the same as in Table 5. The costs have been adjusted to the long time average yields, and to eliminate some chance variations among crops. Corn, either for grain or for silage, and alfalfa produce the most feed per acre; they produce more than twice as much as barley or oats. These crops also produce feed at the lowest cost per pound of nutrients. Alfalfa will yield more protein per acre than will corn, and usually will contribute more to soil conservation. Corn and alfalfa should be the main crops in sound crop rotations in this area.

Many of these farmers also grow some crops for sale. For this the farmer generally wants a crop with a high net return per acre. Here, too, corn leads (see Table 7). Flax and soybeans are approximately equal, with barley and oats giving the smallest returns.

Table 7. Comparative Returns for Cash Crops Southern Minnesota

| Crop | Bushels <br> per acre $1042-51$ | Average price 1949-51 | Average income per acre | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { per acre } \\ 1951 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Return over cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soybeans | 15.8 | \$ 2.44 | \$ 38.55 | \$28.00 | \$ 10.55 |
| Flax | 11.5 | 3.64 | 41.86 | 29.00 | 12.86 |
| Barley | 25.5* | 1.24 | 31.62 | 30.00 | 1.62 |
| Oats | 51.0* | .72 | 36.72 | 31.00 | 5.72 |
| Corn | 48.7 | 1.37 | 66.72 | 34.00 | 32.72 |

* Yields adjusted to 48 and 32 pounds per bushel from an estimated test weight of 44 and 36 pounds.

These data have shown alfalfa to be a desirable feed crop. For maximum benefit in conservation of the soll, alfalfa should be rotated around the farm as rapidy as possible, this means leaving the stand for only a short period. The cost of seeding is a factor affecting this decision. These farmers seeded a total of 374 acres of alfalfa or mixtures of alfalfa with other legumes or grasses. As an average for this acreage they used as seed:


The average cost of seed was $\$ 6.62$ per acre. Commercial fertilizer was applied to 70 per cent of this acreage. Fifteen per cent of the cost of this fertilizer was charged to the nurse crop and the remainder to the alfalfa seeding. The average fertilizer charge per acre seeded was \$4.91. This gives a total seeding cost of $\$ 11.53$ per acre. Since most of this alfalfa was seeded along with a nurse crop, it is very difficult to determine the cost of labor, machinery, and other costs that should be charged against the seedings. The costs would be relatively small since most of the work can be done simultaneous with planting of the nurse crop.

## Comparative Costs and Returns for Livestock

The data on costs and returns for some of the livestock enterprises produced on these farms for the calendar year 1951 are presented in Table 8. The methods of determining man labor, tractor, truck, auto, and horse, charges are the same as those used for crops. The methods of computation peculiar to the livestock enterprises are:

Feed costs include all feeds bought, home grown feeds at average 1951 farm prices and a charge for pasture ranging from $\$ .30$ per head-month for hoge to $\$ 1.50$ per head-month for cows and feeder cattle.

Shelter costs were computed by taking two times the annual depreciation plus interest on investment. This figure was distributed between individual livestock enterprises according to floor space occupied.

Equipment costs for livestock were computed by adding together depreciation, interest on investment, repairs and maintenance.

Interest on livestock was figured at $5 \%$ of the average inventory value.
Value produced represents the sum of products marketed, used in the house, fed to livestock, and changes in inventory. All dairy cattle were valued on the basis of sale prices for 1951. This value was used as the basis for computing the interest charge and also the value of young cattle produced.

Only those enterprises of sufficient size to be important to the farm business are included in the averages. Although the number of farms included in the livestock analysis are small, the averages for feed fed and returns for all classes of livestock are similar to those found on other farms in the area keeping less detailed records.

The ranges of important items which may aid in interpreting the data in Table 8 are:

Size of Enterprise
Dairy cows
Feeder cattle

$$
\begin{gathered}
7-35 \text { cows } \\
19,000-29,000 \text { Ibs. } \\
\text { produced } \\
14,000-83,000 \text { Ibs. } \\
\text { produced } \\
50-483 \text { hens }
\end{gathered}
$$

Man labor
(hours)
73-150 per cow $1.8-4.6$ per 100 1bs.
1.1-2.8 per 100 lbs.
$1.2-5.4$ per hen $4-13$ per hen

The relative average profits from the four major enterprises do not differ greatly. The costs and returns are influenced by the cost-price relationships in the particular accounting year. These relationships may not reflect the long time picture or those to be expected in the future. For longtime planning, therefore. it is wise to adjust the figures for production and prices to those you expect in the future.

