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## INTPRODUCTION

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

Note: Assistance in the preparation of this material was furnished by workers supplied on N.Y.A. Student Work Project No. 350-70. Sponsor: University of Minnesota.

The analysts of the records and the preparation of the reports are handled by the Division of Agricultural Economics under the direction of G. A. Pond, To Ro Nodland, and G. E. Toben. Field organization is handled by the Extension Division with S. B. Cleland and J. B. McNulty in charge of this work. Ross Funtsinger has been fieldman since the organization of the project. At the end of the year Max Hinds and Don Sandager of the Division of Agricultural Economics aided in closing the records. County agricultural extension agents who cooperate in this project include Paul Kunkel. E. C. Rogers, C. G. Gaylord, Il S. Orfield, T. Go Fuller, Fo Jo Meade, C. Ge Powell, A. B. Hagen, C. E. Stower, C. C. Chase. J. I. Swedberg, J. Kenneth King, and Lester Justice.

The officers for the Southwest Aarm Management. Association for 1941 were:
. President," Porter Olstad, Hanska, Brown County
-. "Vícé-Présǐdent, Milfond Davis, Reading, Nobles County
*" "Secretary-Treasurer, Arthur Foster, Garvin, Murray County
The board of directors include these officers and also the following: Wra Golly, Cottonwood county; Stanley Hanks, Faribault county; George Rentschler, Jackson county; Joè 'Boulton, "Lincoln" county;.W. E..Jones, Iyon county, Wo... Io Boyce, Martin county; Paul Cuningham, "Pipestone county; Frank Sheffield, Redwood county; Lo Jo Moeller, Rock county; and Duane Drake, Watonwan county:

The following tabulation shows by counties the numbers of members who completed records in 1941:

|  | Brown | $10^{\circ}$ | Lincoln | 8 | Nobles | 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cottônwood | 12 | Iyon | 12 | Pipestone | 7 |
|  | faribault | 20 | Martin | 14 | Redwood | 24 |
|  | Jackson | 17 | Murray | 12 | Rock | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Watonwan | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | 173 |

The tables. on page 4 and succeeding pages show 166 farms. Seven 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 OR FAPMING*

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 Thes sale of.crops constitutes an important source of income: The principal feed crops grown, are corn, oat's, barley, and häy. In addition wheat, sweet corn, canning peas, and flax are grown to a limited extent as cash crops.

TOPOGRAPHY, SOILS, AND WEATHER
The soils range from dark brown to heavy black loand The najor part of the area is undulating to gently rolling land interspersed with almost level tracts. In the western part of the area the surface ranges from undulating to sharply rolling. Nearly all of the land is tillable and well drained.

Weather conditions in 1941 were unfavorable for early spring work; seeding of small grains was seriousiy delayed. A considerable acreage of small grain was not seeded until early May. A low rainfall, relatively high temperatures, and strong winds in May dried out the tilled soil and resulted in uneven germination of corn, soybeans and sorghums. Excessive moisture in June hindered corn cultivating and haying. Hot, dry weather during July and August damaged small grains and pastures,

[^0]especially in the western counties. Beginning about July first, a series of hailstorms devastated portions of the area. Frequent rains in late September and October delayed late threshing and other fall work. Killing frosts occurred in late October.

Table 1. Monthly and Annual Precipitation

|  | Worthington |  | Fairmont |  | New U1rn |  | Redwood Falls |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Precip- itation itation | Departure from normal | Precipitation | Departure from normal | Precipitation | Departure from normal | Precip- <br> itation | Departure from normal |
|  | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches | Inches. | Inches | Inches |
| January | 0.61 | -0.02 | 0.86 | $+0.06$ | 0.77 | -0.36 | 0.72 | -0.01 |
| February | 0.78 | +0.01 | 0.73 | -0.24 | 1.47 | +0.41 | 0.72 | -0.15 |
| March | 1.14: | -0.12 | 1.24. | -0.17 | 1.46 | -0.15 | 0.72 | -0.53 |
| April | 4.08 | +2.00 | 3.51 | +1.28 | 3.57 | +1.38 | 2.93 | 1.1 .00 |
| May | 0.61 | -3.33 | 2.28 | $-1.77$ | 4.93 | +1.36 | 2.13 | -0.73 |
| June | 5.72 | $+1.43$ | 6.18 | $+1.84$ | 6.25 | +1.60 | 5.55 | +1.06 |
| Juily | 2.69 | -0.70 | 2.42 | -1.14 | 4.41 | $+0.73$ | 5.48 | +2.44 |
| August | 2.07 | -1.69 | 2.03 | -1. 71 | 0.53 | -3.02 | 0.40 | -2.58 |
| September | 5.05 | +1. 51 | 4.88 | $+1.25$ | 3.91 | +0.32 | 2.52 | -0.34 |
| October | 2.91 | +1.22 | 6.27 | 4.4.42 | 5.90 | +3.74. | 3.62 | 41.95 |
| Novernber | 1.69 | +0.52 | 1.88 | 40.37 | 0.90 | -0.41. | 0.50 | -0.71 |
| December | 0.87 | +0.26 | 0.64 | -0.26 | 0.84 | -0.06 | 0.78 | $\underline{-0.30}$ |
| 1941 Total | 28.22 | +1.09 | 32.92 | $+3.93$ | 34.94 | +5.54 | 26.07 | +1. 10 |
| 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 | -7.0\% | 23.04 | -6.36 | 28.52 | -6.45 |
| 1938 Total | 40.50 | +13.37 | 39.99 | +11.00 | 29.98 | +0.058 | 26.84 | +1.87 |
| Normal ${ }^{\text {Annual }}$ Prec | 27.13 |  | 28.99 | $\because$ | 29.40 |  | 24.97 |  |

## RECORDS KEPT

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 information was also secured during the year regarding crop and livestock production and practices.

The cooperators were assisted and supervised in keeping their records by the field, agent, Ross Huntsinger, who visited each farm in the thirteen 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 earnings as shown in this report are computed as if each farm was 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.

Table 2. Summary of Farm Inventories (Beginning of Year), 1941

| Items | Your farm | Average of 166 farms | 33 most profitable farms | 33 least profitable farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Size of farm (acres) |  | 295. | 446 | 249 |
| Size of business (work units)* |  | 631 | 957 | 458 |
| Horses |  | \$ 369 | \$: 445 | \$ 340 |
| Productive livestock (total) |  | 4,567 | 9,558 | 2,739 |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows |  | 642 | 723 | 521 |
| Other dairy \& dual-purpose cattle |  | 363 | 347 | 353 |
| Beef cattle (including feeders) |  | 2,169 | -5,553 | 1,105 |
| Hogs |  | 709 | - 1,207 | 480 |
| Sheep (including feeders) |  | 558 | 1,582 | 178 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 126 | 146 | 102 |
| Crop, seed, and feed |  | 4,126 | 6,692 | 3,096 |
| Mach \% \& equipment (total) |  | 2,943 | 4,51? | 2,145 |
| Power mach ( $\mathrm{f}_{\text {. }}$ share)... |  | 1,122 | 1,703 | 866 |
| Crop \& gen mach. (f, share) |  | 1,419 | 2,211 | 956 |
| Livestock equip. \& supplies |  | 402 | 603 | 323 |
| Buildings, fences, etc. |  | 7,487 | 10,580 | 6,599 |
| Land |  | 15,812 | 25,341 | 12,789 |
| Total farm capital |  | 35, 304 | \$57, 133 | \$27,708 |

