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## INTRODUCTION

The Division of Agricultural Ennomics and the Divisinn of Agricultural Extension of the University of Minnesota, the Bureau of Agricultural Bonomics 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 Assnciatinn in maintaining a farm management service. The Association was organized in the fall of 1939 by farmers in that part of the state for the purpose of studying the farm business through 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 Mimesote.

Note: Assistance in the preparation of this material was furnished by wrivers supplied on N.Y.A. Student Whrk Project Nr. 0061-100. Spnnsnr: University of Minnesnta.

The analysis of the records and the preparation of the reports is handled by the Division of Agricultural Eennomics under the Direction of G. A. Pond, T. R. Nodland, and G. E. Toben. Field organizatinn is handled by the Extension Division with S. B. Cleland and J. B. MciTulty in charge of this work. Ross Huntsinger has been fieldman since the organization of the project. At the end of the year A. W. Anderson and Max Hinds of the Division of Agricultural Eonomics aided in closing the records. County Agricultural extension agents who conperate in this project include Paul Kunkel, D. C. Rogers, C. G. Gaylord, I. S. Orfield, T. G. Fuller, F. J. Meade, C. G. Powell, A. B. Hagen, C. E. Stower, J. I. Swedberg. and J. R. Gute.

The officers for the Southwest Farm Management Association for 1940 were:

President, W, E. Jones, Marshall, Lyon County Vice President, Porter Olstad, Hanska, Brown County Secretary-Treasurer, E. F. Oberg, Hadley, Murray County

The board of directors include these officers and also the following: Earl Ewen, Cottonwood County; Ed Stevermer, Faribault County; George Kentschler, Jackson County; Joe Boulton, Lincoln County; Paul H. Peters, Martin County; Gordon Fresk, Murray County; Bedford Ludlow, Nobles County; Thomas Hicks, Redwood County; and Duane Drake, Watonwan County.

The following tabulation shows by counties the numbers of members who completed records in 1940:

| Brown | 14 | Lincoln | 9 | Nobles | 21 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Cottonwood | 15 | Lyon | 12 | Redwood | 21 |
| Faribault | 22 | Martin | 16 | Watonwan | $\frac{11}{175}$ |
| Jackson | 20 | Murray | 14 | Total | 175 |

The tables on page 4 and succeeding pages show 165 farms. Ten farms have been omitted from all of the averages in the tables because they differed so widely in type from the others or were not sufficiently complete for a full analysis.

## TYPE OF FARMIIVG*

The farms in this area have a wide diversity of enterprises. All classes of livestock are important although livestock kept for ment 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 cesh crops,

TOPOGRAPHY, SOILS, ALD WHATHER
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 the land is tillable and well drained.

The year 1940 as a whle was normal in regard to temperatures. Unfavorable weather conditions in the arly spring delayed the seeding of small grain; however the growing conditinns in May and. June were favorable. Corn was injured to some extent by hot, dry weather in the latter part of July. Weather conditions in September and October were very favorable for late crops and pasture. The first killing frost occurred about October 15.

[^0]Table 1. Monthly and Annual Precipitation

|  | ```Worthington Precipi- Depart- tation ure from normal``` |  | ```Fairmont Precipi-Depart- tation ure from normal``` |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { New Ulm } \\ \text { Precipi- Depart- } \\ \text { tation ure from } \\ \text { normal } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\frac{\text { Redwood Falls }}{\text { Precipi- Depart }}$tation ure fromnormal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches |
| January | Trace | -0.63 | 0.23 . | -0.57 | 0.72 | -0.41 | 0.13 | -0.60 |
| February | . 82 | +0.05 | 0.70 | -0.27 | 1.56 | +0.50 | 0.80 | -0.07 |
| March | 1.96 | +0.70 | 1.35 | -0.06 | 3.50 | +1.89 | 1.93 | +0.68 |
| April | 2.75 | +0.67 | 1.57 | -0.66 | 1.90 | -0.29 | 1.63 | -0.30 |
| May | 1.20 | -2.74 | 2.12 | -1.93 | 1.66 | -1.91 | 2.48 | -0.38 |
| June | 5.67 | $+1.38$ | 4.84 | +0.50 | 7.32 | $+2.67$ | 4.75 | +0. 26 |
| July | . 34 | -3.05 | 0.60 | $-2.96$ | 0.52 | -3.16 | 0.91 | -2.13 |
| August | 2.77 | -0.99 | 8.80 | $+5.06$ | 10.07 | $+6.52$ | 7.18 | +4.20 |
| September | . 70 | -2.84 | 1.41 | -2.22 | 1.05 | -2.54 | 0.49 | -2.37 |
| October | 2.81 | +1.12 | 3.38 | $+1.53$ | 4.63 | $+2.47$ | 2.77 | +1.10 |
| November | 2.72 | +1. 55 | 2.56 | $+1.05$ | 2.45 | $+1.14$ | 1.80 | +0. 59 |
| December | . 76 | +0.15 | 1.16 | +0.26 | 1.52 | +0.62 | 1.08 | 0.00 |
| 1940 Total | 22.50 | -4.63 | 28.72 | -0.27 | 36.90 | +7.50 | 25.95 | +0.98 |
| 1939 Total | 24.27 | -2.86 | 21.92 | -7.07 | 23.04 | $-6.35$ | 18.52 | -6.45 |
| 1938 Total | 40.50 | +13.37 | 39.99 | $+11.00$ | 29.98 | +0.58 | 26,84 | $+1.87$ |
| Normai Annual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prec. | 27.13 |  | 28.99 |  | 29.40 |  | 24.97 |  |

## RECORDS KHPT

The records kept by the cooperators included inventories at the beginning and end of the year, cash receipts and expenses, a report of feed fed to the various classes of livestock, and a record of farm produce used by the farm family. Supplementary informetion was also secured during the year regarding crop and livestock production and practices.