The relative returns from the different livestock enterprises can be measured in several ways. The return per $\$ 100$ of total costs in 1951 was highest for feeder cattle and lowest for chickens, although the differences were too small to be very important. A return of $\$ 100$ for each $\$ 100$ total costs would have meant that the livestock would have paid only market prices for the feed, labor and other costs. Since the returns ranged from $\$ 110$ to $\$ 131$, the livestock were also able to help carry the overhead costs of the farm and pay better than market prices for some costs.

Table 8, Selected Costs and Returns for Livestock Finterprises Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

|  | Dairy cows | Other <br> Dairy <br> Cattle | All <br> Dairy <br> Cattle | Feeder $\begin{aligned} & \text { reeder } \\ & \text { Cattle } \end{aligned}$ | Hogs | Chickens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (per | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (per } \\ & \text { head) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (per } \\ & \text { cow) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (per } 100 \\ \text { pounds) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (per } 100 \\ \text { pounds) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (per } \\ \text { hen) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of farms | 22 | 22 | 22 | 6 | 25 | 27 |
| Average size of enterprise | 19.8 | 22.2 | 19.8 | 24,257 | 39,583 | 205 hens |
| Production per animal | $\begin{gathered} 325 \mathrm{Ibs} \\ \text { B. F. } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 325 \text { lbs. } \\ \text { B.F. } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 205 eggs |
| Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$140.77 | \$56.25 | \$203. 88 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 13.58 | \$ 5.14 |
| Man labor | 84.05 | 16.06 | 102.06 | 2.08 | 1.39 | 1.66 |
| Interest | 13.79 | 6.87 | 21.48 | 2.25 | . 28 | . 06 |
| Shelter | 14.17 | 8.38 | 23.57 | . 86 | . 29 | . 30 |
| Equipment | 8.05 | - | 8.05 | . 21 | . 18 | . 23 |
| Power | 2.70 | . 98 | 3.81 | . 41 | . 20 | . 10 |
| Misc. cash | 24.91 | 2.07 | 27.24 | 47 | . 54 | 21 |
| Total cost | \$288.44 | \$90.61 | \$390.09 | \$ 30.42 | \$16.46 | \$ 7.70 |
| Value of production |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal | \$ -4.55 | \$118.60 | \$128.51 | \$ 37.01 | \$ 18.73 | \$ 1.05 |
| Product | 323.30 | - | 323.30 | - | - | 7.40 |
| Total value produced | \$318.75 | \$118.60 | \$451.81 | \$ 37.01 | \$ 18.73 | \$ 8.45 |
| Heturns above costs | \$ 30.31 | \$ 27.99 | \$ 61.72 | \$ 6.59 | \$ 2.27 | \$ . 75 |
| Returns per \$100 total cost | 110. | 131 | 116 | 122 | 114 | 110 |
| Returns per \$100 feed fed | 226 | 211 | 222 | 153 | 138 | 164 |
| Returns per $\$ 100$ feed fed necessary to pay all costs | 205 | 161 | 191 | 126 | 121 | 150 |
| Net return per hour of labor | 1.09 | 2.20 | 1.28 | 3.33 | 2.15 | 1.15 |
| Man hours per year | 105 | 20 | 128 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 2.1 |
| Feeds fed (pounds) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn | 1161 | 316 | 1516 | 666 | 322 | 40 |
| Small grains | 992 | 287 | 1314 | 44 | 104 | 55 |
| Commercial feeds | 474 | 131 | 620 | 35 | 52 | 58 |
| Total concentrates | 2627 | 734 | 3450 | 745 | 478 | 153 |
| Roughages |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hay | 4228 | 1622 | 6049 | 418 | - | - |
| Silage | 7124 | 2628 | 9849 | 342 | - | - |
| Milk |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skim | - | 263 | 295 | - | 34 | 1 |
| Whole | - | 307 | 345 | - | - | - |

a/ Records of purchased feeder cattle are more meaningful when they cover the time from purchase to sale. A less detailed summary of feeder cattle costs and returns for the feeding years 1940-1951 is found in Mimeo. Report 200 and is available on request from the Division of Agricultural Economics.