*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 farra 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 | No. of work units | Item. | Per | No. of work units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy and dualpurpose cows | cow | 13.5 | Small grain <br> Soybeans for grain | acre | $\begin{array}{r} .7 \\ .9 \end{array}$ |
| Other dairy \& dual-) |  | 4.0 | Sugar beets | " | 3.0 |
| purpose cattle ) | animal |  | Sweet corn. | " | 2.5 |
| Beef breeding herd ) | unit* | 4.0 | Corn, husked | " | 1.3 |
| Sheep - farm flock) |  | 1.6 | Corn, hogged | 1 | . 8 |
| Hens | 100 hens | 26.0 | Corn, shredued | ${ }^{18}$ | 2.5 |
| Feeder cattie , |  | . 35 | Corn silage | " | 1.9 |
| Feeder sheep ) | 100 lbs . | . 4 | Corn fodder | " | 1.3 |
| Hogs $\because \because$ ) | produced | . 25 | Alfalfa hay | " | 1.0 |
| Turkeys , , |  | . 7 | Soybean hay | " | 1.4 |
| Canning peas | acre | 2.0 | Other hay crops | " | . 6 |

*Animal unit represents one cow, one bull, one feeder steer or heifer, two head of other cattle, seven head of sheep, fourteen lambs, five hogs, ten pigs, 100 hens, or 1,400 lbs. turkeys produced.

Table 3. Sumary of Farm Inventories (End of Year), 1941

| Items ... | Your <br> farm | Average of 166 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 33 least <br> profitable <br> farras |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Horses | \$ | \$ 347 | \$ 425 | \$ 321 |
| Productive livestock (total) |  | 6,283 | 13,613 | 3,398 |
| Dairy \& dual-purpose cows |  | 692 | 769 | 560 |
| Other dairy \& dual-purpose cattle |  | 424 | 437 | 333 |
| Beef cattle (including feeders) |  | 2,764 | 7,524 | 1,166 |
| Hogs |  | 1,510 | 2,707 | 881 |
| Sheep (including feeders) |  | 731 | 2,008 | 296 |
| Poultry (including turkeys) |  | 162 | 168 | -162 |
| Crop, seeds, and feed |  | 4,521 | 7, 919 | 3,012 |
| Macho: \& equipment (total) |  | 3,292 | 5,066 | 2,171 |
| Power machinery (farm share) |  | 1,239 | 1,923 | 842 |
| Crop and gen. machinexy |  | 1,595 | 2,491 | 984 |
| Livestock equipment \& supplies |  | 468 | 652 | 345 |
| Buildings, fences, etc. |  | 7,66\% | 10,808 | 6,729 |
| Land |  | 15,812 | 25,341 | 12,789 |
| Total farm capital | \$ | \$37,922 | \$63,172 | \$28,420 |

Table 4. Sumary of Amount of Livestock

| Items | Your farm | Average of 166 farms | 33 most profitable farms | 33 least profitabl farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| No. of horses | 4.2 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of colts | 1.0 | 1. 5 | . 7 |
| No. of daixy \& dual-purpose cows | 9.1 | 8.9 | 7.7 |
| Head of other dairy \& dual purpose cattle | 10.0 | 8.4 | 8.9 |
| Head of cattle kept in beef breeding herd | 9.4 | 9.2 | 8.3 |
| Pounds of beef cattle produced | 14,087 | 44,678 | 5,388 |
| Pounds of feeder sheep produced. | 2,292 | 8,863 | 417 |
| Litters of pigs | 16.9 | 27.5 | 11.3 |
| Pounds of hogs produced | 27,550 | 48,136 | 15,434 |
| Head of sheep ( 2 lambs $=1$ head) (farm flock) | 20.8 | 22.5 | 14.5 |
| No. of hens | 1.73 | 181 | 134 |
| Total no. of prode livestock anjmel units | 66.8. | 137.4 | 4104 |
| \% of total that are: |  |  |  |
| Dairy and dualmpurpose cows | 19.7 | 11.9 | 22.8 |
| Other dajry and dual-purpose cattle | 12.0 | 6.3 | 14.5 |
| In beef breeding herd. " | 11.6 | 8.0 | 12.8 |
| Feeder cattle | 20.0 | 35.2 | 17.5 |
| Sheep - farm flock | 4.8 | 3.3 | 4.1 |
| Sheep m feeders | 3.6 | 9.7 | . 7 |
| Hogs | 22.9 | 21.8 | 20.9 |
| Turkeys | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.3 |
| Hens | 3.9 | 2.4 | 464 |
| Number of farms with tractors | 360 | 32: | 30 |


| Items $\quad \therefore \quad$Your <br> farm | Average <br> of 166 <br> farms | 33 most profitable <br> farms | 33 least profitable farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FARM EXP \#NSES |  |  |  |
| Horses bought , \$ | \$ 32 | \$ 24 | \$ 20 |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows bought | 80 | 52 | 15 |
| Other dairy \& dual-purpose cattle bought" | 58 | 64 | 40 |
| Beef cattle bought (including feeders) | 1,766 | 4,993 | 732 |
| Hogs bought | 209 | 348 | 132 |
| Sheep bought (including feeders) | 686 | 2,407 | 161 |
| Poultry bought (including turkeys) | 96 | 154 | 81 |
| Misc. crop expenses | 303 | 503 | 243 |
| Feed bought | 1,718 | 4,509 | 826 |
| Power mach. (farm share) (new) | 446 | 776 | 175 |
| Power mach. (farm share) (upkeep) | 497 | 740 | 403 |
| Custom work hired | 140 | 134 | 144 |
| Crop and general mach. (new) | 416 | $706^{\circ}$ | 146 |
| Crop and general mach. (upkeep) | 84 | 144 | 70 |
| Livestock equipment (new) | 123 | 122 | 64 |
| Livestock equipment (upkeep) | 32 | 54 | 29 |
| Misc. livestock expense | 109 | 167 | 85 |
| Buildings and fencing (new) | 434 | 533 | 346 |
| Buildings and fencing (uplzeep) | 141 | $\cdots 254$ | 126 |
| Hired labor | 561 | 967 | 451 |
| Taxes | 337 | 566 | 26.9 |
| Insurance | 32 | 35 | 36 |
| General farm | 55 | 68 | 53 |
| (1) Total farm purchases . . $\$$ | \$8,355 | \$18,320 | \$4,647 |
| (2) Decrease in farm capital | - | - | - |
| (3) Board furnished hired labor | 171 | 298 | $127^{\circ}$ |
| (4) Interest on farm capital | 1,831 | 3,008 | 1,403 |
| (5) Unpaid family labor | $\underline{288}$ | 431 | $231{ }^{\prime}$ |
| (6) Total farm expenses (Sum of (1) to (5) \$ | 0,645 | \$22,057 | \$6,408 |
| FARM RECEIFTS |  |  |  |
| Horses | \$ 41 | \$ 22 | \$. 28 |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows | 184 | 181 | 146 |
| Dairy products | 758 | 889 | 599 |
| Other dairy and dual-purpose cattle | 208 | 206 | 243 |
| Beef cattle (including feeders) | 3,399 | 9,279 | 1,634 |
| Hogs | 2,306 | 3,917 | 1,339. |
| Sheep and wool (including feeders) | 1,032 | 3,504 | 192 |
| Poultry (including. turkeys) | 396 | 718 | 317 |
| Fggs | 334 | 360 | 250 |
| Corn | 477 | 375 | - 371 |
| Small, grain | 1,133 | 2,053 | 631 |
| Other.crops $\quad$. | 283 | , 495 | 220 |
| Power machinery sold | 204 | : 326 | 92 |
| Crop and gen. mach. sold | 74 | 148 | 16 |
| Misc. | 176 | \% 321 | - 82 |
| Income from work off the farm | 196 | 226 | - $\quad 93$ |
| Agricultural Adjustment payments | 503 | 784 | 379 |
| (7) Total farm sales $\quad \therefore$ | \$11,704 | \$23,804 | \$6,632 |
| (8) Increase in farm capital. | 2,618 | 6,039 | 712 |
| (9) Family living from farm | 538 | 702 | 445 |
| (10). Total farm receipts (7) + (8) + (9) \$ | \$14, 860: | \$30, 545 | \$7,789 |
| (6) Total farm expenses | 10,645 | 22,057 | 6,408 |
| (11) Operator's labor earnings (10) - (6) | 4,215 | 8,488 | 1,381 |


