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## INTRODUCTION

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

The analysis of the records and the preparation of the reports are handled by the Division of Agricultural Economics under the direction of G. A. Pond and T. R. Nodland. Extension work in connection with the project is handled by S. B. Cleland and J. B. MoNulty of the Agricultural Extension Division.
J. R. Burkholder is the field agent for this project. At the end of the yrear G. E. Toben and S. A. Engene of the Jivision of Agricultural Economics aided in closing the records. County agricultural extension agents who cooperate in this project include E. J. Vossen, O. Go Gaylord, Fred Geisler, Poland Abraham, S. B. Simpson, A. B. Hagen, C. E, Stower, Jo I. Swedberg; C. R. Simon, Wayne Hanson and Ed Kaeder:

The officers for the Southwest Farm Managenent Association for 1944 were:

- President, Robert Saderholm, Readings Nobles County Vice.President, Chas. Winzer, Feron Lake, Jacisson County
- Secretary-Treasurer, Arthur Foster, Garvin, Murray County

The board of directors include these officers and also the following; Walter Schnotzer, Cottonwood County; C. J. Zupp, Faxibeult County; M. E. Teeter, Martin County; Herbert Johnson, Murray County; Robert Soderholm, Nobles County; Carl Rolland, Redwood, County; George Hofelnen, Fock County and Clayton Johnson, Watonwan County.

The following tabulation shows by counties the numbers of members who completed, records in 1944:

| Cottonwood | 10 | Martin | 13 | Redwood | 24 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Faribault | 18 | Murray | 18 | Rock | 1 |
| Jackson | 19 | Mobles | 38 | Watonwan | 11 |
|  |  |  |  | 165 |  |

In the tables on page 4 and succeeding pages are shown data for 163 farms. Three farms have been ornitted from all of the averages in the tables because they differed widely in bype from the others or the records were not sufficiently conplete for a full analysis.

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

TOPOGRAPHY, SOILS, AND WEATHER
The soils range from darl brown to heavy black loam. The major part of the area is undulating to gently rolling land interspersed with alnost level tracts. In the westem part of the area the surface ranges from undulating to sharply rolling. Nearly all of the land is tillable and well drained.

The spring of 104 was cooler and considerably wetter than usual. Weather conditions were very unfavorable for early spring farm activities. The seeding of small grains was seriously delayed and by the end of May sone lowlands were still too vet for seeding, A considerable amount of buckwheat"and milet was planted in these wet areas. Hoying and cultivating were delayed by heavy rains during the latter part of June and early in July. There was some loss from hail storms during July. Weather conditions in August and Sembember were generally favorable for having, harvesting and naturing corm and other late cropso The months of September and October were very diry. Killing frosts occurred early in October. A consjderable anount of com at harvest time contained excessive moisture for storage.

Table 1 ．Monthly and Annual Erecipitation

|  | Worth | cton | Fair | mont |  | U1m | Redwoo | d Talls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Depar－ |  | Depar－ |  | Deparm |  | Depar－ |
|  | Precip－ | ture from | Precip－ | ture from | Precip－ | ture from | Precipm | ture from |
|  | itation | normal | itation | normal | itation | ormal |  |  |
|  | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches |
| Jonuary | 0.94 | ＋0．31 | 0.92 | $+0.12$ | 0.75 | －0．35 | 0.32 | －0．62 |
| February | 1.35 | ＋0．58 | 0.98 | ＋0．01 | 1.10 | ＋0．04 | 1.14 | ＋0．20 |
| March | 0.81 | －0．45 | 0.75 | －0．66 | 1.84 | ＋0．23 | 0.97 | －0．13 |
| April | 2.38 | $+0.30$ | 2.57 | $+0.34$ | 2.89 | ＋0．70 | 2.52 | ＋0．27 |
| May | 4.83 | $+0.89$ | 5.91 | $+1.99$ | 5.37 | ＋1．80 | 4.58 | ＋1．16 |
| June | 5.00 | ＋0．71 | 6.42 | $+2.28$ | 5.64 | ＋0．99 | 4.47 | －0．02 |
| July | 6.04 | $+2.65$ | 4.47 | ＋0．91 | 3.24 | －0．44 | 4.19 | $+1.15$ |
| August | 6.90 | $+3.14$ | 6.33 | $+2.78$ | $5.3{ }^{\prime}$ | $+1.79$ | 3.40 | $+0.42$ |
| September | 2.41 | －1．00 | 1.92 | －1．40 | 2.28 | －1． 20 | 1.49 | －1．37 |
| October | 0.52 | －1．17 | 0.34 | －1．51 | 0.36 | －1．80 | 0.38 | －1．29 |
| Novernber | 1.56 | ＋0，39 | 0.65 | －0．74 | 2.34 | $+1.03$ | 1.34 | $+0.13$ |
| December | 0.09 | －0．62 | 0.28 | －0．62 | 0，27 | －0．63 | 0.06 | －0．84 |
| 1944 Total | $1 \overline{32.83}$ | ＋5．73 | 31.54 | 73.50 | 31.42 | $+2.13$ | 24.66 | －0．94 |
| 19l） 3 Total | 133.15 | ＋6．05 | 36.64 | ＋8．60 | 41.10 | ＋11． 81 | 31.04 | $+5.24$ |
| 1942 Total | －1 33.47 | $+6.37$ | 25.98 | $-2.06$ | 29.63 | $+0.34$ | 21.02 | $-4.78$ |
| 1941 Total | 1 28.22 | $+1.12$ | 32.92 | ＋4．88 | 34.0 .4 | ＋5．65 | 26.07 | ＋0．27 |
| 1940 Total | 122.50 | －4．60 | 28.72 | ＋0．68 | 36.90 | $+7.61$ | 25.95 | ＋0．15 |
| 1939 Total | 124.27 | －2．83 | 21.92 | $-6.12$ | 23.04 | $-6.25$ | 18.52 | －7．28 |
| 1938 Total | 140.50 | $+13.40$ | 39.99 | ＋11．95 | 29.98 | ＋0．69 | 26.84 | ＋1．04 |
| Normal ${ }_{\text {Annual }}$ | rec． 27.1 |  | 28.04 |  | 29.29 |  | 25.80 |  |

## R⿱㇒⿴囗夊心 CORDS KEPY

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 fam produce used oy the fam family．Sup－ plementary information was also secured during the year regarding crop and live－ stock production and practices．

The cooperators were assisted and supervised in keepine their records by the field agent，who visited each farm in the nine．counties several times during the year．In addition to securing the suplementary information，the field agent！s duties included numerous services，such as，securing a monthly list of prices of fam products prevailing in the area，helping the farmer place unifom values on real estate and equipnent，checking tie 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．

Because the farners included in this study are，in general，above the average in managerial ability and operato larger and more productive farms，they have retums naterially higher than the average for this section of the state．There were，never－ theless，wide variations in the methods and practices followed by thesemen．It is reasonable to assume that similar variations occur among all farmers in the area． To the exfent that this is true，this report should be of value to all farmers and to others interestea in agriculture in that it illustrates how farm records nay be used as a basis for making an andysis of a farm business and for irproving the management of a farm．

Table 2. Sumary of Farm Inventories, 1944*

| Items | Your farm | Average of 163 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { proritable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 33 least profitable <br> farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size of farm (acres) |  | 263 | 319 | 269 |
| Size of business (work units)** |  | 530 | 663 | 445 |
| Eeginning of Year |  |  |  |  |
| Productive livestock (total) | 中 | \$6368 | \$8029 | \$6364 |
| Dairy and dual purpose cows |  | 607 | 631 | 367 |
| Other dairy \& dual pur. cattle |  | 354 | 359 | 253 |
| Beef cattle (incl. feeders) |  | 2251 | 2141 | 3202 |
| Hogs |  | 21.94 | 2876 | 1695 |
| Sheep (including feeders) |  | 656 | 1668 | 528 |
| Povitry (inclucing turieys) |  | 306 | 354 | 319 |
| Horses |  | 293 | 288 | 326 |
| Crop, seed, and feed |  | 4462 | 6624 | 3870 |
| Mach. \& equipment (total) |  | 3295 | 3984 | 2851 |
| Power mach. (f. share) |  | 1176 | 1390 | 1003 |
| Crop \& gen. mach. (fo share) |  | 1538 | 1.873 | 1314 |
| Iivestock equip. \& supplies |  | 581 | 721 | 534 |
| Buildings, fences, etc. |  | 7453 | 8124 | 6499 |
| Land. |  | 14335 | 17446 | 13604 |
| Total farm capital |  | \$36206 | \$44495 | \$33514 |

## End of Year

| Productive livestock (total) | \$ | $\$ 5927$ | \$7430 | \$5772 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy \& dual purpose cows |  | 582 | 615 | 389 |
| Other dairy \& dual pur. cattle |  | 388 | 477 | 210 |
| Beef cattle (incl. feeders) |  | 2422 | 2427 | 3478 |
| Hogs |  | 1735 | 2496 | 1090 |
| Sheep (including feeders) |  | 529 | 1177 | 379 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 271 | 298 | 226 |
| Horses |  | 253 | 262 | 274 |
| Crop, seeds, and feed |  | 4508 | 6893 | 3361 |
| Mach. \& equipment (total) |  | 3392 | 4393 | 2776 |
| Power mach. (f. share) |  | 1230 | 1521 | 960 |
| Crop \& gen. mach. |  | 1584 | 2110 | 1296 |
| Livestock equipnent \& supplies |  | 578 | 762 | 520 |
| Buildings, fences, etc. |  | 7379 | 8005 | 6484 |
| Land |  | 14335 | 17446 | 13604 |
| Total farm capital |  | \$35794 | \$44:479 | \$32271 |

* For the purpose of comparison all the data show in this report vith the exception of Tables 7 and 8 are presented on a full-owner basis. The assets, expenses and receipts of the lendlord were included in the records from rented farms.
**See page 13 for an explanation of "work units".