Return per $\$ 100$ feed fed is frequently used as a measure for comparing the efficiency of feeding for one farmer with that of other farmers who have the same classes of livestock. This measure can also be used to compare the relative profitability of different classes of livestock, by considering the relationship of feed costs to total costs as shown in Table 8. For example, for dairy cows the total costs is $\$ 288$ and the feed cost is $\$ 141$, a $\$ 205$ total cost per $\$ 100$ feed cost. This can be considered as a treak even" point for return per $\$ 100$ feed fed. A farmer can then compare his returns for the different classes of livestock with the "break even" returns.

In some cases a farmer will want to compare the returns per hour of labor. For 1951, feeder cattle produced the highest return per hour; dairy cattle and chickens produced the lowest returns. When studying the selection of livestock enterprises a farmer must consider the number of hours of labor he can market as well as the return per hour in order to obtain total returns to labor.

A large part of the shelter and equipment costs in Table 8 are for depreciation and interest on investment. These are based upon the valuations shown in the farmers account books, and are usually the original costs depreciated to present age. If these were adjusted to present price levels, the shelter costs would be about twice as high as shown here, and the equipment costs would be 25 to $50 \%$ higher. All of the other costs have been adjusted to 1951 prices.

## Costs of Operating Power and Machinery

The costs of operating tractors and crop machinery are presented in Tables 9 and 10. Data on machinery costs and use were available for 33 farms. The methods of determining the cost items for power and machinery were as follows:

Depreciation was copied directly from the farmer's account book. No attempt was made to standardize depreciation schedules for similar machines except to the extent that this was done in the regular accounting work.

Interest was charged at 5 per cent of the average inventory value of the machines.

Fuel, oil, and grease were determined from the record of purchases, with the farmer estimating the quantities used by each tractor or machine.

Repairs and maintenance were the cash cost of repairs and service.
Servicing includes the charge for farm labor, power, and truck, used in servicing the machines.

The operating cost data for tractors are grouped by size of tractor, based upon the Nebraska tractor tests of drawbar horsepower. The range in total costs per hour are:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
.25-.90 \text { for } 7-11 \text { D.H.P. tractors } \\
.35-1.57 \text { for } 14-22 . \text { D.H.P. tractors } \\
.69-1.89 \text { for } 25-27 \text { D.H.P. tractors } \\
1.17-1.58 \text { for } 30-32 \text { D.स.P. tractors }
\end{array}
$$

Table 9. Costs per Hour for Tractors, by Size of Tractor Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

|  | Rated Drawbar Horse Power* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7-11 | 14-22 | 25-27 | 30-32 |
| Number of tractors | 5 | 44 | 17 | 3 |
| Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | . 20 | . 20 | . 31 | . 23 |
| Interest at 5\% | . 03 | . 06 | . 10 | . 09 |
| Fuel | . 30 | . 35 | . 47 | . 62 |
| 011 and grease | . 05 | . 03 | . 02 | . 04 |
| Repairs and maintenance | . 02 | . 13 | . 13 | . 12 |
| Servicing | . 03 | . 03 | . 02 | . 14 |
| Total cost per hour | . 63 | . 80 | 1.05 | 1.24 |
| Average hours used | 263 | 477 | 545 | 475 |

[^1]The costs per hour tend to vary with the hours used. For instance, of the 44 tractors with ratings of $14-22$ drawbar horsepower, 19 were used more than 500 hours, with an average cost of $\$ .74$ per hour; 15 were used less than 500 hours with an average cost of $\$ .90$ per hour.

The average tractor hours per farm used for the different enterprises is shown in Table 10.

The costs of crop machinery are shown in Table 11. The data in the table are the costs per farm or per acre for the farmers who owned and used the particular kinds or groups of machines. Whenever a farmer owned a machine in partnership with another, only the cost of his share is shown here. The total cost is shown for farmers who do custom work; the acres of use includes the acres of custom work done.

Table 10. Summary of Tractor Une by Type of Farm Southern Mnnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951


No farmer owned all of the different machines shown in Table 11. Taking into account the kinds of machines that these farmers owned, the average crop machinery cost per farm was:

| Depreciation | $\$ 473$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest | 169 |
| Fuel | 6 |
| Repairs and upkeep | 172 |
| Servicing |  |
| $\quad$Total | $\frac{155}{975}$ |
| Crop acres | 174.3 |
| Cost per crop acre | $\$ 5.59$ |

In figuring the above costs, only that part which can be charged against the work on the farm has been included. When custom work was done for others, a proportionate share of the expense was omitted.