| Items | Your farm | Average of 166 farms | 33 most profitable farms | 33 least profitable farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPENSES ATD NET DECRTASES |  |  |  |  |
| Total power | \$ | \$ 823 | \$1,207 | \$ .713 |
| Horses |  | 169 | 253 | 154 |
| Tractor |  | 287 | 414 | 257 |
| Truck |  | 104 | 220 | 63 |
| Auto (farm share) |  | 154 | 204 | 126 |
| Gas engine (farm share) |  | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Elec. plant or current (farm share). |  | 37 | 42 | 36 |
| Hired power |  | 69 | 71 | 72 |
| Crop and general machinery |  | 256 | 403 | 198 |
| Livestock equipment |  | 83 | 122 | 59 |
| Buildings, fencing and tiling |  | 266 | 406 | 231 |
| Misc. productive livestock expense |  | 105 | 163 | 80 |
| Labor |  | 1,048 | 1,725 | 836 |
| Real estate taxes |  | 275 | 451 | 228 |
| Personal property tax |  | 62 | 115 | 41 |
| Insurance |  | 32 | 35 | 36 |
| General farm |  | 55 | 68 | 53 |
| Interest on farm capital |  | 1,831 | 3,008 | 1,403 |
| (1) Total expenses \& net decreases |  | 4,836 | 7,703 | 3,878 |
| RETURNS AND INET INCREASESS |  |  |  |  |
| All productive livestock | \$ | \$7, 767 | \$15,508 | \$4,507 |
| Dairy and dual-purpose cows |  | 924 | 1,056 | 786 |
| Other dairy \& dual-purpose cattle |  | 411 | 442 | 326 |
| Beef breeding herd |  | 392 | 453 | 293 |
| Feeder cattle |  | 1,855 | 5,894 | 723 |
| Hogs |  | 2,946 | 5,134 | 1,640 |
| Sheep - farm flock |  | 164 | $15 \%$ | - 86 |
| Sheep - feeders |  | 356 | 1,366 | 65 |
| Turkeys |  | 236 | 493 | 192 |
| Chickens |  | 483 | 513 | 396 |
| Crops, seed and feed |  | 376 | -656 | 146 |
| Income from work off the farm |  | 196 | 226 | 93 |
| Agricultural Conservation payments |  | 503 | 784 | 379 |
| Miscellaneous |  | 209 | 329 | 134 |
| (2) Total returns \& net increases |  | 9,051 | 16,191 | 5,259 |
| (1) Total expenses \& net decreases |  | 4,836 | 7,703 | 3,878 |
| (3) Oper. labor earnings (2) minus (1) | - | 4,215 | 8,488 | 1,381 |

(A) Cash receipts and expenses are adjusted for chenges in inventory for each enterprise and for each item of expense in order to show total receipts and net increases, and total expenses and net decreases. The operator's labor earnings are the same as those in Table 5.

## ANALYSIS OF THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCESIN OPERATOR'S EARIENGS

The operator's labor earnings varied widely among the farmers included in this study. The average labor earnings of those farmers ranking in the upper 20 per cent in the range according to earnings was $\$ 8,488$ and of those in the lower 20 . per cent was $\$ 1,381$. This is a range of $\$ 7,107$ between the average earnings of these two groups. Some of the causes for these differences in earnings may be beyond the control of the farmer. However, all of these farmers could make some changes in their farming operations which would increase earnings. A farmer can secure some ideas as 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 accomplishrents with other farmers following the same general type of farming. The more important management factors affecting earnings and their relationshipswith earnings are presented in the following tables.

Table 7. Relation of Crop Yields to Farm Earnings

| Per cent crop yields were of the average. for 211166 farms |  | No. of farms | Average operator's <br> labor earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average |  |  |
| Below 86 | 71 | 38 | \$2,541 |
| 86-113 | 102 | 83 | 4,684 |
| 114 and above | 123 | 45 | 4,763 |

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

Table 8. Relation of Choice of Crops to Farm Earnings

| Per cent of tillable land |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| in high return crops* No. of Average operator's <br> Group Average farms | labor earnings |  |


| Below 31.0 | 27.0 | 36 |  | $\$ 3,908$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $31.0-39.9$ | 36.1 | 89 |  | 3,955 |
| 40.0 \& above | 45.9 | 41 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

> *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 onefourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.

Farmers' earnings are affected by the choice of crops as well as by the yielos of 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 earnings by putting as high a percentage as possible of the tillable land into these higher return crops.

Table 9. Relation of Returns from Productive Livestock to Farm Harnings

| Index of returns for $\$ 100$ feed <br> fed to productive livestock* | No. of | Average operator's |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms** | labor earnings |
| Below 84 | 74 | 30 | $\$ 3,397$ |
| $84-11 \%$ | 105 | 4,384 |  |
| 118 and above | 131 | 30 | 4,446 |

*The index is weighted by the number of animal units. **One farmer did not raise livestock.
The majority of these farms are livestock farms. A large proportion of the crops raised are fed on the farm and some additional feed is purchased. Feed is the major item of cost in livestock production and livestock constitutes an important source of income on these farms. Hence there is a marked relationship between returns for $\$ 100$ of feed and operator's labor earnings on these farms. There are a number of reasons for differences among farms in livestock returnso., Figh productivity per animal and economy in the use of feed and labor are important. Other factors of considerable importance are kind of feed used, quality of pastures, balance of ration, degree of sanitation, and kind of shelter and equipment,

Table 10. Relation of Amount of Productive Livestock to Farm Earnings

| Productive livestock units per 100 acres* |  | No. of | Average operator's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Average | farms | labor earnings |
| Below 16.0 | 11.6 | 45 | \$3,239 |
| 16.0-29.9 | 22.6 | 77 | 4,271 |
| 30.0 and above | 42.6 | 43 | 5,158 |

[^1]On some farms the returns from livestock are so low that they do not cover feed and other costs. Such livestock is unprofitable, especially if there is more than enough to utilize what would otherwise be waste feed. If the livestock is yielding a net return, an increased amount of livestock adds to size of business and the opportunity to increase the farm earnings. Livestock produces manure and aids in keeping up the fertility of the land, and utilizes waste products on the farm. Livestock also helps to provide productive employment throughout the year. Any method that aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capacity should add to the farm income.