Table 3. Fanily Iiving from the Form, 1ght

| Items | Your <br> farm | Average 163 farins | 33 most profitable ferms | 33. least <br> profit- <br> able <br> farms | Your farm | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & 163 \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 33 most profitable <br> fams | ```33 least profit- able farms``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No.0f pers. (Fam. |  | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |
| adult equiv.(Oth.* |  | . 5 | . 6 | . 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Wholemilk |  | 1104 gts. | 1048 | 1.055 | ${ }_{\text {W }}$ | \$57.1.3 | \$62.10 | \$53.93 |
| Skim miliz |  | 300 qts . | 390 | 327 |  | 2.48 | 2.77 | 4.04 |
| Cream |  | 208 pts. | 278 | 204 |  | 36.86 | 50.64 | 36.80 |
| Farrp made butter |  | $6.10 s$. | 8 | 10 |  | 3.01 | 3.96 | 5.11 |
| Eggs |  | 164 doz . | 185 | 147 |  | 50.36 | 56.49 | 44.57 |
| Cattle |  | 451 1bs. | 456 | 485 |  | 49.99 | 52.47 | 51.81 |
| Hogs |  | 515 Ibs. | 549 | 573 |  | 67.79 | 72.18 | 75.56 |
| Sheep |  | 3 lbs . | 6 | 3 |  | . 41 | . 78 | . 37 |
| Poultry |  | 106 Ibs . | 122 | 83 |  | 22.00 | 24.22 | 17.75 |
| Potatoes |  | 10 bu. | 15 | 7 |  | 13.40 | 19.99 | 9.99 |
| Vegetables \& fruit |  |  |  |  |  | 57.20 | 68.81 | 45.03 |
| Farm fuel |  |  |  |  |  | 9.82 | 11.94 | 5.82 |
| Rental vl. of hous |  |  |  |  |  | 201.93 | 171.15 | 192.45 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | \$572.38 | \$597.50 | \$543.26 |

Table 4. Household and Personal Expenses for Those Farms Which Kept Complete Accounts of These Mxpenses, Ight

|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Hired help of otherb boarded

| Items | Your farm | Average of 163 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FARM EXPFMTSES |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows bought |  | \$ 63 | \$ 49 | \$ 107 |
| Other dairy \& dual-pur. cattle bot. |  | 4.9 | 62 | 41 |
| Beef cattle bot. (incl. feeders) |  | 1109 | 1638 | 3199 |
| Hogs bought |  | 315 | 544 | 261 |
| Sheep bought (including feeders) |  | 321 | 733 | 136 |
| Poultry bought (including turkeys) |  | 200 | 326 | 192 |
| Horses bought |  | 43 | 36 | 26 |
| Misc. livestock expense |  | 173 | 268 | 135 |
| Misco crop expenses |  | 582 | 737 | 538 |
| Feed bought |  | 2164 | 2876 | 1869 |
| Custom work hired |  | 261 | 384 | 213 |
| Mech power mach. (farm share) (new) |  | 337. | 433 | 220 |
| Mechopower mach. (fara share) (upkp) |  | 172 | 198 | 168 |
| Mechenower (f.share)(gas,oil, etc.) |  | 527 | 621 | 474 |
| Crop and general mach. (new) |  | 332 | 587 | 216 |
| Crop and general mach (upireep) |  | 174 | 202 | 155 |
| Livestock equipment (new) |  | 91 | 159 | 62 |
| Livestock equipment (upleen) |  | 78 | 91 | 65 |
| Buildings and fencing (new) |  | 297 | 229 | 384 |
| Buildings and fencing (upleep) |  | 192 | 190 | 753 |
| Hired labor |  | 551 | 821 | 627 |
| Taxes |  | 311 | 346 | 282 |
| General farm and insurance |  | 121 | 131 | 110 |
| (I) Total farm purchases |  | \% 8563 | \$1166I | \% 7633 |
| (2) Decrease in farm capital |  | 412 | 16 | 1243 |
| (3) Board fumished hired labor |  | 11.8 | 150 | 132 |
| (4) Interest on farm capital. |  | 1800 | 2224 | 1645 |
| (5) Unpaid family labor |  | 316 | 346 | - 332 |
| (6) Total farm expo(Sum of (1) to (5) |  | \$11209 | \$14397 | 萨10985 |
| FAPM RECEIPMS |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows |  | \$ 215 | \$ 219 | \$ 124 |
| Dairy products |  | 865 | 895 | 626 |
| Other dairy \& dual-purpose cattle |  | 177 | 154 | 147 |
| Beef cattle (includine feeders) |  | 2478 | 3314 | 2455 |
| Hogs |  | 4671 | 6790 | 3472 |
| Sheep and wool (including feeders) |  | 768 | 1938 | 444 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 829 | 1602 | 920 |
| Eggs |  | 911 | 1006 | 839 |
| Horses |  | 47 | 32 | 33 |
| Corn |  | 578 | 1052 | - 296 |
| Snall grain |  | 669 | 1367 | 307 |
| Other crops |  | 600 | 1219 | 270 |
| Machinery \& equip. sold |  | 185 | 268 | 144 |
| Agricultural adjustment payments |  | 74 | 95 | 72 |
| Income from work off the farm |  | 310 | 409 | 200 |
| Misc. |  | 70 | 72 | 40 |
| (7) Total farm sales |  | \$13447 | \$20432 | \$10389 |
| (8) Increase in farm capital |  | - | - | - |
| (9) Family living from the farm |  | $572$ | $590$ | $543$ |
| (10) Total farm receipts (7)+(8)+(9) |  | \$14019 | $\$ 21030$ | \$10932 |
| (6) Total fam expenses |  | 11209 | 14397 | 10985 |
| (11) Oper. labor earnings (10)-(6) |  | 2810 | 6633 | -53 |

Table 6. Summary of Earm Earnings (Enterprise Statenent) 1944*

| Items | Your farm | Average of 163 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 33 least profitable farras |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPENSES AND MET DECRTASES |  |  |  |  |
| Total power |  | \$ 1107 | \$ 1283 | \$ 1065 |
| Horses |  | 183 | 186 | 198 |
| Tractor |  | 453 | 511 | 436 |
| Truck |  | 92 | 155 | 68 |
| Auto (farm share) |  | 216 | 206 | 221 |
| Gas engine (farm share) |  | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Elec. plant or current(f.share) |  | 56 | 66 | 46 |
| Hired power : $\because$ ( |  | 104 | 155 | 92 |
| Crop and general machinery |  | 414 | 440 | 363 |
| Livestock equipment |  | 156 | 204 | 132 |
| Buildings, fencing and tiling |  | 436 | $\therefore \quad 439$ | 440 |
| Misc. productive livestock expense |  | 171 | - 266 | 132 |
| Labor $\because$............ |  | 1154 | 2418 | 1149 |
| Real estate taxes |  | 252 | 269 | 226 |
| Personal property tax |  | 59 | 77 | 56 |
| Insurance |  | 41 | 46 | 36 |
| General Carm |  | 80 | 85 | 74 |
| Interest on farm capital |  | 1800 | 2224 | 1645 |
| (1) Total expenses \& net decreases |  | 5670 | 6751 | 5318 |
| REMURTS ATD HET ITCREASES |  |  |  |  |
| All productive livestock |  | \$8814 | \$12496 | \$ 6861 |
| Dairy and dual purpose covs |  | \%937 | 1112 | 589 |
| Other dairy \& dual pur.cattle |  | 343 | . 419 | 173 |
| Beef breeding herd |  | 573. | 599. | 582 |
| Feeder cattle |  | 1049 | 1404 | 1141 |
| Hogs |  | 3963 | 5937 | 2681 |
| Sheep - Tarm flock |  | 120 | 138 | 128 |
| Sheep - feeders |  | 202 | 579 | 35 |
| Turkeys |  | 398 | 1052 | 491 |
| Chickens |  | 1179 | 2256 | 1041 |
| Crops, seed and feed |  | -736 | 400 | -1907 |
| Incoma from labor off the farm |  | 153 | 246 | 119 |
| Agricultural conservation payments |  | 74 | 95 | 72 |
| Miscellaneous |  | 145 | 147 | 120 |
| (2) Total returns \& net increases |  | 8480 | 13384 | 5265 |
| (1) Total eapenses \& net decreases |  | 5670 | 6751 | 5318 |
| (3) Oper. labor earnings (2) - (1) |  | 2810 | 6633 | -53 |

* Cash receipts and expenses are adjusted for changes in inventory for each enterprise and for each item of expense in order to show total receipts and net increases, and total expenses and net decreases. The operator's labor earnings are the same as those in page 6 .