The cooperators were assisted and supervised in kerping their records by the field agent, Ross Huntsinger, who visited each farm in the eleven counties several times during the year. In addition to securing the supplementary information, the field agent's duties included 'numerous services, viz., securing a monthly list of prices of farm products prevailing in the area, helping the farmer place uniform values on real estate and equipment, checking the cash and feed records, and answering any questions that might arise as to how the entries should be made in the account book. The supervision resulted in uniformity in the type of records secured, in the inventory valuations and in the prices at which feed and farm produce were charged.

At the end of the year, the books were taken to the central office at University Farm, where they were summarized. For the purpose of comparison, the enrnings as shown in this report are computed as if ench ferm were owned by its operator; however, each tenant is supplied a statement of his earnings on the basis of the rental system under which he is operating.

| Items | Your farm | Average of 165 farms | 33 most profitable farms | 33 least <br> profitable <br> farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size of farm (acres) |  | 279 | 402 | 236 |
| Size of business (work units)* |  | 569 | 774 | 45.7 |
| Horses |  | \$. 377 | \$ 408 | \$ 430 |
| Productive livestock (total) |  | 3,497 | 5,728 | 2,674 |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows. |  | 574 | 588 | 480 |
| Other dairy io dual purpose cattle |  | 374 | 426 | 219 |
| Beef cattle (incluaing feeders) |  | 1,530 | 3,238 | 990 |
| Hogs |  | 550 | 758 | 575 |
| Sheep (including feeders) |  | 327 | 617 | 245 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 142 | 101 | 165 |
| Crop, seed, and feed |  | 3,616 | 5,613 | 2,757 |
| Mach: \& equipment (total) |  | ?,658 | 3,659 | 2,257 |
| Power mach. (f. share) |  | 998 | 1,391 | 774 |
| Crop \& gen. mach. (f. share) |  | 1,283 | 1,832 | 1,064 |
| Livestock equip. \& supplies |  | 377 | 436 | 419 |
| Buildings, fences, etc. |  | 6,974 | 8,734 | 6,829 |
| Land |  | 15,011 | 21,636 | 12,809 |
| Total farm capital |  | 32,133 | 45,778 | 27,756 |

* Explanation of term: "Work units."

The total "work units" for any one farm is a measure of size of that farm business. It is the accomplishment of a farm worker in a ten-hour day working on crops and productive livestock at average efficiency.

The number of work units for each animal and each acre of crops used in this report are listed as follows:

| Item | Per | ino. of work units | Item | Per | No. of work units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy and dual | cow | 13.5 | Small grain | scre | . 7 |
| - purpose cows |  |  | Soybeans for grain | " | .9 |
| Other dairy \& dual |  | 4.0 | Sugar beets | " | 3.0 |
| purpose cattle | ) animal |  | Sweet corn | " | 2.5 |
| Beef breeding herd | ) unit* | 4.0 | Corri, husked | " | 1.3 |
| Sheep - farm flock |  | 1.6 | Corn, hagged | " | . 8 |
| Hens | 100 hens | 26.0 | Corn, shredded | " | 2.5 |
| Feeder cattle | ) | .35 | Corn silace | " | 1.9 |
| Feeder sheep | ) 100 lbs | . 4 | Corn fodder | " | 1.3 |
| Hogs . | ) produced | .25 | Alfalfa hay | " | 1.0 |
| Turkeys | ) | . 7 | Soyboan hay | " | 1.4 |
| Canning pers. | acre | 2.0 | Other hay crops | " | . 6 |

*Animal unit represents one cow, one bull, one ferder steer or heifer, two head of other cattle, seven head of sheep, fourtwen lambs, five hogs, ten pigs, 100 hens, or $1,400 \mathrm{lbs}$. turkeys produced.

Sumary of Farm Inventories (End of Year), 1940


Summary of Amoint of Livestock

|  $\ddots$ $\cdots$ Your <br> Items $\ddots$ $\cdots$ farm | Average of 165 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of horses | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| No. of colts | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.0 |
| No. of dairy do dual purpose cows | 8.6 | 8.3 | 8.0 |
| Head of other dairy a dual purpose cettle | 9.0 | 8.1 | 7.5 |
| Head of cattle kept in beef breeding herd | 9.0 | 14.5 | 6.9 |
| pounds of beef cattle produced. | 8,678 | 21,539 | 4,031 |
| Litters of pigs | 13.6 | 17.9 | 13.3 |
| Pounds of hoes produced. | 21,335 | 32,231 | 18,101 |
| Head of sheep ( 2 lambs = 1 head) | 40.5 | 61.4 | 35.6 |
| No. of hens. | 161 | 146 | 145 |
| Total no. of prod. Livestock animal units | 55.3 | 91.8 | 41.3 |
| Gof total that are: |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows | 21.7 | 14.5 | 24.1 |
| Other dairy and dual purpose cows | 12.9 | 8.3 | 11.9 |
| In beef breeding herd | 11.3 | 14.9 | 10.8 |
| Feeder cattle | 18.1 | 31.2 | 12.6 |
| Native sheep | 5.1 | 4.1 | 5.3 |
| Feeder sheep | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| Hogs | 21.1 | 18.4 | 24.5 |
| Turkeys | 2.2 | 1.5 | 3.3 |
| Hons | 4.1 | 2.6 | 4.0 |
| Number of farms with tractors | 155 | 32 | 29 |