Table 1l. Costs of Operating Crop Machinery
Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

| Kind <br> of <br> Machinery | Number <br> of <br> Farms | Depreciation | Costs per Farm |  |  |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { Acres } \\ & : \text { of } \\ & : \text { Use } \end{aligned}$ | Cost <br> per <br> Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Interest | Fuel | Repairs <br> and <br> Main- <br> tenance | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Servic- } \\ & \text { ing } \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Cont |  |  |
| General crop machinery | 33 | \$ 92 | \$ 33 | \$ - | \$ 44 | \$ 34 | \$203 | 174.3 | \$1.17 |
| Tillage machinery | 33 | 66 | 23 | - | 37 | 18 | 144 | 134.4 | 1.07 |
| Corn planter and cultivator | 32 | 41 | 15 | - | 13 | 14 | 83 | 73.0 | 1.14 |
| Grain drill and fanning mill | 25 | 29 | 14 | - | 4 | 5 | 552 | 67.9 | .77 |
| Grain binder | 8 | 21 | 7 | - | 12 | 13 | 53 | 60.1 | . 88 |
| Thresher | 7 | 45 | 13 | - | 7 | 5 | 70 | 55.8 | 1.25 |
| Swathers | 13 | 13 | 4 | - | 11 | 15 | 43 | 79.4 | . 55 |
| Combines 5-6 ft. 8-12 ft. | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 107 \\ & 191 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | 24 | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 88 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 217 \\ & 453 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.4 \\ 125.0 \end{array}$ | 2.37 3.63 |
| Hay mowers and rakes | 33 | 31 | 12 | - | 15 | 12 | 70 | 130.4 | . 54 |
| Other general hay machinery | 18 | 16 | 5 | - | 1 | 5 | 27 | 29.1 | . 93 |
| Field chopper and blowers | $12$ | 137 | 42 | 9 | 29 | 40 | 257 | 76.4 | 3.36 |
| Balere | 3 | 203 | 59 | 32 | 74 | 41 | 409 | 292.3 | 1.40 |
| Corn pickers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 row | 10 | 67 | 19 | - | 12 | 9 | 107 | 40.5 | 2.65 |
| 2 row | 13 | 120 | 33 | - | 43 | 29 | 225 | 115.5 | 1.95 |
| Portable elevator | 23 | 32 | 15 | - | 5 | 17 | 69 | 140.7 | . 49 |
| Crop sprayers | 19 | 22 | 6 | - | 7 | 6 | 41 | [ b/ | b/ |

[^2]The relationship of cost per acre to acres of cropland is shown in Table 12. Of the farmers with 175 acres of cropland or less, the 8 who owned only one or none of the larger harvesting machines had lower costs per acre than those who owned two or more. These men used other types of equipment, such as hay loaders, or they hired the use of the large machines. Therefore, their expenditures for custom work were larger.

Table 12. Orop Machinery Costs as Related to Acres of Cropland Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

| Acres of cropland per farm | Number of farms | Cost per acre |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | General, tillage \& planting machinery | Harvest Machinery | Custom work hired |
| 50-175 acres |  | $\ldots$ |  |  |
| 1 or no large |  |  |  |  |
| harvesting machines* | 8 | \$ 2.73 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 3.21 |
| large machines* | 14 | 3.76 | 3.95 | 1.21 |
| 176-300 acres | 9 | 2.44 | 2.96 | . 62 |
| 301 acres or more $\because$ | 2 | 2.32 | 3.27 | . 59 |

* Baler, field chopper, combine, corn picker.

The amount of time used by these farmers in covering an acre for different fleld operations are shown in Table 13.

## Source and Use of Labor

4
The hours of labor per farm worked by the different types of workers and the hours spent on each enterprise are shown in Table 14. More labor was used on the dairy farme than on the feeder cattle and hog farme.

Some of these farms had two operators. The average number of operators per farm was 1.12 for the dairy farms and 1.13 for the feeder cattle and hog farms. Dividing this into the number of hours of operator labor per farm, gives 3,054 hours per operator and 2,818 hours per operator, respectively. This is an average of 8.4 and 7.7 hours per day, for the full year.