Table 7. Net Worth Statement for Those Farmers Who Kept a Complete Record of All


[^0]| FARM EXPETSES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { farm } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & \text { owners } \end{aligned}$ | 35 partowners | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \\ & \text { renters } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy and dualmurpose cows bought | \$ | \$ 58 | \$ 108 | \$ 40 |
| Other dairy \& dual-pur.cattle bought |  | 44 | 33 | 66 |
| Beef cattle bot. (incl. feeders) |  | 733 | 1600 | 1046 |
| Hogs bought |  | 278 | 522 | 194 |
| Sheep bought (including feeders) |  | 194 | 210 | 340 |
| Poultry bought (including turkeys) |  | 180 | 220 | 145 |
| Horses bought |  | 24 | 50 | 55 |
| Misc. livestock expenses |  | 197 | 170 | 132 |
| Misc, crop expenses |  | 580 | 580 | 467 |
| Feed bought |  | 1896 | 2470 | 1606 |
| Custom work hired |  | 191 | 291 | 284 |
| Mech. power moch. (farm share) (new) |  | 267 | 213 | $\because 468$ |
| Mech. power mach. (farm share) (upkp) |  | 171 | 180 | 135 |
| Mech. power ( $f$. share) (gas, oil, etc.) |  | 508 | 566 | 464 |
| Crop and general mach. (new) |  | 258 | 372 | 365 |
| Crop and general mach. (upkeep) |  | 152 | 198 | 164 |
| Livestock equipment (new) . |  | 72 | 101 | 96 |
| Livestock equipment (upkeep) |  | 77 | 98 | 72 |
| Buildings and fencing (new) |  | 254 | 459 | 26 |
| Buildings and fencing (upreep) |  | 186 | 264 | 28 |
| Hired labor |  | 698 | 872 | 430 |
| Taxes (real estate \& pers, property) |  | 263 | 236 | 45 |
| General farm and insurance |  | 114 | 139 | 80 |
| Cash rent |  |  | 294 | 529 |
| Interest paid |  | 406 | 326 | 62 |
| (1) Total farm purchases |  | \$ 7797 | \$10572 | \$7339 |
| (2) Decrease in farm capital |  | 442 | 258 | 10 |
| (3) Board fumished hired labor |  | 127 | 148 | 102 |
| (4) Interest on farm capital |  | 1220 | 1328 | 473 |
| (5) Unpaid family labor. |  | 207 | 272 | 263 |
| (6) Total farm exp. (Sum of (1) to (5) |  | \$9793 | \$12578 | \$ 8187 |
| FARM RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |
| Daisy and dual-purpose cows |  | \$ 144 | \$. 154 | \$ 173 |
| Dairy products |  | 978 | 798 | 611 |
| Other dairy and dual-purpose cattle |  | 195 | 147 | 126 |
| Beef cattle (including feeders) |  | 2129 | 3143 | 2028 |
| Hogs |  | 4406 | 5448 | 3041 |
| Sheep and wool (including feeders) |  | 458 | 656 | 655 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 634 | 879 | 736 |
| \#ges |  | 861 | 1007 | 802 |
| Horses |  | 37 | 17 | 40 |
| Corn |  | 303 | 490 | 233 |
| Small grain |  | 411 | 782 | 483 |
| Other crops |  | 450 | 617 | 453 |
| Machinery \& equip. sold |  | 111 | 215 | 174 |
| Agricultural adjustment payments |  | 83 | 63 | 69 |
| Income from work off the farm |  | 340 | 361 | 283 |
| Misc. |  | 101 | 69 | 49 |
| (7) Total farm sales |  | \$11661 | \$14476 | \$9956 |
| (8) Increase in farm capital |  | - | - | - |
| (9) Family living from the farm |  | 552 | 595 | 512 |
| (10) Total farm receipts (7)+(8)+(9) |  | \$12213 | \$15471 | \$10468 |
| (6) Total farm expenses |  | 9793 | 12578 | 6187 |
| (11) Operator's labor earnings (10)-(6) |  | $2+20$ | 2893 | 2281 |
| (12) Ret.cap. \& fam.1ab. (4)+(5)+(11) |  | 3847 | 4493 | 3017 |

## ANALYSIS OF THE RBASOIS FOR DITFBREMCES IN OPBRAIOR'S BARIINGS

.) The operator's labor earnings varied widely anong the farmers included in this study. - The average labor earning of those farmers ranking in the uipher 20 per cent in the range according to earmings was $\$ 6,633$ anc of those in the lower 20 per cent was $\$-53$. This is a range of $\$ 6,686$ between the average earn--ings of these two groups. Some of the causes for these differences in eamings may be beyond the control of the farmer. However, all of these farmers could make some changes in their farming operations which would inçrease earnings. A farmer can secure some ideas bs to changes that could profitably be made on his farm by studying the facts about his business as presented in this report and comparing his accomplishments with other famers following the same general type of farming. The more important management factors affecting eamings and their relationships with earnings are preseated in the following tables. These factors vary from year to year in their relative influence on earningiso

Table 9. Relation of Cnop Yields to Farm Earnings
Per cent crop yields were of the average

| for all 163 farms | No of | Average operatorts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms |

$\because$
$\vdots$
$\vdots$

High production per acre, up to certain limits, tends to lower the cosit per bushel of grain or per ton of hay. Any possible method of managenent that will

- increase cropy yields and thercfore lower cost of production more than the extra expense incurred in securing the higher yields should be given consideration.


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

Table 11. Relation of Returns from Productive Iivestock to Farm Earmings Index of returns for $\$ 100$ feed

| fed to procuctive Iivestock* | No. of | Average operator's |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms |


| Below 62 | 73 | 30 | $\$ 1426$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $82-115$ | 98 | 104 | 3024 |
| II6 and above | 136 | 29 | 3475 |

*The index is weighted by the number of animal units.
The mafority of these farms are livestock fams. A large proportion of the crops raised are fed on the farm and some additional feed is purchased. Feed is the major item of cost in livestock production and livestock constitutes an inportant source of income on these farms. Hence there is a marked relationship between returns for $\$ 100$ of feed and:operator!s labor carnings on these farms. There are a number of reasons for differonces among forms in livestock returns. Eigh productivity per animal and oconomy in the.use of feod and labor are important. Other factors of consideable importanco are kind of feed used, quality of pastures, balance of ration, degree of sanitation, and kind of sheltor and equipment.

Table 12. Relation of Amount of Productive Livestock to Farm Earnings Productive Iivestock

| units per 100 acres* | No. of | Averace operator's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms |


| Below 17.0 | 12.9 | 39 | $\$ 2380$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $17.0-27.9$ | 21.6 | 74 | 2661 |
| 28.0 and above | 34.1 | 34 | 3527 |

*Acres in timber not pastured, roads, waste and farmstead were not incluäed.
The amount of livestock was less importent in 1944 than in 1943. Sixteen highly specialized crop farms with rore than 50 per cont of the total work units expended on crops were onitted from the averages in Tablo 13. The anount of livestock is an important factor only on livestoch farms.

On some farms the rotums fron livestock are so low thet they do not cover feed and othor costs. Such livestock is unprofitable, especially if there is nore than enough to utilize what would othervise be waste foed. If the livestock is yielding a net retum, an increased amount of livestock adds to size of businoss and the opportunity to increase the farm oarnings. Iivestock produces manure and aids in keeping up the fertility of the land, and utilizes waste products on the farm. Livestock also helps to provide productive employment throughout the yoar. Any method that aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capacity should add to the fam incore.


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

Table 14. Relation of Anount of Work Accomplished per Worker to Farm Earnings

|  | Earnings |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Worls units per worker Ho. of Average operatorts <br> Group Average fams | labor earnings |  |


| Below. 230 | 194 | 34 | $\$ 1397$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $230-334$ | 280 | 97 | 2738 |
| 335 and above | 393 | 32 | 4530 |

Farmers! eamings are generally higher on those farms on which a large amount of work is accomplished per worter. 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 farily labor. The farm should be so organized that the labor requirements are well distributed throughout the year. Handing pastures in such a way that as large a proportion as possible of the year's feed for livestock may be obtaincd fron them helps to reduce labor requirenomis. Proper plaining of the farre work and econonical use of labor-saving machinery help to increase the work accomplished per worker.

| Expense to Farm Earnings* |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expenso per work unit | No. Of | Average operator's |
| Group Average | farms | labor eamings |
| \$5.25 and above \$6.13 | 34 | \$149? |
| \$3.25-\$5.24:4.12 | 95 | 2913 |
| Below \$3.25 . 2.55 | 34 | 3843 |

Some of the cash expenses con be kept down by careful managenent. Oftentines necessary repairs and improvenonts can be made by using the available farm labor rather than by hiring extra help. Repairs and overhanling should be done before spring work begins insofar as possible; or on rainy days or in other spare tine during the sunter. Reducing the number of horses to the ninimun required for efficient operation of the farm holps reduce the power expense, In sone cases famers can offsct some or all of the power and machinery oxponse by using their equipnent for outside work.