| Items | Average. of 165 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 33 least profitable farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RM EXPETSES |  |  |  |
| Horses bought | \% 32 | \$ 51 | \$ 31 |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows bought | 33 | 33 | 26 |
| Oth. dairy \& dual purpose cattle bought | 43 | 62 | 24 |
| Beef cattle bought(including feeders) | 1243 | 2679 | 760 |
| Hogs bought | 103 | 128 | 85 |
| Sheep bought (including feeders) | 414 | 811 | 292 |
| Poultry bought (including turkeys) | 99 | 131 | 91 |
| Misc. crop expenses | 243 | 406 | 166 |
| Feed bought | 1007 | 1821 | 861 |
| Power mach. (farm share)(new) | 379 | 459 | 376 |
| Power mach. (farm share)(unkeoj) | 411 | 560 | 354 |
| Custom work hired | 150 | 173 | 127 |
| Crop and general mach. (new) | 319 | 683 | 231 |
| Crop and general mach. (upkerp) | 69 | 98 | 57 |
| Livestock equipment (new) | 74 | 84 | 43 |
| Livestock equipment (upkeop) | 20 | 25 | 17 |
| Misc. livestock expense | 72 | 98 | 68 |
| Euildings and foncing (now) | 412 | 621 | 339 |
| Buildings and fencing (upkerp) | 88 | 125 | 83 |
| Hired labor | 392: | 630 | 312 |
| Taxes | 313 | 472 | 273 |
| Insurance | 15 | 20 | 10 |
| General farm | 59 | 72 | 59 |
| (1) Total farm purchases | 5990 | 10242 | 4685 |
| (2) Decrease in farm capital | - | - | - |
| (3) Board furnished hired labor | 131 | 194 | 103 |
| (4) Interest on farm croital | 1635 | 2362 | 1398 |
| (5) Unpaid family labor | 252 | 316 | 257 |
| (6) Total farm expenses( Sum of (1) to (5) | $\overline{8008}$ | $1 \overline{3314}$ | 6443 |
| FARM, RECEIPTS $\quad \cdots \quad \cdots$ |  |  |  |
| Horses | 42 | 56 | 67 |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows | 110 | 122 | 66 |
| Dairy products | 570 | 58? | 429 |
| Other dairy and dual purpose cattle | 155 | 127 | 93 |
| Beef cattle (including feeders) | 2373 | 5160 | 1343 |
| Hogs | 1162 | 1673 | 1067 |
| Sheep and wool (including feeders) | 470 | 839 | 363 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) | 372 | 521 | 262 |
| Erss | 244 | 210 | 267 |
| Corn | 516 | 749 | 343 |
| Small Erain | 849 | 1461 | 521 |
| Other crops | 239 | 381 | 176 |
| Power machinery sold | 168 | 208 | 136 |
| Crop and gen, mach. sold | 81 | 185 | 45 |
| Mise. | 394 | 607 | 219 |
| Income from work off the farm | 193 | 262 | 82 |
| Agricultural adjustment payments | 506 | 795 | 417 |
| (7) Total ferm salos .... | 8414 | 13938 | 5896 |
| (8) Increase in farm capital | 1179 | 2614 | 416 |
| (9) Farm prod. used in thouse + house |  |  |  |
| (10) Total farm receipts (7)+(8)+(9) | $\underline{483}$ | $\frac{555}{17437}$ | $\frac{475}{6787}$ |
| (6) Total farm expenses | 8008 | 13114 | 6443 |
| (11) Operator's labor earnings(10)-(6) | 2098 | 4323 | 344 |


|   Your <br> Items farn  | Averase of 165 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farns } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPENSES AND NTET DECREASES |  |  |  |
| Total power \$ | \$: 674 | \$ 876 | \$ 646 |
| Horses | 144 | 182 | . 160 |
| Tractor | 231. | - $\quad 303$ | $\cdots: 204$ |
| Truck | 67 | 138 | 54 |
| Auto (farm share) | 137 | 144 | 139 |
| Gas engine (farm share) | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Qlec. plant or current(farm share) | 32 | 38 | 35 |
| Hired power | 61 | 69 | 50 |
| Crop and general machinery | 223 | 315 | 203 |
| Livestock equipment | 67 | 76 | 65 |
| Buildings, fencing and tiling | 240 | 325 | 270 |
| Misc. productive livestock expense | 70 | 96 | 66 |
| Labor | 807 | 1,176 | 698 |
| Real estate taxes | 269 | 395 | 242 |
| Personal property tax | 44 | 77 | 31 |
| Insurance | 15 | 20 | 10 |
| General farm | 59 | - 72 | 59 |
| Interest on farm capital | 1,636 | 2,362 | 1,398 |
| (1) Total expenses \& net decreases | 4,104 | 5,790 | 3,688 |
| RETURISS AND NET Incirases |  |  |  |
| All productive livestock | \$4, 194 | \$6,935 | 83,011 |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows | -682 | . 732 | $547$ |
| Othor dary \& dual purpose cattle | 294 | 259 | 194 |
| Beef breeding herd | 268 | 490 | 186 |
| Feeder cattle | 1,035 | 2,724 | 457 |
| Hogs | 1,176 | 1,760 | 1,003 |
| Sheep - farm flock | 108 | . 143 | 110 |
| Sheep - feeders. | 71 | - 160 | 39 |
| Turkeys | 233 | : 321 | 226 |
| Chickens | 327 | \% 346 | 249 |
| Crops, seed and feed | 939 | 1,573 | 266 |
| Income from work off the farm | 193 | 262 | 82 |
| Agricultural conservation payments | 506 | 795 | 417 |
| Miscellaneous | 370 | 548 | 256 |
| (2) Total returns \& net increases | 6,202 | 10,113 | 4,032 |
| (1) Totel expenses \& ntt decreases | 4,104 | 5,790 | 3,688 |
| (3) Oper. labor earniness (?) minus(1) | 2,098 | 4,323 | 344 |

(A) 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 on page $\sigma$.