Table 11. Relation of Size of Business: (Work Units) to
Farm Earnings


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

Table 12. Relation of Amount of Work Accomplished per Worker to

|  | Farm Earnings |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work units per worker | No of | Average operator's |  |
| Group | Average | farms | labor earnings |


| Below 215 | 185 | 40 | $\$ 3,195$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $215-299$ | 254 | 82 | 4,122 |
| 300 and above | 355 |  | 44 |
|  |  |  | 5,315 |

Farmers ${ }^{\prime}$ earnings are generally higher on those farms on which a large amount of work is accomplished per worker. More days of productive work accomplished per worker reduces the labor charge per unit of business. 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 labor requirements are well distributed throughout the year. Handling pastures in such a way that as large a proportion as possible of the year's feed for livestock may be obtained from them helps to reduce labor requirements. Proper planning of the farm work and economical use of laborsaving machinery help to increase the work accomplished per worker.

Table 13. Relation of Power, Machinery, Equipment and Building "Expense to Earm Earnings*

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

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

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

## EFHECT OF WELL-BALANCBD EFFICIENCY ON FARM PROFITS

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency. Quite often farm operators show efficient managenent 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 14.

Table 14. Relation of Operator's Labor Earnings to the Number of Factors in which the Farmer Is Above Average

| No. of factors in which farm excels | NO. 09 <br> farms | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { farm } \end{aligned}$ | The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the average operator's labor earnings | Average <br> operator's <br> labor <br> earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None | 4 |  | XXxxxxx | \$1, 696 |
| One | 20 |  | xxxxxxixxxxx | 2,657 |
| Two | 24 |  | xxxxxcxarxxxxx | 3,353 |
| Three | 44 |  | Xxyxxxxxxxxxxxx | 3,297 |
| Four | 33 |  | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | 4,991 |
| Five | 27 |  |  | 5,230 |
| Six | 11 |  |  | 7,321 |
| Seven | 3 |  | XXTXXXXXTXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | 9,251 |

The array in Table 14 indicates that it will be worth-while 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.

Table 15. Measures of Farm Organization and Management Efficiency, 1941 $\qquad$ 33 most 33 least Your Average profit-- profitfarm of 166 able able
Measures used in chart farms farms on page 13 farms farms farms Operator's labor earnings.
$\$ \ldots \$ 4,215$ \$8,488 \$1,381
(1) Crop fields*

100
111
88
(2) \% of tillable land in high return crops**
$\qquad$

37.1
34.8
(3) Ret. for $\$ 100$ feed to productive livestock*** $\qquad$ 100
105
90
(4) Productive livestock units per 100 acres**** $\qquad$ $24.7 \quad 33.3 \quad 19.7$
(5) Size of business - work units $\qquad$ 631 … 957 4.58
(6) Work units per worker $264 \quad 293$ 227
(7) Pow。, mach., equip., \& bldg. exp.per work unit $\square$ $\$ 2.30 \$ 2.23$ $\$ 2.66$

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

Dairy cattle Dual-purpose cattle
Beef cattle - breeding herd
Beef cattle - feeders
Hogs
Sheep - farm flock
Sheep - feeders
Turkeys
Chicirens
(5) Work units on crops

Work units on productive livestock Other work units
(6) Total number of workers

Number of family workers
Number of hired workers
(7) Power expense per work unit

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

|  | 100 | 103 | 91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100 | 97 | 99 |
|  | 100 | 114 | 94 |
|  | 100 | 105 | 81 |
|  | 100 | 104 | 93 |
|  | 100 | 103 | 75 |
|  | 100 | 109 | 76 |
|  | 100 | 98 | 124 |
|  | 100 | 90 | 97 |
|  | 225 | 351 | 183 |
|  | 357 | 550 | 252 |
|  | 49 | 56 | 23 |
|  | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.1 |
|  | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.3 |
|  | 2.0 | 1.6 | . 8 |
| \$ | \$1.34 | \$1.24 | \$1.59 |
|  | . 41 | . 41 | . 44 |
|  | .13 | .13 | . 14 |
|  | . 42 | . 45 | . 49 |

[^2]Using your figures from page 12 locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for the 166 farms included in this, summery are located between the dotted lines across the center of this page.


Table 16. Distribution of Acres in Farm, 1941

| Crop: (A) (B) (C) and (D) refer to ranking used in calculating \% of tillable land in High Return Crops (see page.12) |  | No. growing this crop | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { farm } \end{aligned}$ | ```Average of 166 farms``` | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profit- } \\ & \text { able } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profit- } \\ & \text { able } \\ & \text { farns } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canning peas | (A) | 11 |  | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.7 |
| Flax | (B) | 147 |  | 33.6 | 55.7 | 22.3 |
| Barley | (c) | 99 |  | 21.0 | 34.1 | 16.6 |
| Barley and oats | (c) | 17 |  | 4.8 | 12.3 | 1.8 |
| Winter wheat. | (c) | 4 |  | . 2 | . 2 | . 0 |
| Spring wheat | (D) | 53 |  | 3.9 | 2.6 | 6.3 |
| Oats | (D) | 144 |  | 39.0 | 47.3 | 32.8 |
| Oats and wheat | (D) | 5 |  | . 7 | . 4 | 1.0 |
| Rye | (D) | 11 |  | 1.0 | .7 | 1.9 |
| Soybeans for grain | (D) | 46 |  | 4.4 | 9.3 | 3.7 |
| Miscellaneous | (D) | 8 |  | . 4 | . 0 | . 6 |
| Total Smail Grain and Peas |  |  |  | 110.5 | 165.1 | 88.7 |
| Sugar beets, hybrid seed corn, potatoes and truck crops | (A) | 81 |  | - 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Sweet corn | (B) | 10 |  | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Corn grain | (B) | 166 |  | 63.2 | 97.0 | 47.6 |
| Corn silage | (C) | 98 |  | 7.7 | 15.8 | 4.9 |
| Corn fodder | (D) | 57 |  | 2.1 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Total cultivated crops |  |  |  | 75.8 | 118.8 | 59.2 |
| Alfalfa hay | (A) | 14.7 |  | 17.3 | 27.9 | 12.9 |
| Sweet clover hay | (B) | 35 |  | 4.4 | 8.0 | 6.1 |
| Soybean hay | (c) | 55 |  | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Mixed legumes \& non-legumes | (c) | 38 |  | 3.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Legumes for seed | (c) | 6 |  | . 5 | -1 | 1.8 |
| Timothy and/or brome | (D) | 28 |  | 1.4 | 2.5 | . 8 |
| Other annual hay | (D) | 39 |  | 2.2 | 5.7 | 1.4 |
| Total tillable land in hay |  |  |  | 31.5 | 49.2 | 27.9 |
| Alfalfa pasture | (A). | 49 |  | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| Sweet clover pasture $\quad$ | (B) | 76 |  | 8.4 | 13.9 | 4.7 |
| Mixture incl. alf., sweet clov.,brome | (B) | 49 |  | 3.9 | 4.1 | 2.4 |
| Other legunes and mixtures | (c) | 22 |  | 2.2 | 2.8 | - 2 |
| Sudan grass and/or rape | (C) | , 53 |  | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Other tillable pasture | (D) | 86 |  | 8.4 | 11.8 | 8.7 |
| Total tillable land in pasture |  |  |  | 26.9 | 37.1 | 20.1 |
| Tillable land not cropped | (D) | 59 |  | 3.3 | 4.9 | 2.1 |
| Total tillable land |  |  |  | 248.0 | 375.1 | 198.0 |
| Phalaris hay (non-tillable) |  | 3 | - | . 1 | . 0 | . 2 |
| Wild hay (non-tillable) |  | 57 |  | 4.8 | 4.8 | 8.1 |
| Non-tillable pasture |  | 105 |  | 21.8 | 35.7 | 24.3 |
| Timber (not pastured) |  | 31 |  | . 7 | . 8 | 1.5 |
| Roads and waste |  |  |  | 10.3 | 15.6 | 7.4 |
| Farmstead |  |  |  | 9.5 | 13.9 | 9.0 |
| Total acres in farm |  |  |  | 295.2 | 445.9 | 243.5 |
| \% land tillable: |  |  |  | 88.3 | 86.2 | 82.0 |
| \% tillable land in high return crop |  |  |  | 36.5 | 37.1 | 34.8 |