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency, Quite often farm operators show efficient management in one part of the farm business, which is offset by poor results in other phases. These farmers get medium returns while those who fall down all along the line get the lowest returns; and on the other hand those few who can manage to attain high efficiency in all parts of their organization receive returns well above the average. This is well illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16. Relation of Operator's Labor Eamings to the Number of Factors in Which the Farmer is Above Average


EXPLAIAATION OF "WORK UNITS"
The total "work units" for any one farm is a measure of the size of that farm business. A work unit as used in this report is the average accomplishment of a farm worker in a ten hour day working on crops and productive livestock at average efficiency or ten hours of work off the farm for pay. The number of work units for each class of livestock and each acre of crop are presented in Table 17.

Table 17. Nurber of Work Units for Mach Class of Livestock and Each Acre of Crop

| Item $\quad$ No. of | Itom | No. of work units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy and dual pur. covs .. 13.5 per cow | Snall grain | . 7 per acre |
| Other dairy \& du.pur.eattle 4.0 per an.unit* | Sugar beets | 3.0 per acre |
| Beef breeding herd ...... 4.0 per an.unit* | Sweet corm | 2.3 per acre |
| Feeder cattle ....... . 35 per 100 lbs. | Corn, husked | 1.0 per acre |
| Sheep-farm flock - .i.l.6 per an. unit* | Corn, hogged | . 6 per acre |
| Sheep - feeders. . 4 per 100 lbs . | Com, shredded | 2.1 per acre |
| Hogs . ........ 25 per 100 lbs. | Com silage | 1.7 per acre |
| Turkeys. ${ }^{\text {. }}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$. 7 per 100 lbs . | Corn fodder | $\because .9$ per acre |
| Hens . 26.0 per 100 hens | Alfalfa hay | 1.0 per acre |
| Canning peas 2.0 per acre | Soybean hay | 1.4 per acre |
| Soybeans for grain $\quad . .9$ per acre | Other hay crops | -6.pex acre |

Table 18. Measures of Farm Organization and Managenent Efficiency, 1944
Measures used in chart
on page l5

Itens related to some of the above measures:
(3) Index of return for $\$ 100$ feed from -
Dairy cattle (See pages 20 \& 21)
Dual-purpose cattle (See pp. 22 \& 23)
Beef cattle - breeding herd. (See p. 26 )

|  | 100 | 116 | 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100 | 109 | 83 |
|  | 100 | 112 | 95 |
|  | 100 | 1.25 | 98 |
|  | 100 | 115 | 87 |
|  | 100 | 74 | 91 |
| $\cdots$ | 100 | 131 | - |
|  | 100 | 104 | - |
|  | 100 | 105 | 101 |
|  | 181 | - 229 | 162 |
|  | 312 | 384 | 258 |
|  | 37 | 50 | 25 |
|  | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| , | . 6 | . 8 | . 6 |
| 9. | \$2.20 | \$2.05 | \$2.49 |
|  | . 83 | . 70 | . 84 |
| $\cdots$ | - 32 | . 31 | .31 |
|  | . 85 | .70 | 1.01 |

[^1]Using your figures from page 14, locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for the 163 farms included in this summary are located between the dotted lines across the center of this page.


Table 19. Distribution of Acres in Farrn, 1944

| ```Crop: (A) (B) (C) and (D) refer to ranking used in calculating % of tillable land in High Return Crops (see page 1.4)``` |  | No. growing this crop | Your <br> farm | Average of 163 fartis | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profit- } \\ & \text { able } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 33 least profit- able farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canning peas | (A) | 7 |  | . 5 | 1.4 | - |
| Plax | (C) | 97 |  | 15.2 | 22.3 | 11.4 |
| Barley | (D) | 9 |  | . 8 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| Wheat | (D) | 9 |  | . 4 | . 8 | . 1 |
| Oats | (D) | 156 |  | 39.3 | . 51.1 | 30.9 |
| Soybeans for grain | (D) | 55 |  | 6.3 | 12.4 | 5.5 |
| Rye | (D) | 3 |  | . 2 | .5 | - |
| Millet | (D) | 33 |  | 3.1 | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| Buckwheat | (D) | 7 |  | . 8 | 2.2 | . 3 |



Table 20. Crop Yields per Acre, 1944

| Crop | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { farm } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { of } 163 \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 33 most profitable farms | 33 least profitable farras |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canning peas, value above seed cost | \$ | \$21.94 | \$23.52 | \$ - |
| Rlax, bu. |  | 6.0 | 6.9 | 4.3 |
| Barley, bu. |  | 15.8 | 14.5 | - |
| Wheat, bu. |  | 12.4 | 19.0 |  |
| Oats, bu. |  | 36.3 | 43.0 | 30.7 |
| Soybeans for grain, bu. |  | 18.5 | 18.9 | 16.1 |
| Rye, bu. |  | 7.4 | 5 | 11 ? |
| Millet, bu. |  | 13.6 | 10.5 | 11.2 |
| Buckwheat, bu. |  | 13.4 | - | - |
| Corm grain, bu. |  | 49.6 | 54.9 | 42.4 |
| Corn or sorghus silage, tons |  | 7.5 | 8.2 | 5.7 |
| Sweet corm, tons |  | 2.7 | - | 1.8 |
| Corn or sorghus fodder, tons |  | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.8 |
| Alfalfa hay, tons |  | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| Soybean hay, tons |  | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Mixed legurie \& non-leguna hay, tons |  | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Iegurnes for seed, lbs. |  | 104 | - |  |
| Timothy and/op brone hay, tons |  | 1.3 | - | 1.3 |
| Timothy seed, libs. |  | 119 | - | $\therefore$ |
| Other anrual hay, tons |  | 1.0 | - | 1.0 |
| Phalaris hay on non-tillable land, tons Wild hay, tons | - | 1.0 .9 | 1.2 | . 6 |



Table 24. Feed Costs and Returms fron Hogs, 1944

| Items | Your <br> farm | Average <br> of 159 <br> farms | 32 farms highest in returns above feed | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \text { farns } \\ & \text { lowest in } \\ & \text { returns } \\ & \text { above feed } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feed per cut. hogs produced, Ibs.: |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  | 435 | 311 | 626 |
| Snall erain |  | 73 | 48 | 119 |
| Con. feeds - under 25\% protein |  | 8 | 4 | 15 |
| Com. feeds - over 25\% protein |  | 27 | 26 | 31 |
| Total concentrates |  | 543 | 339 | 791 |
| Skin milk and buttemilk |  | 71 | 48 | 96 |
| Feed cost per cwt. hags produced: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | \$10.00 | \$7.26 | \$14.61 |
| Skina milk and butternilk |  | . 17 | . 13 | . 23 |
| Pasture |  | . 15 | . 13 | . 18 |
| TOTAL FEED COSTS |  | \$10.32 | \$7.52 | \$15.02 |
| Net increase in val. Ber cwt.hogs prod. \$ |  | \$13.63 | \$14.29 | \$13.16 |
| REPTUTS ABOVE PEED COST ERR CWT. HOGS PROD. $\$$ |  | \$3.31 | \$6.77 | \$-1.66 |
| RETURIS FOR \$100 OF ETED |  | \$142 | \$194 | \$91 |
| Price received per cut, hogs sold |  | \$13.12 | \$13.56 | \$12.76 |
| No. Of spring litters faised |  | 13.4 | 11.4 | 11.6 |
| No. Oi fall litters raised |  | 3.6 | 3.9 | 2.0 |
| Total no. on litters raised |  | 17.2 | 15.3 | 13.6 |
| No. of pigs born per litter |  | 7.5 | 7.7 | 6.6 |
| No. of pigs weaned per litter |  | 5.9 | 6.0 | 5.1 |
| Pounds of hogs produced. |  | 29797 | 29353 | 19221 |

High returns are associated with high quality managenent. The combined effect. on return over feed from excelling in a number of hog managenent factors is showh in Table 25. The factors included are: (1) pounds of concentrates required to produce 100 pounds of hogs including skimilk and buttermilk on a grain equivalent basis, (2) price received for hogs sold, (3) number of pigs born per litter, (4) number of pigs weaned per litter, and (5) sanitation (pigs raised on clean ground). Eighteen farriers were below the average of the group in all five factors; their average return over feed was. $\$-3.92$ per 100 pounds of hogs. The 4 farmers who were abovo average in all five factors had an average returm over feed of $\$ 5.56$ per 100 pounds. The difference between the two extremes amounts to $\$ 9.46$ per 100 pounds or $\$ 2825$ for the average production 0229,797 pounds of hogs on these farms.

Table 25. Relation of Return Over Feed per 100 Pounds of Hogs to the Number of Managonent Factors in Whioh Famers Excelled

| Wo. of factors in which farmer excels | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { farms* } \end{aligned}$ | The length of the shaded Ines is in proportion to the average return over foed per 100 pounds of hogs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { return } \\ & \text { over feed } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $1{ }^{16}$ | x-xxaxxxxxxax | \$-3.92 |
| 1 | 27 | 2xaxixxex | 2.28 |
| 2 | 36 | xymerxamexix | 3.61 |
| 3 | 32 | xxxcrxxixxxxymx | 4.69 |
| 4 | 27 |  | 4.82 |
| 5 | 4 |  | 5.56 |

* The data from 15 famers who purchased feedor pigs or who did not supply informe tion on sanitation practices vere onitted from this table.

Table 26. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dairy Cows, 1944


* 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 sane variation in the number of months of ary period per cow; however, this variation is snall for the najority of farms.