The seasonal distribution of this labor is shown in Table 15.

Table 13. Average Rates of Performance for Fieldwork Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

| Machine |  | Number of farms: | At. per Acre |  | Man hours per acre |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kind | Size |  | Man hours | Power hours |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Iow | high |
| T. Disc. | $7^{1-101}$ | 12 | . 40 | . 40 | . 32 | . 59 |
| S. Disc. | 10'-18' | 16 | . 22 | . 22 | . 14 | . 40 |
| 2 bottom plow |  | 15 | 1.13 | 1.12 | . 61 | 1.82 |
| 3 bottom plow |  | 10 | 1.02 | 1.02 | . 72 | 1.65 |
| Spring-tooth | 77121 | 16 | . 34 | . 34 | . 26 | . 75 |
| Spring-tooth | 15:20' | 2 | .27 | . 23 | . 16 | . 36 |
| Spike-tooth | 18'-21' | 20 | . 14 | . 14 | . 10 | . 23 |
| Grain drill | $8^{\prime}-10{ }^{\prime}$ | 18 | . 41 | . 38 | . 11 | . 69 |
| Grain drill | 11'-12' | 6 | . 30 | . 28 | . 23 | . 40 |
| Drill: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn planter | Tractor |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2-row | 22 | . 54 | . 54 | . 30 | .79 |
| Corn planter | 4-row | 3 | . 46 | . 43 | . 29 | . 75 |
| Check: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn planter | 2-row | 6 | . 66 | . 62 | . 48 | 1.26 |
| Corn planter | 4 -row | 3 | . 44 | . 38 | . 30 | . 54 |
| Cultivator | 2-row | 25 | . 46 | . 45 | . 28 | .77 |
| Corn picker | 1-row | 5 | 4.99 | 3.32 | 1.71 | 8.28 |
| Corn picker | 2-row | 9 | 1.53 | 1.26 | . 42 | 2.27 |
| Corn, field chopper |  | 18 | 5.36 | 3.10 | 2.23 | 10.77 |
| Mower | 7 ft | 22 | . 49 | . 47 | . 29 | . 76 |
| Side del. rake |  | 27 | . 36 | . 35 | . 17 | 1.02 |
| Sweep rake |  | 3 | 2.21 | 1.47 | 1.33 | 3.12 |
| Eay loader |  | 7 | 2.59 | . 97 | 1.68 | 4.67 |
| Hay baler |  | 3 | 3.05 | 1.41 | 2.61 | 3.71 |
| Hay, field chopper |  | 6 | 2.57 | 2.57 | 1.20 | 3.57 |
| Grain binder | 71.81 | 3 | 1.11 | . 61 | . 87 | 1.85 |
| Shock |  | 7 | 1.26 | - | . 75 | 1.81 |
| Thresh |  | 7 | 3.41 | 1.26* | 2.09 | 3.95 |
| Swather | 6'-7'-8' | 6 | . 67 | . 64 | . 27 | 1.30 |
| Swather | 121 | 3 | . 42 | . 35 | . 26 | . 51 |
| Combine | 5'-6' | 7 | 1.63 | 1.08 | . 97 | 3.04 |
| Combine | 12 ' | 3 | 1.38 | . 42 | . 72 | 1.84 |

* Plus 1.75 hours of horse work.

Table 14. Source and Use of Labor by Type of Farm Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

|  | Dairy Parms | Feeder Cattle and Hog Farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms | 22 | 10 |
| Acres per farm | 202 | 294 |
| Source of labor | Hours per farm | Hours per farm |
| Operator | 3421 | 3184 |
| Family | 721 | 400 |
| Hired | 1694 | 1327 |
| Hxchange and gratis received | 144 | 180 |
| Total hours of labor | $\overline{5980}$ | 5091 |
| Use of Labor |  |  |
| Crops |  |  |
| Grain | 260 | 297 |
| Corn | 352 | 464 |
| Soybeans | 36 | 66 |
| Hay | 262 | 255 |
| Other crops | 83 | 154 |
| Haul manure | 155 | 147 |
| Tall work | 51 | 120 |
| Total crope | 1199 | 1503 |
| Livestock |  |  |
| Dairy cattle | 2597 | 285 |
| Feeder cattle | 18 | 530 |
| Hogs | 464 | 775 |
| Chickens | 452 | 222 |
| Sheep | 22 | 67 |
| Horses | 38 | 15 |
| Total livestock | 3591 | 1894 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |
| Puilaings and fence | 356 | 542 |
| Machinery and equipment | 194 | 355 |
| Power | 34 | 102 |
| Miscellaneous | 332 | 433 |
| Mory for others -paid, exchange, or gratis | $\frac{274}{1190}$ | $\frac{262}{1694}$ |
| Total miscellaneous | 1190 | 1694 |
| Total hours of labor | 5980 | 5091 |