Table 1\%. Crop Yields per Acre, 1941

| Crop | Your farm | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { of } 166 \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \text { least } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conning peas, value above seed cost | \$ | \$21.06 | \$30.19 | \$21.92 |
| Flax, bu. |  | 12.0 | 12.8 | 10.8 |
| Barley, bu. |  | 29.6 | 33.3 | 24.6 |
| Barley and oats, bu. |  | 29.4 | 39.2 | 28.5 |
| Winter wheat, bu. |  | 4.2 | - | - |
| Spring wheat, bu. |  | 11.7 | 11.8 | 9.9 |
| Oats, bu. |  | 26.4 | 30.9 | 21.4 |
| Oats and wheat, bu. |  | 29.5 | - | - |
| Rye, bu. |  | 12,4 | - | - |
| Soybeans for grain, bu. |  | 14.4 | 15.6 | 14.2 |
| Sweet corn, tons |  | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.2 |
| Corn, grain, bu. |  | 55.9 | 60.4 | 49.4 |
| Corn silage, tons |  | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| Corn fodder, tons |  | 3.3 | 3.7 | 2.5 |
| Alfalfa hay, tons |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| Sweet clover hay, tons |  | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.1 " |
| Soybean.hay, tons |  | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Mixed legume \& non-legume hay, tons |  | 1.8 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| Legumes.for seed, lbs. |  | 208 | - | - |
| Timothy and/or brome hay, tons |  | 1.2 | 1.4 | . 9 |
| Other annual hay, tons |  | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Phalaris hay on non-tillable land, tons |  | -9 | -- | . 8 |
| Wild hay, tons |  | . 9 | 1.0 | . 8 |

Table 18. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dairy Cows, 1941

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

*Not including nutrients received from pasture.
**AIl 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 nonths of dry period per cow; however, this variation is small for the majority of farms.

| Table 19. Feed Costs and Returns from Other Dairy Cattle, 1941 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Table 20. Feèd Costs and Returns from AII Dairy Cattle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

Table 21. Factors of Cost and Returns from Dual-Furpose Cows, 1941


[^3]Table 22. Feed Costs and Returns from Other Dual-Purpose Cattle; 1941

| Items | Your <br> farm | Average of 47 farms* | 9 farms highest in returns above feed | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \text { farras } \\ & \text { lowest in } \\ & \text { returns } \\ & \text { above feed. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per head, Ibs.: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | $76 \Omega$ | 640 | - 840 |
| Hey and fodder |  | 1,235 | 798 | 1. 568 |
| Silage |  | 1,140 | 804 | 1,001 |
| Whole milk |  | 383 | 644 | 522 |
| Skim milk |  | 1,196 | 1,722 | 1,013 |
| Feed cost per head: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | \$7. 32 | ... \$6.05 | \$7.86 |
| Roughages |  | 5.66 | 3.94 | 6.32 |
| Milk |  | 7.80 | 12.47 | 9, 55 |
| Pasture |  | 2.33 | 1.93 | 2.25 |
| TOTAL HEED COSTS |  | \$23.11 | \$24.19 | \$25.88 |
| Net increase in value |  | \$4.3. 28 | \$61.72 | \$27.80 |
| REIURIS ABOVE KHED COST PER MEAD |  | \$20.17 | \$37.53 | \$1.92 |
| RETURNS FOR \$100 OF FEED | \$ | \$200 | \$287 | \$106 |
| No. of head of other dual-purpose cattle |  | 13.9 | 11.4 | 15.3 |

Table 23. Feed Costs and Returns from A11 Dual-Purpose Cattle

| Items | Your farn | Average of 53 farms | 11 farms highest in returns above feed | 11 farms <br> lowest in returrs above feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeds per animal unit, los.: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates |  | 1,801 | 1,948 | 1,879 |
| Hay and fodder |  | 3,322 | 3,290 | 4,199 |
| Silage |  | 2,901 | 3,110 | 2,256 |
| Feed cost per animal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | \$ | \$17.08 | \$18.3 ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | \$17.89 |
| Roughages |  | 15.61 | 15.83 | 1\%.57 |
| Pasture |  | 5.52 | 5.53 | 5.52 |
| TOTAJ HEED COSTS | \$ | \$38.21 | \$39.73 | \$40.98 |
| Value of produce per animal unit: |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy products | ¢ | \$4:2.86 | \$52. 41 | \$31.02 |
| Net increase in value |  | 33.9r? | 48.63 | 25.16 |
| TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED |  | \$76.83 | \$101.04 | \$56.18 |
| REMURVS ABOVE HEDD PER ANTMAL UNIT |  | \$38.62 | \$61.31 | \$15.20 |
| RETURNS FOR \$1.00 OF HEED |  | \$208 | \$264 | \$140 |
| Animal units of dual-purpose cattle |  | 16.4 | 14.9 | 13.8 |

[^4]Table 24. Feed Costs and Returns from Beef Cattle, 1941

*Several farmers had both dairy or dual-purpose cows and beef cows and fed considerable amounts of milk produced by the dairy herd to beef calves.