Table 27. Feed Costs and Retums from Other Dairy Cattle, 1944


Table 28. Feed Costs and Retums from All Dairy Cattle, 1944

| Items | Your farm | Average <br> o土 65 <br> farms | 13 farms <br> highest in butterfat per cow | 13 farms lowest in butterfat per cow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per animal unit, lbs: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | 1925 | 2601 | \$1346 |
| Hay and fodder |  | 3548 | 4187 | 3432 |
| Silage |  | 3266 | 391.6 | 3140 |
| Feed cost per animal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | \$ | \$36.83 | \$50.28 | \$24.38 |
| Roughages |  | 32.49 | 38.92 | 31.33 |
| Pasture |  | 5.11 | 4.84 | 5.53 |
| TOTAL FABD COSTS |  | \$74.43 | \$94.04 | \$61. 24 |
| Value of produce per animal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy products | \$ | \$92.63 | \$133.13 | \$53.00 |
| Net incr.in value of dairy cattle |  | - 31.29 | 44.17 | 28.92 |
| TOEAL TALUE PRODUCED |  | \$123.92 | \$177.30 | \%81.92 |
| RETURNS ABOVE FEED PER ANIMAL UNIT |  | \$ 49.49 | \$63.26 | \$20.68 |
| PETURNS PER \$100 OF FEED |  | \$174 | \$204 | \$139 |
| Animal units of dairy cattle |  | 18.0 | 22.6 | 13.6 |

* Four farmers having both a dairy and a beef herd used a beef buli and included all the youne stock in the beer hera.

Table 29. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dual Purpose Cows, 1944

| Items | Your farn | Average of 38 farms | 9 farms highest in butterfat ner cow | 9 farms lowest in butterfat per cow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pounds of butterfat per cow |  | 172 | 221 | 132 |
| Feeds per cow, lbs.: - - 172 |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  | 1278 | 1297 | 902 |
| Small grain |  | 412 | 524 | 393 |
| Com. feeds - under 25\% protein |  | 13 | - | 6 |
| Com: feeds - over 256 protein |  | 21 | 8 | 10 |
| Legume hay |  | 3100 | 3338 | 2003 |
| Other hay |  | 110 | 88 | 192 |
| Fodder and stover |  | 206 | 293 | - |
| Total concentrates |  | 1724 | 1829 | 1311 |
| Total dry roughage |  | 3416 | 3719 | 2195 |
| Silage |  | 2830 | 3372 | 3541 |
| Total digestible nutrients* |  | 3579 | 3980 | 2718 |
| T.D.N. per lb. B.F. |  | 20.8 | 18.0 | 20.6 |
| \% T.D.N. that is protein |  | 14.0 | 14.1 | 13.0 |
| Feed cost per cow: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | \$ | \$31.75 | \$34.06 | \$24.42 |
| Roughaces |  | 30.32 | 33.25 | 23.54 |
| Pasture |  | 5.95 | 6.45 | 5.41 |
| TOTAL FHED COSTS |  | \$6\%.02 | \$73.76 | \$53.37 |
| Value of produce per cow: |  |  |  |  |
| B.F. sales | $\$$ | \$75.04 | \$92.15 | \$57.47 |
| Dairy produce used in house |  | 16.03 | 21.92 | 12.03 |
| Milk to Iivestock |  | 16.50 | 21.53 | 13.04 |
| Net increases in value of cows |  | 6.45 | 6,00 | 2.05 |
| - TOTAL VALUTE PRODTICED |  | \$114.03 | \$37. 3.70 | W84.59 |
| RETURNS ABOVB HEED COST PER COM |  | \$46.01 | \$67.94 | \$31.22 |
| RETURITS FOR \$100 OA PEED |  | \$176 | \$201 | \$158 |
| Price recd. per Ib. B.F. sold (cts.) |  | 57.0 | 57.1 | 55.6 |
| Feed cost por 10. B.F. (cents) | : | 39.5 | 33.4 | 40.4 |
| \% fall freshening |  | 33 | 42 | 14 |
| Number of cows |  | 8.0 | 5.9 | 10.1 |

* Not incIuding nutrients received from pasture.

| Items | Your <br> farm | Average of 28 farms* | 7 farms highest in returns above feed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { farms } \\ & \text { lowest in } \\ & \text { returns } \\ & \text { above feed. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per head, lbs.: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | 906 | 849 | 1118 |
| Hay and fodder |  | 1169 | 803 | 1456 |
| Silage $\quad$ |  | 899 | 602 | 1740 |
| Skim milk |  | 879 | 1033 | 744 |
| Whole milk |  | 322 | 303 | 488 |
| Feed cost per head: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | \$16.72 | \$15.28 | \$21.02 |
| Roughages |  | 9.90 | 6.38 | 14.71 |
| Milk |  | 9.50 | 9.73 | 12.49 |
| Pasture |  | 2.89 | 2.78 | 3.03 |
| TOTAL FYED COSTS |  | \$39.01 | 534.17 | \$51.25 |
| Nét increase in value |  | \$42.75 | \$61.32 | \$31.52 |
| RETURIS ABOVE PEED COST PER HPAD |  | \$3.74 | \$27.15 | \$-19.73 |
| PHTURNS FOR \$100 OF FTED |  | $\$ 119$ | \$187 | \$60 |
| No. of head of other dual-purpose cattle |  | 14.5 | 11.4 | 15.7 |



* Ten famerg Laving both dual-purpose and a beof herd used a beef bull and included al the young stotk in the beef herot.

The farmer who excels in all phases of the management of his dairy cows receives a larger return than one who excels in none or only a few of the management factors. The combined effect on return over feed per dairy cow from excelling in a number of mangenent factors is shown in Table 32. The factors included are (1) pounds of butterfat per cow, (2) total digestible nutrients per pound of butterfat, (3) percentage of protein in the T.D.N., (4) price received for butterfat, (5) feed cost per pound of butterfat, and (6) percentage of fall freshening. Seven farmers were below the average of the group in all six factors; their return over feed anounted to $\$ 9.25$ per cow. Eleven farmers who were above the average of the group in either five or six factors received a retum over feed of $\$ 117.24$ per cow. The difference between these two oxtrenos amounts to $\$ 107.99$ per cow or $\$ 1199$ for the average herd of 11.1 cows.

Table 32. Relation of Return Ovet Feed per Dairy Oow to Number of Managenent
Fictors in Which Farmers Excelled

| No. of factors | No. | The length of the shaded lines is in | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in which | of | proportion to the average return over | return |
| farmer excels | ferms | feed per dairy cow | over feed |
| 0 | 7 | XX | \$ 9.25 |
| 1 | 4 | xxxxacxax | 33.62 |
| 2 | 16 | x<xxxxxxxxxuxx | 61.74 |
| 3 | 16 | xxxxxmexinxcrixxx | 64.20 |
| 4 | 11 |  | 89.10 |
| 5 or 6 | 11 |  | 120.17 |

$\therefore$ Similar variations occur in the returns secured from dual purpose cows. The data in Table 33 show the combined effect from excelling in the six factors listed above. The 6 famers, were below the average of the group in all six factors or excelled in only one factor received a return over feed cost per cow of $\$ 28.31$. Nine famers who excelled in four or five factors received a return of $\$ 75.43$ per cow. The difference between these two extrenes anounts to $\$ 47.12$ per cow or $\$ 377$ for the average milking herd of 8 cows.

Table 33. Relation of Return Over Feed per Dual Purpose Cow
to Nurber of Managenent Factors in Which Farmers Excolled

| No. of factors | No. | The length of the shaded lines is in | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in which | of | proportion to the average retum over | return |
| farmer excels | farms | feed per dual purpose cow | over feed |
| None or I | 6 | xxexaxixax. | \$28.31 |
| 2 or 3 | 23 |  | 39.14 |
| 4 or 5 | 9 |  | 75.43 |

Table 34. Feed Costs and Returns fron Feeder Cattle, 1944

| Itens | Your farm | Average of 77 fams | 15 farms highest in returns above feed | 15 fams lowest in returns above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per cwt. beef produced, Ibs.: |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  | 609 | 420 | 665 |
| Small grain |  | 17 | 17 | 9 |
| Com. feeds - under 25\% protein |  | 6 | 3 | 20 |
| Con. feeds - over $25 \%$ protein |  | 26 | 13 | 13 |
| Legurne hay |  | 257 | 217 | 355 |
| Other hay |  | 56 | 49 | 70 |
| Fodder and stover |  | 34 | 26 | 28 |
| Lotal concentrates |  | 658 | 453 | 707 |
| Total diy roughages |  | 347 | 292 | 453 |
| Silage |  | 410 | 348 | 793 |
| Feed cost per cwt beef produced: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | \$11.52 | \$8.02 | \$11.75 |
| Roughages |  | 3.22 | 2.74 | 4.92 |
| Pasture |  | .32 | .43 | . 44 |
| TOTAL HBED COSTS |  | \$15.06 | \$11.19 | \$17.11 |
| Net increese in value of feeders |  | \$18.62 | \$21.30 | \$12.91 |
| RET.ABOVE. HEED COST PER CWI.BEEF PROD. |  | \$3.56 | \$10.11 | \$-4.20 |
| RETUPTS TOR $\$ 100$ OE FEED |  | \$134 | \$206 | \$75 |
| Price reed. per 100 lbs. beef sold |  | \$13.83 | \$14.01 | \$13.06 |
| Price paid per 100 lbs. bought |  | \$11.22 | \$11.10: | \$10.98 |
| No. of animal units |  | 22.0 | 20.0 | 34.7 |
| Pounds of beef produced. |  | 11182 | 11782 | 13132 |
| Ibs. gain in weight per day |  | 1.7 | 7.8 | 1.6 |

Superior nanagenent in the cattle feeding enterprise results in a comparar tively high return juct as superior manegenent in the dairy herd resulted in a high retum over feed per cow. The combined effect on retum over feed per 100 pounds produced fron excelling in five factors is shown in Table $35 \cdot$ The factors included axe: (1) feed cost per 100 pounds of cattle produced, (2) the price receired per 100 pounds sold, and (3) gain in weight per day. The 11 farmers who were below the average in all three factors failed to secure a return large enough to cover the cogt of the feed. Four famers were above the average in the three factorg and their ieturn ovor feed anounted to $\$ 9.64$. The difference between the two extrenos is $\$ 11.49$ or $\$ 1285$ for the average production of 11,182 pounds per famm.