Table 15. Seasonal Distribution of Man Labor by Source and by Selected Finteroriges
Southern Minnesota Detailed Accounting Farms - 1951

| Month | Source of Labor |  |  |  | Livestock |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { labor } \end{aligned}$ | Oper- ator | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Famm } \\ & \text { ily } \end{aligned}$ | Hired | Dairy <br> Cattle | Hogs | Chickens | Feeder Cattle |
|  | Hours per farm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan. | 374 | 227 | 34 | 112 | 266 | 42 | 34 | 51 |
| Feb. | 358 | 212 | 32 | 114 | 242 | 55 | 32 | 55 |
| March | 420 | 254 | 38 | 126 | 270 | 77 | 40 | 65 |
| April | 430 | 267 | 44 | 116 | 243 | 77 | 43 | 56 |
| May | 570 | 341 | 65 | 151 | 208 | 49 | 39 | 40 |
| June | 557 | 307 | 69 | 153 | 170 | 41 | 38 | 32 |
| July | 531 | 296 | 72 | 144 | 166 | 37 | 36 | 19 |
| Aug. | 546 | 302 | 66 | 149 | 158 | 43 | 33 | 27 |
| Sept. | 482 | 285 | 44 | 128 | 159 | 48 | 33 | 32 |
| Oct. | 502 | 305 | 53 | 122 | 176 | 48 | 32 | 40 |
| Nov. | 463 | 279 | 51 | 122 | 218 | 48 | 32 | 50 |
| Dec. | 392 | 252 | 45 | 94 | 248 | 51 | 33 | 82 |
| Total | 5625 | 3327 | 613 | 1531 | 2524 | 616 | 425 | 549 |
| No. of farms | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 22 | 29 | 27 | 9 |


| Month | Crons |  |  |  |  | Manure hauling | Misc. work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{\text { Small }}$ | Flax | Corn | SOYbeans | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alf. } \\ & \text { mixt. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Hours per farm |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan. | - | - | - | per | - | 14 | 70 |
| Feb. | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | 56 |
| March | 1 | - | - | - | $-$ | 10 | 75 |
| April | 10 | 8 | 1 | 5 | - | 17 | 77 |
| May | 49 | 22 | 107 | 39 | 1 | 27 | 105 |
| June | * | 11 | 53 | 43 | 85 | 6 | 164 |
| July | 7 | 7 | 49 | 39 | 81 | 8 | 147 |
| Aug. | $13 ?$ | 38 | 30 |  | 20 | 8 | 152 |
| Sept. | 24 | 33 | 54 | 5 | 38 | 14 | 132 |
| Oct. | 1 | 5 | 85 | 38 | 4 | 13 | 157 |
| Nov. | * | - | 6 | 4 | - | 11 | 111 |
| Dec. | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 85 |
| Total | 229 | 124 | 385 | 173 | 229 | 156 | 331 |
| No. of farms | 31 | 10 | 32 | 8 | 32 | 31 | 32 |

* Lēes than $\frac{1}{2}$ hour.
** Includes repair work on buildings, snow clearing, upkeep of farmstead and roads, farm meetings, farm business, etc.


[^0]:    1/ The annual renorts for the Southeast Minnesota Farm Management Seritice (Mimeogranhed Renort No. 195) and for the Southwest Service (Mimeographed Report No. 107) present averages for a larger number of farms for in ventories, earninge, use of land, crov yields, feed for livestock, and production of livestock. These reports are available from the Division of Agricultural Bconomics, University Farm, St. Paul 1, Minnesota.

[^1]:    * 75 per cent of maximum drawbar horse power developed in plow gear. (Nebraska tractor tests)

[^2]:    a/ Includes custom work done.
    b/ Record of acres used not available.