ANALYSIS OF THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES IN OPERATOR'S EARNINGS
The financial statement on the preceding pages show that there is a wide range in earnings. The average operator's labor earnings for the 33 most profitable farms was $\$ 4,323$, and for the 33 least profitable farms $\$ 344$. The difference between the averages for these two groups was $\$ 3,979$. Some of the causes for these differences in earnines may be beyond the control of the farmer. It is significant, however, that the data in this report indicate that there are several factors which show definite relationshins with operator's labor earnings and which suggest opportunities for increased earnings. The more important of these factors and their relationship with earnings are presented in the following tables.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per cent croo yields } \\ & \text { were of the average } \\ & \text { for all } 165 \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ |  | No. of farms | Average operator's <br> labor earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grnup | Average |  |  |
| Below 86 | 78 | 33 | \$1,308 |
| 86-113 | 100 | 100 | 2,282 |
| 114 and above | 123 | 32 | 2,338 |

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 vields should be given consideration.

Table 3. Relation of Choice of Crops to Farm Earnings
Per cent of tillable land

$\frac{\text { in high return crops* }}{\text { Group }}$ Average | Ho of |
| :--- |
| farms |$\quad$| Average operator's |
| :--- |
| labor eernings |


| Below 31.0 | 27.8 | 41 | $\$ 1,883$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $31.0-39.9$ | 35.1 | 84 | 2,025 |
| $40.0 \&$ above | 46.0 | 40 | 2,472 |

*Crops are marked on page 14 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 jn calculating per
cent of tillable land in high return crops.
As a rule, on these farms, such crops as alfalfa, clover, canning crops, sugar beets, corn, and flax bring a higher net return per acre than other crops usually grown. Additions can be made to enrnings by putting as high a percentage as possible of the tillable land into these higher return crops.

Table 4. Relation of Returns From Productive Livestock to Farm Earnines

| Index of returns for $\$ 100$ feed | No. |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| fed to productive livestock* |  |  |
| Group | Average | farms |


| Below 88 | 72 | 41 | $\$ 1,278$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $89-111$ | 100 | 79 | 2,352 |
| 112 and nbove | 126 | 45 | 2,398 |

[^1]The majnrity of these farms are livestock farms: A large propnrtion of the crops raised are fed on the farm ond some nditinnal feed is purchased. Feed is the major item of cost in livestock production and livestock onnstitute an important source of income on these farms. . Hence there is a marked relationship between returns for $\$ 100$ of feed and operator's labor enrnings 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, belance of ratinn, degree of sanitatinn, and kind of shelter and equipment.

| Productive livestock units per 100 acres* | No. of | Average operator's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group Averase | farms | labor earnings |
| Below 16.5 \% 12.1 | 53 | \$1,970 |
| $16.5-25.4$ 20.9 | 64 | 1,953 |
| 25.5 and above 34.7 | 48 | 2,434 |

*Acres in timber not pastured, roads, waste and farmstead
were not included.
The information in Table 5 shows the farms with a small amount of livestock to be as profitable as those with an average amount of livestock. However, an examination of the farms in these two groups shows that several very specialized crop farms with very little livestock are included. in the group having less than 16.5 productive livestock units per 100 acres. If the farmers receiving more than 40 percent of their income from crops were to be omitted from the averages the operator's labor earnings of the group with a small amount of livestock would be $\$ 1,482$. 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. Livestook also helps to provide productive employment throughout the year. Any nethod that aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capacity should add to the farm income.


Average farm earnings tend to incroase with an increase in size of business. For farmers operating their farms at loss, the larger the volume of businass, the larger will be the loss, but a farmer who is making a profit could make a larger profit ifthe incrased his size of business, providing that in so doing he does not lower matoridlly the efficiency in some one or more important branches of his business. Those formers who have large businesses usually have more flexibility of their organization than doos 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 typo.

Table 7. Relation of Amount of Work Accomplished per Worker to Parm Earnings

| Work unit per worker | No, of <br> farms | Average operator's <br> Group | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

More days of productive work accomplished per worker reduces the labor charge per unit of business. Higher 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 lebor requirenents 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 laborsaving machinery help to increase the work accomplished per worker.

Table 8. Relation of Powor, Machinery, Equipment and
Building Expense to Farm Rarnings*

| Expense per work unit | No. of | Average operator's |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms |


| $\$ 2.65$ and above$\$ 3.38$ 39 <br> $\$ 1.60-\$ 2.64$ 2.01 <br> Below $\$ 1.60$ 1.32$\quad 40$ | $\$ 1,773$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2,122 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 40 | 2,363 |

*Includes building, fencing, all crop machinery and livestock
equipment, horse feed, and miscellaneous horse oxpense.
The expense factor does not show as high relationship with earnings when prices are high as when they are low. Some farms are undor-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 extrahelp. 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 holps reduce the power expense. In some cases, farmers can offset some or all of the powor and machinery expense by using their oquipment for outside work.