Table 35. Relation of Return Over Feed per 100 Pounds of Beef Cattle Produced to Number of Mancenent Factors in Thich Farters Excelled


Table 36. Teed Costs and Returns fron Beef Breeding Herd, 1944

| Itens | Your fam | Average <br> or 59 <br> farms | 12 fams highest in retums above feed | 12 fams lowest in returns above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per aninal unit, Ibs. |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | 1028 | 1339 | 1192 |
| Legune hay |  | 2164 | 1774 | 2455 |
| Other hay |  | 380 | 181 | 531. |
| Fodder and stover |  | 272 | 321 | 352 |
| Silage |  | 2934 | 1047 | 3582 |
| Skin milik* |  | 101 | 234 | 33 |
| Whole milk* |  | 7 | 21 | 10 |
| Feed cost per aninal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | \$18.86 | \$24.21 | \$22.78 |
| Roughages |  | 24.76 | 19.06 | 28.94 |
| Milk* |  | . 43 | 1.10 | . 30 |
| Pasture |  | $5: 87$ | 5.92 | 5.77 |
| TOTAL HEED COSTS |  | \$49.92 | \$50.29 | \$57.79 |
| Value of produce per aninal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy products |  | \$13.45 | \$25.56 | \$7.95 |
| Net increase in value of animals |  | 48.67 | 67.02 | 35.86 |
| TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED |  | \$62.12 | \$92.58 | \$34.81 |
| RETP. ABOVE FEED COST PER ANIMAL UNIT |  | \$12.20 | \$42.29 | \$-13.98 |
|  |  | \$130 | \$200 | \$75 |
| Number of cows and herd bulls |  | 16.6 | 18.0 | 18.9 |
| Number of animal units in the herd |  | 26.1 | 29.4 | 29.2 |

* Several farners had both dairy or dual purpose cows and beet cows and fed sone milk produced by the milking herd to beef calves.

Table 37. Feed Costs and Returns for Turkeys, 1944

| Itens | Your fam | Average of 8 fams | 4 farms <br> highest in <br> retums <br> above feed | 4 farms Iowest in returns above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feed per cwt. turkeys produced, lbs.: |  |  |  |  |
| Grain |  | 338 | 337 | 339 |
| Con. feeds - under $25 \%$ protein |  |  | 5 | 1 |
| Com. feeds - over 25\% protein |  | 134 | 198 | 170 |
| Total concentrates |  | 525 | 540 | 510 |
| Feed cost per cwt. turkeys produced |  | \$14.88 | \$15.51 | \$14.26 |
| NRT ITCREASES IN VAIUE OF TURKEYS | \$ | \$25.15 | \$28.51 | \$21.79 |
| RETURIS ABOV F FiED COSI PER CWT. TURKEYS |  | \$10.27 | \$ $\$ 13.00$ | \$7.53 |
| RETURIS FOR \$100 OF FERD |  | \$168 | \$185 | \$151 |
| Price recd.per lb. turkey sold (cts.) |  | 34.5 | 33.7 | 35.2 |
| Pounds of turkeys produced. |  | 28517 | - 40654 | 16370 |

Table 38. Feed Costs and Returns from Chickens, 1944


Superior managenent leads to high returns. The combined effect on return over feed fron excelling in a number of poultry management. factors is shown in Table 39. The factors included are (1) pounds of concentrates per hen, including skin milk on a grain equivalent basis, (2) price recelved per dozen of eggs sold, (3) number of eggs laid per hen, (4) percentage of the hens that are pullets, and (5) death loss. Two famers were below the average in all the factors; they failed to receive a return large enough to cover the cost of the feed. The 2 farmers who excelled in all five factors had an average return over feed of $\$ 3.13$ per hen. The difference betweon the two extremes amounts to $\$ 3.39$ or $\$ 837$ for the average flock of 247 hens.

Table 39. Relation of Return Over Feed Per Hen to the Number of Management Factors in Which Famers Excelled


Table 40. Feed Costs and Returns from a Farm Flock of Sheep, 1944


* Two lams under six months of age considered as one head.
**Lambs which die during nonth of birth are not included.
Superior management in the sheap enterprise results in a comparatively high return over feed just as superior management in the dairy herd or poultry flock resulted in a high return over feed per cow or per hon. The effect on return over feed fron excelling in 6 factors is shown in Table 41. The factors included are (1) feed cost per head, (2) price received per 100 lbs. or lambs sold, (3) price received per lb. of wool sold, (4) Ibs. of wool per sheep sheared, (5) per cent lamb crop, and (6) per cent death loss. The 7 farmers who were above the average in only one or two factors received a return above feed cost of $\$ 0.20$ per head, while 8 farmers who excelled in 5 of 6 of the factors reccived a return of $\$ 6.78$ per head. The difference between the two extremes is $\$ 6.58$ or $\$ 385$ for the average flock of 59 head.

Table 41. Relation of Return Over Feed Per Head of Sheep to Munber of Managenent Factors in Which Famers Excelled

| No. of factors in which farmer excels | No. of farns | Iength of shaded lines is in prom portion to the average return over feed per head of sheep | Average return over feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 or 2 | 7 | X | \$0.20 |
| 3 or 4 | 20 |  | 4.14 |
| 5 or 6 | 8 |  | 6.78 |

*The records of 15 famers who did not sell lambor falled to report wadghts were onitted.


The effect on return over feed fron feeder sheep fron excelling in three factors is shown in Table 43. The factors included are (1) feed cost per. 100 lbs. of sheep produced, (2) price received per 100 lbs . of sheep sold, and (3) death loss. Two farmers failed to excel in any of the three factors or excelled in only one factor; their return over feed was $\$ 6.09$ per 100 Ibs produced. ien farmers excelled in two or three of the factors and had an averase return over foed of $\$ 14.80$ per $100 \mathrm{Ibs}$. The difference between the two extremes is $\$ 8.71$ or $\$ 608$ for the avorage production of 6982 lbs . of sheep.

Table 43. Relation of Retum Over Feed per 100 Lbs. of Feeder Sheep Produced to Nuriber of Management Factors in Which Farners Excelled

| 7o. of factors | No. | Iength of shaded lines is in | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in which farmer | of | proportion to the average return | return over |
| axcels | fams* | over feed per 100 los. produced | foed |
| None or 1 | 8 | 20xarxaroxax | \$6.09 |
| 2 or 3 | 10 |  | 14.80 |

* The records of 3 famers who did not sell sheep during the year were omitted.