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

Table 26. Feed Costs and Returns from Hogs, 1941

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

The extent to which proper sanitation methods are followed is one of the important reasons for variations among farmers in the returns secured from hogs. (Table 27) Raisjng young pigs on clean ground away from the old hog lots is one of the important elements in a program of hog sanitation. The farmers who raised their young pigs onfeground at least during a large portion of the growing period, away from the old hog lots, produced hogs with less feed and received a higher return than those farmers who allowed the young pigs access to the old hog lots.

Table 2\%. Sanitation in Hog Production and Return from Hogs


Pigs raised on clean ground away from old lots during most or all of the growing period

Pigs not raised on clean ground 61. $4.60 \quad 592 \quad 121$

Table 28. Feed Costs and Returns from Chickens, 1941

| Items | Your farm | ```Average of 143 farms``` | 29 farms highest in return over feed | 29 farms lowest in return over feed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feed per hen, 1bso: |  |  |  |  |
| Grain |  | 97 | $113{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 94 |
| Commercial feeds |  | 19 | 28 | 15 |
| Total concentrates |  | 116 | 141 | 109 |
| Skim milk and buttermilk |  | 23 | -27 | 13 |
| Feed cost per hen: |  |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | \$ | \$1.46 | \$1.87 | \$1.30 |
| Skim milk |  | . 04 | . 05 | . 02 |
| TOTAL FHED COST | \$ | \$1.50 | \$1.92 | \$1.32 |
| Value of produce per hen: |  |  |  |  |
| Eggs sold and used in house | \$ | \$2.04 | \$2.65 | \$1.33 |
| Net increase in value of chickens |  | . 81 | 1.80 | . 25 |
| TOTAL VALUE PRODUCED |  | \$2.85 | \$4.045 | \$1. 58 |
| RIIURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEN: \$ \$ \$1.35 \$2.53 |  |  |  |  |
| RETURIS FOR $\$ 100$ OF FEED | \$ | \$199 | \$252 | \$120 |
| Price recld per doz. eggs sold |  | 20.8 | 21.4 | 19.9 |
| Eggs laid per hen |  | 117 | 148 | 80 |
| No. of hens | * | 199 | 179 | 221 |
| \% of hens that are pullets |  | 70 | 50 | 72 |

Farmers who raise their chicks on clean ground and away from the old hens receive greater returns from their poultry than those who raise their chicks on the same ground year after year (Table 29). Farmsteads and old poultry lots very soon become infested with diseases and parasites which the young chicks are unable to withstand.

Table 29. Sanitation in Raising Chicks and Return from Poultry

|  | No. of farms | Return <br> over <br> feed per <br> hen | Rêturn <br> for $\$ 100$ <br> of feed | Average no. of hens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chicks raised on clean ground | 78 | \$1.55 | \$203 | 210 |
| Chicks, not raised on clean ground | 55 | 1.16 | 197 | 179 |

The number of times hens are culled is an important factor, affecting the return secured from poultry (Table 30 ). Culling out the poor layers saves feed and leaves more foom for the good producers.

Table 30. Number of Cullings and. Returns from Poultry

| Number of cullines | No. of farms | Return over feed per hen | Eges per hen | No. of hens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None or one | 30 | \$.97' | *97 | 177 |
| Two or three | 80 | $\cdots 1.43$ | 723 | 205 |
| Four or more | 31 | , 1.60 | 125 | 210 |

Table 31. Feed Costs and Returns for Turkeys, 1941


Table 32. Feed Costs for Horses and Misc. Power and Machinery Expense, 1941

|   <br> Items  | Average of 160 farms* | 31 most profit- <br> able <br> farms* | 33 least <br> profit- <br> able <br> farms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feed per horse,** 1bs.: |  |  |  |
| Grain | 1,989 | - 2,311 | 1,965 |
| Hay | 2,621 | 2,965 | 2,445 |
| Fodder and stover | 202 | 101 | 407 |
| Feed costs per horse: |  |  |  |
| Grain \$ | \$19.12 | \$22. 65 | \$18.74 |
| Roughage | 8.53 | 9.49 | 7.89 |
| Pasture | 4.15 | 4 3.94 | 4.32 |
| TOTAL FEED COSTS | \$31.80 | \$36.08 | \$30.95 |
| Number of work horses | 4.2 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Number of colts | - 1.0 | 1.5 | .7 |
| Crop acres per farm | 222.7 | 33.7 .8 | 184.1 |
| Tractor andhorse exp per crop acre \$ | \$ 2.16 | \$2.09 | \$ 2.29 |
| Crop and general mach. exp. per crop acre \$ | 1.22 | 1.42 | 1.14 |

[^5]Table 33. Family Living from the Farm, 1941


Table 34. Household and Personal Expenses for Those Farms Which Kept Complete Accounts of These Eixpenses, 1941


*Hired help or others boarded.