## gFrect of whll balaicen bfficibncy on farm profits

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency. Quite often farm operators show officient 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 organizatinn recoive returns well above the averagə. This is well illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9: Relation of Operator's Iabor Barnings to the Number of Factors in which the Farmer is Above Average

| No. of <br> factors in which farm excels | No. of firms | Your-... farm | The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the average overator's labor earnings | Average operator's <br> labor <br> earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seven | 3 |  |  | \$4,446 |
| Six | 13 |  |  | 3,285 |
| Five | 27 |  | xxyxy xxxxxxxxxyxxxxyxxxxx | 3,078 |
| Four | 28 |  | xxxxxxyxixxyxxxxx | 2,085 |
| Three | 43 |  | xxxxxxxxxxymxxyxx | 2,030 |
| $T^{\text {wo }}$ | 34 |  | xxxyxxyxyyxy | 1,411 |
| One or nona | 17 |  | xxymxy | 848 |

The array in Table 9 indicates that it will be worthwhile for each cooperator to study carefully his ranking on pages 12 and 13 , and learn his standing in respect to each of the above factors and the elements of strength and weakness in his farm business.

| Measures used in chart on page 13 | Average of 165 <br> farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profit } \\ & \text { able } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profit- } \\ & \text { able } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operator!s Labor Earnings $\$$ | \$2,098 | \$4, 323 | \$344 |
| (1) Crop yields* | 100 | 107 | 94 |
| (2) \% of tillable land in high return crops** | 35.9 | 38.1 | 34.4 |
| (3) Ret. for \$100 feed to prod. livestock*** | 100 | 107 | 90 |
| (4) Prod. Livestock units per 100 geres**** | 22.1 | 24.5 | 19.9 |
| (5) Size of business - work units | 569 | 774 | 457 |
| (6) Work units per worker | 263 | 288 | 223 |
| (7) Pow., mach., equip., \& bldg. exp.per work mit \$ | \$2.17 | \$1.99 | \$2.65 |

Measures and items related to some of the above measures:
(3) Index of return for $\$ 100$ feed from -

Dairy cattle 100
Dual purpose cattle
Beef cattle - breeding hord
$\square \quad 100$
Beef cattle - feeders
Hogs
Sheep - farm flock
Sheep - feeders
Turkeys
Chickens
(5) Work units on crops

Work units on productive livestock
Other work units
00
00
96
87
114
98 90

99
91
76
63 78 94

181
255 21
(6) Total number of workers

Number of family workers
Number of hired workers
(7) Power expense per work unit $\qquad$
$\$ 1$.
.
$.40 \quad \$ 1$.
.40 .
.12
.43

| 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| .7 | 1.2 | .7 |

Crop machinery expense per work unit Livestock equip. expense per whrk unit Bldgs. and fencing exp. per wark unit

[^2]** Crops are marked on page 14 as (A), (B), (C) and (D). All of acres in (A) crops, ne-half of acres in (E) crops, and ne-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 livestnck.
**** Acres in timber ant pastured, rnads, wnste nnd farmstend were not included.

Using your figures fror page 12 locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for the 165 farms included in this summary are located between the dotted lines across the center of this page.


Distribution of Acros in Farm, 1940



Factors of Cost and Returns From Dairy Cnws, 1940


[^3]Feed Costs and Returns From Other Dairy Cattle, 1940

| Items | Average 14 farms 14 farms <br> of 72   <br> farms*  $\quad$highest in <br> returns <br> above feed$\quad$lowest in <br> returns |
| :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per head, lbs.: |  |
| Concentrates | $674 \quad 777 \quad 642$ |
| Hay and fodder | $1,464-1,090 \quad 2,042$ |
| Silage | 1,917 1,785 2,516 |
| Whole milk | 379 608 240 |
| Skimmilk | 1,308 1,590 1,301 |
| Feed cost per head: |  |
| Concentrates | \$ 5.46 \$ 6.39 \$ 5.05 |
| Roughages |  |
| Milk | 6.64 9.9.89 $\quad 5.01$ |
| Pasture | $3.48 \quad 3.95 \quad 3.39$ |
| TOTAL FRED COSTS | \$22.28 \$ $\$ 24.76 \% \$ \begin{aligned} & 22.75\end{aligned}$ |
| Net inc. in value of other dairy cattle | \$31.94 \$53.38 \$17.02 |
|  | \$ 9.66 \$28.62-\$-5.73 |
| RETURISS FOR \$100 OT FEED |  |
| Number of head of other dairy cattle | 12.6 13.3, 12.1 |

Feed Costs and Returns From All Dairy Cattle

Feeds per animal unit, lbs.:


Feed cost per animal unit:
Concentrates
Roughages
Pasture
. TOTAL FERD COSTS


[^4]Factors of Cost and Peturns from Dual Purpose Cows, 1940


[^5]Foed Costs and Returnis Fron Other Pal Purpose Cattle, 1940

|   Your <br> form <br> Items   | Average <br> of 39 <br> farms* | 10 Parms <br> highest in <br> returns <br> above feed | 10 Farms <br> lowest in <br> returns <br> above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per head, lbs.: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | 742 | 791 | 877 |
| Hay and fodder | 1633 | 1652 | 2118 |
| Silaçe | 1228 | 768 | 1459 |
| Whole milk | 204 | 136 | 158 |
| Skimmilk | 1223 | 1134. | 801 |
| F'eed cost per head: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates \$ | \$5.94 | \$6.32 | \$6.97 |
| Roughages. | 6.07 | 5.76 | 7.71 |
| Milk | 4.42 | 3.42 | 3.29 |
| Pasture. | 3.43 | 2.48 | 4.41 |
| TOTAL FEED COSTS | \$19.86 | \$17.98 | \$22.38 |
| Net increase in value ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | \$30. 39 | \$41.48 | \$21. 25 |
| HETURNS ABOVE FEPD COST PER HEAD .... $\$$ | \$10.53 | \$23.50 | \$-1.13 |
| RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED … \$ | \$163 | \$243 | \$98 |
| No. of head of other dual purrose cattle | 16.6 | 19.3 | 18.6 |