Table 44. Summary of Farm Earnings - Averaged by Counties, 1944

| , | Cottonwood | Faribault | Jackson | Martin | Murray | Nobles | Redwood | Rock | Vatonwan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAPM EXPGTSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle bought | \$ 1525 | \$ 1132 | \$ 878 | \$ 816 | \$ 1522 | ¢ ${ }^{\circ} 1584$ | \$ 1562 | \$ 931 | \$ 292 |
| Hogs bought | : 217 | - 533 | 154 | 186 | - 699 | 306 | - 220 | 440 | - 58 |
| Sheep bought | 332 | 362 | 197 | 75 | 239 | 770 | 40 | 373 | 27 |
| Poultry bought | 214 | 229 | 121 | 104 | 108 | 396 | 95 | 223 | 110 |
| Misc. livestock exp. | 126 | 176 | 126 | 208 | 131 | 213 | 117 | 383 | 122 |
| Crop expense | 555 | 597 | . 506 | 759 | 506 | 406 | 699 | 589 | 653 |
| Feed : | 2016 | 1586 | 2089 | $\therefore 1450$ | 1567 | 3011 | 2442 | 2418 | 1585 |
| Custom work hired | 293 | 225 | 315 | 447 | 175 | 278 | 178 | 273 | 243 |
| Power expense | 872 | 1074 | 990 | 1109 | 1153 | 1131 | 1115 | 1207 | 935 |
| Crop mach. \& livestock equip. | 807 | 580 | 517 | 532 | 821 | 712 | 675 | 967 | 529 |
| Builaings $\quad \because \quad$, | 439 | 353 | 493 | 719 | 388 | 485 | 502 | 687 | 456 |
| Labor | 449 | 583 | 667 | 920 | 712 | 573 | 728 | 812 | 508 |
| Taxes, insurance, \& misc. | 499 | 407 | 410 | 326 | 411 | 451 | 469 | 455 | 425 |
| (1) Total purchases | *. 8344 | \$ 7537 | 8.7463 | 97551 | * 8433 | \$20406 | \$ 8845 | \$ 9758 | \$ 5943 |
| (2) Decrease in cap. | . | . 941 | $\therefore 1124$ | - | - | 572 | 1102 | - | $\therefore 1235$ |
| (3) Board to hirec labor | 60 | 49. | 75 | 243 | 125 | 77 | 138 | 235 | 160 |
| (4) Unpaid family labor. | 357 | 352 | 304 | 276 | 179 | 298 | 361 | 355 | 405 |
| - (5) Int. on farm cap. | 1857 | 1892 | 1697 | 1711 | - 1646 | $1790$ | $1959$ | $2017$ | 1655 |
| (6) Total expenses | \$10518 | \$11071 | \$20663. | \% 6881 | \$10584 | \$13143 | $\$ 12+05$ | $\frac{236}{372366}$ | \$9398 |
| EARM RECEIPMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle sales | \$ 2052 | \$ 2509 | \% 3141 | \% 1492 | \$. 2332 | \$ 3728 | \$ 3852 | \$ 3039 | \$1379 |
| Dairy products | : 759 | - 857 | 605 | 1806 | . 905 | 806 | 432 | - 1344 | 961 |
| Hogs | 3511 | 4499 | 4693 | 4060 | 4027 | 4633 | 5454 | 6653 | 4253 |
| Sheep | 2035 | 877 | 231 | 277 | 123 | 1558 | 152 | 741 | 701 |
| Poultry \& eggs. | 1673 | 1633 | 王494 | 936 | 962 | 3039 | 1261 | 2102 | 1090 |
| Crop | 2263. | $\therefore 2159$ | 2021 | 2019 | 2219 | 1433 | 1879 | 1307 | 120\% |
| AAA payment | 75 | $\therefore 83$ | 91 | 84 | 69 | 100 | 57 | 30 | $3{ }^{6}$ |
| Work off the farm : | 177 | 73 | 244 | 23 | 643 | 236 | 508 | 367 | 406 |
| Nisc. cash receipts | 377 | 274 | 130 | 243 | 260 | 428 | 306 | 322 | 267 |
| (7) Total farm sales | \$12922 | S12964 | \$12650 | \$10940 | \$11540 | 315961 | \$13931 | \$16405 | \$10508 |
| (8) Increase in cap. | 275 | - | - | 583 | 1366 | $\overrightarrow{4}$ | - | 132 | - |
| (9) Family living from fam | $\underline{463}$ | 618 | $577$ | $563$ | $548$ | $554$ | $535$ | +661 | $665$ |
| (10) Total receipts | \$13660 | \$13582 | \$13227 | $\$ 12086$ | \$13454 | \$15515 | \$14466 | \$17248 | \$11173 |
| (6) Total expenses | 10618 | 11071. | 10663 | 9861 | 10364 | 13143 | 12105 | 12366 | 9396 |
| (11) Oper. zabor eamings. | 3042 | 2511 | 2564 | 2205 | 3070 | 3372 | 2061 | 4882 | 1775 |

Table 45. Miscellaneous Information - Averaged by Counties, 1944

|  | ottonwood | Faribavit | Jacison | Martin | Murray | Hobles | Redwood | Rock | Watonwan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FARMI İVChitorims (Begiming of Year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Froductive livestock | \$ 5579 | \$ 5808 | \$ 6035 | \$ 5025 | \$ 5108 | \$ 6763 | \$ 7580 | \$ 7915 | \$6010 |
| Horses | 206 | 283 | 250 | 399 | 222 | 343 | 266 | 262 | 358 |
| Crop, seed and feed | 3544 | 4545 | 3955 | 3334 | 4014 | 4694 | 5450 | 5779 | 3872 |
| Kach. and equipment | 3732 | 3244 | 3313 | 2795 | 3237 | 3104 | 3773 | 3640 | 2963 |
| Builaings - | 8534 | 556\% | 7387 | 6906 | 7696 | 6803 | 6458 | 8437 | 7822 |
| Land | 15398 | 15567 | 13556 | 15464 | 11964 | 14360 | 15909 | $\underline{14115}$ | 12690 |
| Total farm capital | 836993 | \$3837.5 | 需34496 | \$33925 | 332243 | \$36087 | \$39736 | \$40248 | \$35115 |
| MEAS. OF FARM ORG. AND MATAGBIIMT EFPIC. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop yields - \% of ave. | 567 | 104 | 102 | 100 | 105 57.0 | 95 56.9 | 50.4 | 121. | $\begin{array}{r} 91 \\ 47.9 \end{array}$ |
| Of high return, crops | 56.9 | 53.5 100 | 53.2 102 | 55.0 111 | 57.0 97 | 56.9 104 | 50.4 88 | 56.5 102 | 47.9 100 |
| Index ret. from livestock | 102 | 100 23.7 | 102 18.6 | 111 20,1 | 97 27.9 | $2{ }^{104}$ | 88 15.1 | 102 | 19.3 |
| A. U. livestock per. 100 A . | 16.3 | 23.7 | 18.6 | 20,1 | 21.9 | 24.2 | 15.1 | 25.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \cdot 3 \\ 494 \end{array}$ |
| Work units | 463 | 503 | 463 | 456 | 583 | $52 \%$ | 583 | 663 | $\begin{aligned} & 494 \\ & 950 \end{aligned}$ |
| Work units per worker | 279 | 274 | 255 | 210 | 326 | \$ 302 | 289 | - 320 | \% 259 |
| Exp. per work unit | \$4.44 | \$4.48 | \$5.13 | \$5.04 | 33.47 | \$4.10 | \$4.06 | 35.48 | \$3. 63 |
| DISTRIBUTIOM OF ACRES ITi PARL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cultivated crops | 112.4 | 93.0 | 92.5 | 91.4 | 91.0 | 94.7 | 115.5 | 91.1 | 70.9 |
| Sillable hay land | 21.3 | 20.5 | 19.4 | 17.6 | 26.3 | 23.7 | 37.8 | 27.9 | 25.3 |
| tillable pasture | 15.0 | 29.5 | 20.7 | 23.1 | 22.0 | 19.2 | 10.5 | 22.1 | 21.7 |
| Tillable land not cropped | 19.3 | 8.9 | 12.3 | 1.5 | 10.6 | 5.6 | 36.7 | 1.6 | 21.9 |
| Total acres in farm | 292.0 | $2^{146.0}$ | 253.7 | 27.6 | 281.2 | 245.1 | 345.0 | 282.0 | 244.1 |
| $\%$ land tillable | 82.6 | 87.2 | 83.1 | 68.9 | 79.6 | 85.4 | $85 . ?$ | 62.0 | 77.9 |
| CROP YIELDS PPR ACPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flax, bu. | 5.6 | 7.3 | 3.9 | $5 \cdot 3$ | 8.2 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 8.9 | ${ }^{4} \cdot 3$ |
| Oats, bu. | 38.6 | 38.9 | 34.3 | 29.5 | 37.5 | 34.9 | 44.8 | 39.4 | 28.6 |
| Soybeans, bu. | 19.0 | 20.1 | 19.3 | 17.9 | 19.5 | 17.5 | 15.4 | 21.0 | 17.1 |
| Corn, grain, bu. | 49.3 | 49.0 | 53.1 | 54.6 | 49.6 | 47.7 | 44.2 | 55.6 | 48.2 |
| Com silage, tons | 8.3 | - 8.1 | 6.9 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 8.2 | 7.3 |
| Affalfa hay, tons | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.7 |
| AH. UNITS OF LIYESTOCK | 38.8 | 52.4 | 44.1 | 37.3 | 51.0 | 53.3 | 59.3 | 73.7 | 43.1 |
| P dasiry and du. pur. cattle | 35.4 | 21.5 | 23.6 | 36.8 | 25.9 | . 21.1 | 29.7 | 26.3 | 32.0 |
| \% in beef breeding herd | 5.1 | 18.7 | 19.4 | 15.0 | 25.6 | 16.1 | 11.0 | 27.6 | 17.0 |
| $\therefore$ \% feeder cattle | 10.6 | 12.2 | 16.0 | 9.0 | 15.7 | $1{ }^{10} 0$ | 26.0 | 5.6 | 5.8 |
| \% hogs | 24.3 | 27.1 | 28.6 | 30.1 | 20.4 | 24.7 | -31.7 | 26.9 | 31.0 |
| \% sheep-farm flock | 9.0 | 11.4 | $3 \cdot 5$ | 3.2 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 6.2 | 5.4 |
| \% sheep-feeders | 6.1 | 3.7 | 1.9 | -7 | 1.2 | 5.0 | - | 2.2 | 3.1 |
| \% turkeys: | 1.6 | \% | -0 | $5 \ddot{\square}$ | 1, | 4.6 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 5.2 |