Table 35. Summary of Farm Earnings - Averased by Counties. 1941

|  | Brown \& Watonwan | Cottonwood | Faribault | Jackson | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Iincoln } \\ & \text { \& Iyon } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Martin | - Mur ray | ${ }^{\text {Nobles }}$ | Pipestone. \& Rock | Redwood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FARM EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle bought | \$ 1,044 | \$ 2,609 | \$ 1,908 | \$ 1,993 | \$ 428 | \$ 1,116 | \$ 805 | \$ 4, 451 | \$1,038 | \$ 2,877 |
| Hogs bought | 184 | 231 | 324 | 241 | 88 | 264 | . 305 | - 190 | - 167 | 175 |
| Sheep bought | 38. | 233 | 634. | 270 | 43. | 3 | 435 | 2,343 | 2,916 |  |
| Poultry bought | 65 | 91 | 68 | 76 | 55 | 38 | 42 | 330 | 108 | 52 |
| Feed | 783 | 1,655 | 1,458 | 1,212 | 595 | 957 | 889. | 3,973 | 2,150 | 2,694 |
| Other livestock expense | 103 | 60 | 69 | 129 | 93 | 156 | . 57 | $\bigcirc 160$ | 182 | 83 |
| Crop expense | 248 | 244 | 272 | 254 | 285 | 312 | 281 | 340 | 278 | 438 |
| Power machinery \& equipment | 1,382 | 1,747 | 1:540 | 1,729 | 1,422 | 1.,457 | 1,336 | 1,756 | 1,712 | 2,017 |
| Custom work hired | 113 | 89 | 142 | 129 | 139 | 142 | 147 | 183 | 132 | 156 |
| Buildings | 484 | 275 | 772 | 1,079 | 584 | 880 | 304 | 506 | 267 | 469 |
| Hired laber | 453 | 420 | 503 | 498 | 560 | 519 | 554 | 976 | 400 | 595 |
| Taxes, insurance, \& misc. | 325 | 438 | 372 | 350 | 432 | 338 | 428 | 565 | 383 | 542 |
| (1) Total purchases | \$5,222 | \$ 8,092 | \$ 8,062 | \$ 7,960 | \$4.724 | \$ 6,182 | \$5,583 | \$15,773 | \$9,733 | \$10,106 |
| (2) Decrease in cap. |  |  |  |  | - - |  | - |  | - |  |
| (3) Bcard to hired labor | 177 | 88 | 127. | 131 | 132 | 229 | 183 | 246 | 171 | 202 |
| (4) Unpaid family labor | 321 | 267 | 306 | 319 | 279 | 213 | 137 | 173 | 430 | $\begin{array}{r}348 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| (5) Int. on farm cap. | 1,699 | 1,629 | 1, 831 | $1,636$ | 1, 1.20 | $1.633$ | $1,468$ | $\frac{2,484}{81876}$ | $\frac{1,577}{}{ }^{12}$, | $\frac{2.134}{\$ 12,790}$ |
| (6) Total expenses | \$7.419 | \$10,076 | \$10,326 | $\$ 10,046$ | $86,655$ | $\$ 8,257$ | $\$ 7,371$ | $\$ 18,676$ |  | $\$ 12,790$ |
| FARM RECEIPTS $\because \therefore \therefore \quad \therefore \quad 6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle sales | \$ 2, 256 | \$ 4,856 | \$ 4,128 | \$ 3.533 | \$ 1,46\% | \$ 2,645 | \$2,103 | \$ 6,346 | \$ 3.197 | \$6,113 |
| Dairy preducts | + 871 | 613 | 645 | 958 | 842 | 918 | - 390 | - 904 | 791 | . 559 |
| Hogs. | 1,986 | 1,628 | 2,309 | 2,048 | 1,538 | 2,837 | 1,900 | 2,501 | 2,342 | 3,408 |
| Sheep | 232 | 123 | 725 | 531 | 176 | 208 | 939 | 3,329 | 3,768 | 283 |
| Poultry \& eggs | 617 | 762 | 467 | 586 | 460 | 450 | 407 | 2,186 | 900 | 371 |
| Crop | 1.748 | 1,955 | 1,566 | 2.058 | 1,883 | 1,232 | 1,880 | 2;163 | 1,101 | 2,746 |
| AAA payment | 468 | $\because 420$ | - 508 | 437 | 417 | 445 | 470 | 728 | 469 | 566 |
| Miscellanecus cash receipts | 624 | 488 | 628 | 930 | 629 | 570 | 922 | 614 | 727 | 747 |
| (7) Total farm sales | \$8,802 | \$10,845 | \$10,976 | \$11,081 | \$ 7, 411 | \$9,305 | \$ 9,011 | \$18,771 | \$13, 295 | \$14,793 |
| (8) Increase in cap. | 1,361 | $2,838$ | 3,227 | 2,492 |  | 2,074 | 1,696 | 5,775 | 2,369 | 2,433 |
| (9) Family living from farm | $\begin{array}{r}1,616 \\ \hline \$ 7079\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 453 \\ 974736 \end{array}$ | $\therefore \quad 593$ | - 524 | - 484 | - 512 | - 4217 | \$ $\quad 553$ | 538 $\$ 16,202$ | $\frac{578}{\$ 17.804}$ |
| (10) Total receipts | $\$ 10,779$ 7.419 | 14,136 10,076 | $\$ 14.796$ 10,326 | $\$ 14,097$ 10,046 | $\$ 9,368$ 6,655 | \$11,891 | $\$ 11,128$ 7,371 | $\$ 25,099$ 18,676 | \$16,202 12,211 | $\$ 17,804$ 12,790 |
| (11) Oper. labcr earnings | 3,360 | 4,060 | -4,470 | -4,051 | 2,713 | 3,634 | 3,757 | 6,423 | 3,991 | 5,014 |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& rown \& Tatonwan \& Cottonmood \& Faribault \& Jackson \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lincoln } \\
& \text { \& Lyon } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$ \& Martin \& Murray \& Nobles \& Pipestone \& Rock \& Redwood <br>
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{FARM INVENTORIES (Beginning of year)} <br>
\hline Horses
Productive livestock \& 3.928 \& +3,591 \& - 4,448 \& 3,664 \& 2,839 \& 3,707 \& 3,165 \& -6,856 \& :6,043 \& 5,997 <br>
\hline Crop, seed and feed \& 3,847 \& 4,219 \& 3,948 \& 4,138 \& 3,966 \& 3,745 \& 3.653 \& 4,966 \& 3,854 \& 4.483 <br>
\hline Mach. and equipment \& 2,882 \& 2,840 \& 2,802 \& 2,872 \& 2,537 \& 2,654 \& 2,622 \& 3.731 \& 3.057 \& 3.129 <br>
\hline Buildings \& 8,243 \& 6,410 \& 7,761 \& 6,655 \& 7,298 \& 7.531 \& 6,009 \& 8,202 \& 7. 523 \& 7.934 <br>
\hline Land \& 13,951 \& 13,815 \& 15,706 \& 13,716 \& 12.600 \& 13.618 \& 12,800 \& 22,648 \& 15.546 \& 19.598 <br>
\hline Total farm capital \$ \& \$33,296 \& \$31,164 \& \$35,017 \& \$31,464 \& \$29.657 \& \$31,615 \& \$28,508 \& \$46,801 \& \$36.359 \& \$41,473 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{MEAS.OF FARM ORG. AND MANAGFMENT RFFIC.} <br>
\hline Crop yields - \% of ave. \& 111 \& 102 \& 109
386 \& 107 \& \%36 \& 37.3 \& 34.6 \& 38.2 \& 33.3 \& 35.1 <br>
\hline \% high return crops \& 37.4
99 \& 39.3
92 \& 38.6
107 \& 38.5
96 \& 33.7
103 \& 37.3
109 \& 34.6
94 \& 38.2
92 \& 33.3 \& 35.1 <br>
\hline Index ret. from livestock
A. u. livestock per 100 A . \& $\begin{array}{r}97 \\ \hline 22.6\end{array}$ \& 24.6 \& 29.7 \& 23.8 \& 15.2 \& 29.1 \& 20.5 \& 32.2 \& 26.5 \& 24.0 <br>
\hline Wark units \& 558 \& 539 \& 574 \& 595 \& 610 \& 529 \& 579 \& 822 \& 703 \& 692 <br>
\hline Werk units per worker \& 235 \& 266 \& 260 \& 245 \& 276 \& 233 \& 277 \& 280 \& 296 \& 271 <br>
\hline Exp. per work unit \& \$2.49 \& \$2.44 \& \$2.27 \& \$2. 21 \& \$2. 22 \& \$2. 84 \& \$2.41 \& \$2.05 \& 81.93 \& \$2.42 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|l|}{DISTRIBUTION OF ACRES IN FARM} <br>
\hline Small grain \& 80.3 \& 112.6 \& 88.8 \& 90.3 \& 126.5 \& 70.7 \& 114.3
65.5 \& 127.7
96.8 \& 108.3
80.2 \& 157.9
95.6 <br>
\hline Cultivated crops \& 62.1 \& 71.9 \& 74.2 \& 65.9 \& 69.2
33.1 \& 59.1 \& 65.5
32.6 \& 96.8
39.7 \& 80.2
38.6 \& 95.6
39.6 <br>
\hline Tillable hay land \& 27.5 \& 27.0 \& 24.0 \& 25.0 \& 33.1 \& 21.1 \& 32.6 \& 45.7 \& 26.2 \& 17.6 <br>
\hline Tillable pasture \& 25.7 \& 22.0
277.1 \& 26.5 \& 24.1 \& 27.9
348.1 \& 26.6
196.4 \& 284.0 \& 345.5 \& 302.3 \& 389.2 <br>
\hline Total acres in farm \& 243.3
82.4 \& 277.1 \& 249.1
85.6 \& 235.1
87.2 \& 348.1
79.7 \& 196.4
90.1 \& 284.0
82.8 \& 345.5
89.8 \& 302.3
85.4 \& 389.2
85.5 <br>
\hline \% land tillakle \& 82.4 \& 86.4 \& 85.6 \& 87.2 \& 79.7 \& 90.1 \& 82.8 \& 89.8 \& 85.4 \& 85.5 <br>
\hline Flax, bu. \& 10.1 \& 11.5 \& 13.1 \& 12.5 \& 11.3 \& 14.4 \& 11.9 \& 14.1 \& 10.7 \& 11.1 <br>
\hline Barley, bu. \& 34.7 \& 26.2 \& 28.8 \& 30.9 \& 22.1 \& 37.8 \& 38.2 \& 28.0 \& $35 \cdot 8$ \& 28.2 <br>
\hline Oats, bu. \& 26.2 \& 26.1 \& 28.7 \& 26.7 \& 15.9 \& 28.4 \& 31.3 \& 32.8 \& 31.3 \& 21.3 <br>
\hline Corn, grain, bu. \& 65.5 \& 61.3 \& 61.9 \& 64.7 \& 43.2 \& 62.1 \& 57.4 \& 56.4 \& 42.8 \& 49.7 <br>
\hline Corn silage, tons \& 10.8 \& 10.5 \& 10.4 \& 10.9 \& 8.1 \& 11.0 \& $9 \cdot 2$ \& 10.4 \& 7.0 \& 7.8 <br>
\hline Alfalfa hay, tons \& 2.8 \& 2.3 \& 2.9 \& 2.0 \& 1.4 \& 2.6 \& 1.4 \& 1.5 \& 1.4 \& 2.2 <br>
\hline AN. UNITS OF LIVESTOCK \& 49.2 \& 53.9 \& 65.5 \& 50.4 \& 46.3 \& 52.8 \& 48.2 \& 115.2