## Foed Costs and Returns From All Dusi Purpose Cattle



Feeds per animal unit, lbs.:


Feed cost per animal unit:
Concentrates
Roughages
Pasture
TOTAL FEED COSTS
Value of produce per animal unit:
Dairy products
Net increase in value
TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED ...
RETURINS ABOVE PEED PER ANIMAL UNIT
RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED
Animal units of dual purpose cattle

$\$$ $\qquad$ \$18
16.5

| $\$ 37.23$ | $\$ 51.43$ | $\$ 25.74$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\frac{20.40}{}$ | $\frac{24.27}{}$ | $\frac{16.71}{}$ |
| $\$ 27.63$ | $\$ 75.70$ | $\$ 42.45$ |
| $\$ 26$ | $\$ 44.89$ | $\$-.30$ |
| $\$ 184$ | $\$ 256$ | $\$ 105$ |
| 16.5 | 13.7 | 18.7 |

* Several farmers having both a dual purpose and a beef herd used a beef bull and included all the young stock in the beef herd.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ynur } \\ & \text { farin } \end{aligned}$ <br> Items | Average <br> of ell <br> farms | Farms <br> highest in <br> returns <br> above feed | Farms <br> lowest in <br> returas <br> above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beef breeding herd: no. of farms: | 42 | 8 | 8 |
| Feeds per animal unit, lbs.: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | $1418{ }^{\circ}$ | 1535 | 1939 |
| Legume hay | 1824 | 2757 | 2221 |
| Other hay | 628 | 319 | 899 |
| Fodder and stover | 438 | 722 | 166 |
| Silage | 2833 | 1540 | 6808 |
| Skimmilk* | 345 | 250 | 205 |
| Whole milk* | 79 | 135 | 59 |
| Feed cost par animal unit: - - |  |  |  |
| Onncentrates: ${ }_{\text {O }}$ | \$11.34 | \$12.08 | \$15.73 |
| Roughages | 11.19 | 13.15 | 16.58 |
| Wilk* | 1.53 | 2.25 | . 96 |
| Pasture | 5.80 | 4.11 | 6.98 |
| TOTAL FEPD COSTS | \$29.86 | \$31. 59 | \$40.25 |
| Value of produce per animal unit: |  |  |  |
| Dairy products \$ | \$ 7.00 | \$17.28 | \% 1.41 |
| Wet increase in value of animals | 41.06 | 52.71 | - 34.15 |
| TOTAL VALU'E PRODUCED | \$48.06 | \$69.99 | \$35.56 |
| REYURIS ABOVE fred Cost per hivimat Unit | \$18. 20 | \$38.40 | \$-4.69 |
| RETURIS FOR \$100 OF FETD | \$172 | \$237 | $\$ 95$ |
| Number of cows and herd bulls | 12.8 | 16.3 | 12.4 |
| Number of animal units in the herd | 23.1 | 24.8 | 22.4 |
| Feeder cattle: no, of fnrms: $\quad 15 \quad 15$ <br> Feeds per cwt, beef produced, lbs.: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Corn | 596 | 534 | 773 |
| Small grain | 110 | 76 | 172 |
| Com. feds - under 25\% protein | 8 | 4 | 13 |
| Com. feeds - over 25\% protein | 26 | 17 | 36 |
| Legume hay | 270 | 230 | 262 |
| Other hay | 64 | 43 | 135 |
| Fodder and stover | 44 | 55 | 29 |
| Total concentrates | 740 | 631 | 994 |
| Total dry roughages | 378 | 328 | 426 |
| Silage | 555 | 398 | 1168 |
| \% of T.D.N. in ration that is pretein | 11.7 | 11.6 | 11.0 |
| Feed cost per cwt. beef produced: ${ }^{\text {a }}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$. |  |  |  |
| Concentrates \$ | \$ 5.92 |  | \$ 7.94 |
| Rrughages | 1.70 | 1.39 | 2.41 |
| Pasture | 38 | . 16 | . 67 |
| TOTAL FHAD COSTS | $\$ 8.00$ | \% 5.5 | \$11.02 |
| Wet increasc in value of feaders | \$10.92 | \$13.31 | 4.8.68 |
| REIURNS ABOVE FEED COST PBR CWT. BHEP PROD. | \$ 2.92 | \$ 6.72 | \$-2.34 |
| RETURIS FOR \$100 OF FEED | \$148 | $\$ 213$ | \$82 |
| Price received per cut. beef sold | \$ 7.99 | \$ 9.26 | \$ 6.05 |
| No., of animal units | 36.9 | 28.0 | 17.7 |
| Pounds of beef produced | 18991 | 15685 | 6740 |