Table 46. Summary of Farm Earnings by Years*

| Items | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 | 1944 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VTo. of faxins | 765 | 166 | 165 | 164 | 163 |
| FARII EXPEENSES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dual-pur. cattle bot. | \$. 76 | \$ 138 | \$ 141 | \$ 135 | \$ 112 |
| Beef cattle bot. (incl.feeders) | 1243 | 1766 | 1718 | 1187 | 1109 |
| Hogs bot. | 103 | 209 | 339 | 408 | 315 |
| Sheep bot. (incl. feeders) | 414 | 686 | 866 | 694 | 321 |
| Poultry bot. (incl. turkeys) | 99 | 96 | 138 | 165 | 200 |
| Horses bot. | 32 | 32 | 49 | 33 | 43 |
| Misc. livestock expense | 72 | 109 | 148 | 199 | 173 |
| Miscellaneous crop expenses | 243 | 303 | 377. | 507 | 562 |
| Feed bought | 1007 | 1718 | 2235 | $30 \% 0$ | 2164 |
| Custom wort hired | 150 | 140 | 199 | 215 | 261 |
| Power mach.' (new). | 379 | 446 | 256. | 160 | 337 |
| Power mach. (upkeep) | 411 | 497 | 533 | 617 | 699 |
| Crop and gen. mach. (new) | 319 | 416 | 387 | 221 | 332 |
| Crop and gen. mach. (unkeep) | 69 | 84 | 135. | 157 | 174 |
| Livestock equipment (new) . | 74 | 123 | 134 | 138 | 91 |
| Livestock equipment (upkeen) | 20 | 32 | 57 | 87 | 78 |
| Buildings and fencing (new) | 412 | 434 | 327 | 236 | 297. |
| Buildings and fencing (upkeep) | 65 | 141 | 156 | $16 \%$ | 192 |
| Hired labor | . 392 | 561 ' | 622 | 739 | 651 |
| Taxes | 313 | 337 | 355 | 335 | 311 |
| Insurance | 15 | 32 | 35 | 40 | 41 |
| General farm | 59 | 55 | 60 | 72 |  |
| (1) Total fam purchases | 35990 | \$635 | 39267 | \$9613 | \% 6563 |
| (2) Decrease in farm capital |  | - |  |  | 412 |
| (3) Board fumished hired labor | 131 | 171 | 143 | 147 | 118 |
| (4) Interest on farm capital | 1635 | 1831 | 1886 | 1880 | 1800 |
| (5) Unpaid family labor | $\underline{.252}$ | 266 | 350 | 335 | 316 |
| FARM RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cattle | \$ 265 | 6.392 | \$ 446 | $\$ 419$ | \$ 392 |
| Dairy products | 570 | 758 | 604 | 916 | 865 |
| Beef cattle (incl. feeders) | 2373 | 3399 | 3660 | 3590 | 2478 |
| Hogs | 1162 | 2306 | 4336 | 5630 | 4671 |
| Sheep and wool (incl. feeders) | 470 | 1032 | 1402 | 968 | $76 \%$ |
| Poultry (including turkeys) | 372 | 396 | 598 | 622 | \%29 |
| \#ggs | 244 | 334 | 589 | 905 | 911 |
| Horses | 42 | 41 | 47 | 45 | 47 |
| Com. | 516 | 477. | 625 | 724 | 576 |
| Small grain | 549 | 1133. | 1120 | 1382 | 669 |
| Other crops | 239 | 283 | 366 | 510 | 600 |
| Machinery and equipment sold | 249 | 278 | 133 | 137 | 185 |
| Agri. adjustrient payment | 506 | 503 | 503 | 264 | 74 |
| Income from labor off the farm | 193 | 196 | 163 | 137 | 1.83 |
| Miscellaneous | 394 | 176 | 165 | 155 | 197 |
| (7) Total farm sales | उड्ड44 | \$11704 | \$1515\% | \$16434 | \$73447 |
| (8) Increase in farm capital | 1179 | 2618 | - 2102 | 2 | - |
| (9) Family living from farm | 4.453 | 538 | 584 | 565 | 572 |
| (10) Tot. farm rec. $(7)+(8)+(9)$ | T10106 | \$14560 | \$17844 | \$17024 | \$14019 |
| (6) Total farm expenses | 3003 | 10645 | . 11656 | 11975 | 11209 |
| (11) Oner. Iab. earn. (10) - (6) | 2098 | 4215 | 6156 | 5049 | 2810 |

* The financial statenents dirfer in that the unpaid fanily labor rate was $\$ 45$ per month in 1940, $\$ 50$ in $1941, \$ 60$ in $1942, \$ 75$ in 1943 and $\$ 55$ in 1644 ; and the board for hired labor was calculated at $\$ 18$ per month in 1940, $\$ 20$ in 1941; $\$ 25$ in 1942, 1943 and 1944 .

Table 47. Sunmary of Miscellaneous Itens by Years
$\frac{\text { Table 47. Sunmary of Miscellaneous Items by years }}{\text { Items }} \frac{1940}{1941} \frac{1942}{19243} \quad 1944$

MEAS. OF FARM ORG. AND MATAGBMENT BHFICIENCY

oduced
PEPO OUST PER:
चaicy 0 ow
Drel purpose cow
Avinel unit in beef breeding herd
loo oss of feeder cattle produced
Fond or sheep in farm flock
100 tibs. feeder sheep produced.
100 lbs. hogs produced
Hen
200 Ibs. turkeys produced
Horse
MIES, LIVESTOCK INFORMATION
Ko. of vork horses
No. of colts
No. of dairy or dual-purpose cows
Hoad in beef breeding herd
Ihz. feeder cattle produced
Lituters of pigs
Founds of hogs produced
Mu, of hens
Ihs. of butterfat per dairy cow
Lhse of butwerdat per dual-pur. cow
Ho of pies weaned per litter
$\%$ lamb crop
Bggs per hen
$\begin{array}{r}35 \\ 52 \\ \\ \hline\end{array}$
35.9
22.1
560
569
263 79 279 213
13.7
42.3
60.1
46.2
8.5
2.0
$\$ 43$
26
18
2
3
6.
2.
2.
3.27
2.13
1.23
.96
5.74
646.50
34.85
29.86
8.00
2.60 7.16 4.29 1.11 7.27 29.74 4.1 1.0
8.6 9.0
8673 13.6
21335 161
36.5
24.7
631
264
$\$ 2.30$
295
223
12.0
29.6

26
55.9
9.5
2.0
$\$ 56$
39
25
3
5
8
5
$\because 5$

## $\$ 53$

33
9.21
2.76
8.38
5.55
1.50
8.26

31
3
4

662.99
48.55
34.55
13.27
3.01
14.23
6.76
2.15
17.40
37.06

| $\$ 88.03$ | $\$ 88.04$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 70.09 | 68.02 |
| 46.58 | 49.92 |
| 17.25 | 15.06 |
| 4.14 | 3.78 |
| 13.85 | 12.98 |
| 9.89 | 10.32 |
| 3.17 | 3.46 |
| 14.96 | 14.88 |
| 47.87 | 40.58 |

Table 47. Sumnary of Miscellaneous Items by Years (Continued)
Items $\frac{1940}{1941} \frac{1942 \quad 1943}{1944}$

## PRICE RBCEIVED PER:

Lb. B.F. sold to creameries
100 pounds feeder cattle
loo pounds feeder sheep
Pound of wool
100 pounds of hogs
Dozen eggs
Pound of turkeys

| $\$ .31$ | $\$ .37$ | $\$ .42$ | .9 .53 | $\$ .58$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8.81 | 10.13 | 12.22 | 13.65 | 13.83 |
| 6.74 | 10.08 | 12.47 | 14.52 | 15.32 |
| .29 | .38 | .41 | .41 | .41 |
| 5.15 | 9.07 | 13.13 | 13.80 | 13.12 |
| .15 | .21 | .28 | .35 | .31 |
| .14 | .18 | .29 | .32 | .34 |

PRICE. OF FEED
Shelied com, bu.
Oats, bu,
Barley, bu,
Alfalfa hay, ton
Mimothy hay, ton
Corn silage, ton
Bran, cwt.
Linseed oilmeal, cwt.
Manlage, cwt.
Meat scraps, cwt.

| $\$ .47$ | $\$ .54$ | $\$ .68$ | .9 .91 | $\$ .92$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| .26 | .32 | .41 | .60 | .70 |
| .31 | .39 | .52 | .77 | .92 |
| 7.50 | 8.50 | 8.00 | 11.00 | 15.00 |
| 4.80 | 5.45 | 5.15 | 6.75 | 9.00 |
| 2.10 | 2.55 | 2.75 | 3.62 | 5.00 |
| 1.20 | 1.50 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.20 |
| 3.75 | 2.00 | 2.40 | 2.55 | 2.05 |
| 2.50 | 3.20 | 4.10 | 4.00 | 4.18 |
| 2.55 | 3.20 | 4.10 | 4.00 | 4.18 |

- Sugeestions for Imorovenents


[^0]:    *Only operator's share of the assets and litabilitjes is included.
    **14 rented for cash, 9 cash and crop share, and 12 crop share.
    ***9 farms were rented for cash, 22 cash and crop share, 1 crop share and 1.1
    livestock: gharen

[^1]:    *Given as a percentage of the average.
    **Crops are merked in Table 19 as (A), (B), (C) and (D). All of acres in (A) crops, one-half of acres in (B) crops, and ono-fourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.
    ***An index weighted by the animal units of livestock.
    ****Acres in tinber not pastured, roads, wasto and farmstead wore not included.