[^6]|   Your <br> farm | Average of all farms | Farns <br> highest in <br> returns <br> above feed | Farms <br> lowest in <br> returns <br> above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm flock: No. of farms: | 56. | 11. | 11 |
| Feeds per head,* 1bs.: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | 75 | 28 | 105 |
| Legume hay | 208 | 126 | 277 |
| Other hay | 60 | 78 | 74 |
| Fodder and stover | 46 | 76 | 46 |
| Silage | 142 | 181 | 138 |
| Feed cost per head: ... |  |  |  |
| Concentrates . ... ... \$ | \$ . 64. | \$. 24 | \$ . 36 |
| Roughages | 1.08 | . 87 | 1.33 |
| Pasture | . 88 | 1.00 | . 88 |
| TOTAL FED COSTS | \$2.60 | \$2.11 | \$3.07 |
| Va,lue of produce per head: |  |  |  |
| Wool | \$2.09 | \$2.01 | \$2. 45 |
| Net increase in value of sheep | 3.78 | $\underline{6.36}$ | . 35 |
| TOTAL VALJA PRODUGED \$ | \$5.87 | \$8.37 | \$2.80 |
| RETURLS ABOVE FEED COST PER HRAD \$ | \$3.27 | \$6. 26 | \$-. 27 |
| RETURNS FOR \$1O0 OF FŻD | \$246 | \$406 | \$92 |
| Value per lamb sold | \$7.14 | \$7.46 | \$7.68 |
| Price per Ib. wool sold (cts.) | 28.7 | 29.1 | 27.5 |
| Pounds of wool per sheep sheared | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.9 |
| Number of ewes kept for lambing | 36.0 | 26.0 | 44.0 |
| \% lamb crop | 110.4 | 122.4 | 102.4 |
| \% death loss | 19.0 | 16.0 | 32.0 |
| No. of head of sheep* (Farm flock) | 54.8 | 47.1 | 53.1 |
| Feeder sheep: no. of farms: | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Feeds per cwt. sheap produced, lbs.: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | 622 | 455 | 788 |
| Legume hay | 326 | 331 | 322 |
| Other hay | 72 | 52 | 91 |
| Fodder and stover | 52 | 80 | 45 |
| Silage | 99 | 152 | 47 |
| Feed cost per head: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates. | 84.76 | \$3.60 | \$5.91 |
| Roughages | 1.55 | 1.61 | 1.49 |
| Pasture TOTAL FIED COSTS | $\underline{.85}$ | $\frac{.57}{5.78}$ | \% $\frac{1.13}{8.53}$ |
| Net incrase in value of sherp .... \$ | 39.29 | \$ 10.68 | \$7.90 |
| REIURNS AbOVE Find Cost Peir CwT. Prosuced | \$2.13 | \$4.90 | \$-. 63 |
| RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FERD** | \$150 | \$198 | \$101 |
| Price per cwt. sheep sold. | 88.74 | \$8.94 | \$8.48 |
| \% death loss | 3.5 | 2.2 | 4.5 |
| \% of T.D.iN. in ration that is protoin | 13.0 | 13.1 | 12.8 |
| Pounds of sheet produced. | 6490 | 7068 | 5913 |

* Two lambs under 6 mo. of age considered as one hend.
** Five flocks were omitted from this statement because of very high death losses. The average returns for $\$ 100$ of feed for the 25 flocks was $\$ 114$.


Feed Costs and Returns for Turkeys, 1940 ,


* Two farms did not have horses.
**Two colts equal one horse.

Farm Produce Used in House and House Rental, 1940


Household and Personal Expenses For
Those Farms Which Kept Complete Account s of these Expenses, 1940

| Those Farms Which Kept Complete Accounts of |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^7]Miscellaneous Information - Avereged by Countios - 1940

| Item | Brown | Cottionvood | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fari- } \\ & \text { bault } \end{aligned}$ | Jackson | Lincol | Iton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operator's labor earnings | 22008 | ¢2120 | \$1775 | \$2. 48 | \$2341 | \$1550 |
| Total farm sales | 8368 | 8548 | 9480 | 7153 | 6953 | 6909 |
| Total ferm purchases | 6052 | 6718 | 7865 | 4417 | 3766 | 4781 |
| Average farm inventory | \$29924 | \$28924 | \$32838 | 328449 | \$28870 | \$31836 |
| Total acres in small grain | 83.3 | 112.3 | 85.5 | 92.6 | 155.7 | 132.8 |
| Total acres in cultivated crops | 55.1 | 63.3 | 71.5 | 61.6 | 70.2 | 83.5 |
| Total acres in tillable hay | 21.5 | 25.0 | 28.0 | 24.2 | 21.3 | 27.1 |
| Total acres in tillable pasturo. | 16.7 | 23.0 | 23.4 | 14.8 | 25.0 | 23.0 |
| Total acres in farm | 223.6 | 254.3 | 242.9 | 238.5 | 383.4 | 334.4 |
| \% land tillable | 77.8 | 88.3 | 84.9 | 84.1 | 75.8 | 84.0 |
| Animal units of productive livestock : $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll}54.1 & 45.2 & 57.4 & 48.2 & 50.3 & 48.8\end{array}$ \% of prod. animal units that are dairy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| other dairy and dual purpose cattle | 12.6 | 15.2 | 11.4 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 14.3 |
| beef cattle - broeding herd | 1.2 | . 9 | 13.9 | 13.5 | 24.7 | 8.7 |
| beef cattle - feedor | 26.6 | 31.8 | 17.0 | 20.2 | 3.0 | 10.7 |
| sheep - farm flock | 3.0 | 2.3 | -8.8 | 4.2 | 8.9 | 8.0 |
| shoep - fooders | 0 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 0 | 2.6 |
| hogs | 22.1 | 15.8 | 21.6 | 21.0 | 18.9 | 20.7 |
| turkeys | 6.5 | 3.9 | . 5. | 1.2 | 0 | 0 |
| hens | 4.1 | 6.8 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 4.7 | 5.9 |
|  |  | Martin | Murray | Nobles | Rod- wood | Wetonwan |
| Operator's labor camings |  | \$2127 | 32111 | \$2607 | \$2314 | \$1755 |
| Total farm seles . |  | 9464 | 6849 | 10699 | 10083 | 5655 |
| Total farm purchase |  | 5333 | 4137 | 8320 | 7398 | 4160 |
| Average farm invontory |  | \$35761 | \$26269 | \$36268: | 339356 | \$30211 |
| Total acres in small grain |  | 75.4 | 115.5 | 110.5 | 168.5 | 78.0 |
| Total acres in cultivated crops |  | 65.5 | 65.0 | 80.9 | 58.3 | 59.3 |
| Total acres in tillable hay |  | 19.0 | 26.0 | 32.9 | 36.9 | 23.5 |
| Total acres in tillable pasture |  | 27.3 | 22.6 | 27.9 | 27.3 | 28.2 |
| Total acres in farm |  | 230.0 | 266.4 | 285.9 | 399.3 | 240.2 |
| \% land tillable |  | 90.2 | 86.0 | 88.8 | 65.1 | 80.1 |
| Animal units of productive livestock |  | 54.4 | 43.7 | 70.3 | 79.2 | 39.1 |
| \% of prod. animal units that aro dairy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| other dairy and dual burposo cattle |  | 12.7 | 14.1 | 13.3 | 12.2 | 10.3 |
| beef cattle - breeding hord |  | 13.5 | 12.9 | 9.8 | 8.4 | 20.5 |
| beef cattle - fecders |  | 17.3 | 20.6 | 15.3 | 24. 5 | 1.6 |
| shoep - farm flock |  | 5.6 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 5.4 | 5.7 |
| shoop - fecders |  | . 1 | 5.0 | 9.1 | 1.7 | 5.9 |
| hogs |  | 27.5 | 17.7 | 21.1 | 21.2 | 23.1 |
| turkeys |  | . 3 | 0 | 6.1 | 0 | 6.6 |
| hens |  | 3.5 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 4.2 |

Miscellaneous Information (Continued)

| Item | brown | Cotton wood | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fari- } \\ & \text { bault } \end{aligned}$ | Jackson | Linicoln | Iyon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop yields - \% of averafe | 110 | 101 | 105 | 107 | 89 | 89 |
| $\%$ till. land in high ret. crons: | 36.4 | 37.6 | 40.6 | 36.4 | 31.3 | 32.5 |
| Index of ret. from livestock | 106 | 95 | 98 | 100 | 105 | 88 |
| Amount of livestock per 100 A . | 26.1 | 22.0 | 26.3 | 23.0 | 15.6 | 14.5 |
| Work units | 566 | 489 | 529 | 504 | 665 | 561 |
| Work units per worker | 249 | 247 | 280 | 235 | 266 | 244 |
| Expenses per work unit, | \$2.29 | \$2.35 | \$2.26 | \$2. 05 | \$1.87 | \$2.15 |
| Yield per acre, flax, bu. | 14.8 | 14.8 | 13.6 | 15.6 | - 11.9 | 9.7 |
| Yield per acre, barley, bu. | 41.4 | 45.8 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 33.0 | 34.6 |
| Yield per acre, oats, bu. . | 69.1 | 68.6 | 59.5 | 61.7 | 57.4 | 54.0 |
| Yield per acre, corn, mrain, bu. | 49.1 | 47.5 | 48.9 | 50.0 | 41.9 | 43.4 |
| Yield per acre, corn silage, tons | 10.2 | 9.3 | 8.3 | 10.0 | 6.5 | 6.8 |
| Yield per acre, alfalfa hay, tons | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 1.8 |


|  | Martin | Murray | Nobles | Redwood | Watonwan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop yields - \% of average | 109 | 82 | 101 | 91 | 110 |
| \% till. land in high ret. crops | 37.8 | 37.2 | 34.8 | 33.1 | 34.1 |
| Index of ret. from livestock | 105 | 111 | 105 | 93 | 98 |
| Amount of livestock per 100 A . | 25.4 | 19.8 | 25.9 | 19.2 | 18.8 |
| Work units | 592 | 561 | 642 | 667 | 479 |
| Work units per worker | 264 | 306 | 280 | 250 | 266 |
| Expenses per work unit | \$2.00 | \$1.93 | \$1.89 | \$2. 76 | \$2.06 |
| Yield per acre, flax, bu, | 13.6 | 10.1 | 17.7 | 12.8 | 13.0 |
| Yield per acre, barley, bu: | 55.0 | 39.2 | 49.2 | 37.6 | 37.4 |
| Yield per acre, oats, bu, | 66.8 | 57.2 | 53.4 | 52.6 | 68.6 |
| Yield per acre, corn, grain, bid. | 51.2 | 35.4 | 44.0 | 44.9 | 49.9 |
| Yield per acre, corn silage, tons | 0.5 | 7.4 | 8.6 | 7.7 | 6.9 |
| Yieja per acre, alfalfa hay, tons | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.4 |


[^0]:    * For a more complete description of the aren see Engene, S. A., and Pond, G. A., "Agriculturel Production and Types of Frrming in Minnesota", Minn. Bul. 347, May, 1940.

[^1]:    *The index is weighted by tho number of animal units of each class of livestock.

[^2]:    * Given as a percentage of the average.

[^3]:    * 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 in small for the mejority of farms.

[^4]:    * Several farmers having both a dairy and a beef herd used a beef bull and included all the young stock in the beef herd.

[^5]:    *iNot including nutrients received from pasture.

[^6]:    * Severni farmers had both dairy or dual purpose cows and beef onws and fed considerable amounts of milk produced by the dairy herd to beef calves.

[^7]:    *Hired help or others boarded.