27 \& 74.8 \& 87.7 <br>
\hline \% dairy and du.-pur.cattle \& e 35.3 \& 30.9 \& 24.9 \& 41.3 \& 35.7 \& 32.3 \& 21.9 \& 27.8 \& 32.8 \& 30.6 <br>
\hline \% in beef breeding herd \& 13.5 \& 5.0 \& 13.1 \& 4.6 \& 19.0 \& 16.0 \& 21.4 \& 6.0 \& 7.5 \& 11.1 <br>
\hline \% feeder cattle \& 14.7 \& 34.4 \& 20.8 \& 21.1 \& 11.4 \& 9.4 \& 25.7 \& 22.8 \& 15.8 \& 27.4 <br>
\hline \% sheep-farm flock \& 4.8 \& 1.7 \& 11.6 \& 4.2 \& 6.8 \& 4.2 \& 2.7 \& 3.0 \& 4.0 \& 2.4 <br>
\hline \% sheep-feeders \& 1.1 \& 1.5 \& 3.9 \& 3.3 \& . 1 \& . 0 \& 3.8 \& 11.4 \& 10.9 \& - <br>
\hline \% hogs \& 25.6 \& 18.6 \& 22.8 \& 20.7 \& 21.8 \& 33.5 \& 20.0 \& 18.3 \& 21.9 \& 25.4 <br>
\hline \% turkeys \& . 2 \& 1.6 \& . 0 \& 1.8 \& . 0 \& 4.5 \& . 0 \& 7.2 \& 3.7
3.4 \& . 0 <br>
\hline \% hens \& 4.8 \& 5.3 \& 2.9 \& 3.0 \& $5 \cdot 2$ \& 4.1 \& 4.2 \& 3.5 \& 3.4 \& 2.9 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 37. Summaxy of Farm Tarnings by Years*

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

| Items | 1940 | 1941 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total farm capital | \$32,724 | $\$ 36,613$ |
| MFAS. OF FARM QRG. AND MATHAGMENT ETFICIENCY |  |  |
| $\%$ tillable land in high return crops | 35.9 | 36.5 |
| Animal units prod. livestock per 100 A . | 22.1 | 24. ${ }^{7}$ |
| Work units | 569 | 631 |
| Work units per worker | 263 | 264 |
| Expenses per work unit | \$2.17 | \$2.30 |
| ACRES PIER EARM | 279 | 295 |
| Crop acres per farm | 213 | 223 |
| CROP YIELDS PER ACRE |  |  |
| Flax, bu. | 13.7 | 12.0 |
| Barley, bu. | 42.3 | 29.6 |
| Oats, bu. | 60.1 | 26.4 |
| Corn, grain, bu. | 46.2 | 55.9 |
| Corn silage, tons | 8.5 | 9.5 |
| Alfalfa hay, tons | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| RETURN ABOVE FEED COST PEP: |  |  |
| Dairy cow | \$43.03 | \$56.89 |
| Dual-purpose, cow | 26.49 | 39.13 |
| Animal unit in beef breeding herd | 18.20 | 25.06 |
| 100 pounds feeder cattle produced | - 2.92 | 3.99 |
| Head of sheep in farm flock | 3.27 | 5.96 |
| 100 pounds feeder sheep produced | 2.13 | 8.01 |
| 100 pounds hogs produced | 1.23 | 5.15 |
| Hen | .96 | 1.35 |
| 100 pounds turkeys produced | 5.74 | 9.63 |
| FEED COST PER: |  |  |
| Dairy cow | \$46.50 | \$53.11 |
| Dual-purpose cow | 34.85 | 44.19 |
| Animal unit in bees breeding herd | 29.86 | 33.57 |
| 100 pounds of feeder cattle produced | 8.00 | 9.21 |
| Head of sheep in farm flock | 2.60 | 2.76 |
| 100 pounds feeder sheep produced | 7.16 | 8.38 |
| 100 pounds hogs produced. | 4.29 | 5.55 |
| Hen | 1.11 | 1.50 |
| 100 pounds turkeys produced | 7.27 | 8.26 |
| Horse | 29.74 | $31.80^{\circ}$ |
| MISC. LIVESTOCK INHORMATION |  |  |
| No. of work horses | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| No. of colts | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| No. of dairy or dual-purpose cows | 8.6 | 9.1 |
| Head of cattle in beef breeding herd | 9.0 | 9.4 |
| Pounds feeder cattle produced. | 8,678 | 14,087 |
| Litters of pigs | 13.6 | 16.9 |
| Pounds of hogs produced | 21,335 | 27,550 |
| Ho. of hens | 161 | 173 |
| Pounds of butterfat per dairy cow | 250 | 254 |
| Pounds of butterfat per dual-purpose cow | 179 | 190 |
| No. of pigs per litter | 6.2 | 6.4 |
| \% Lamb crop | 110 | 110 |
| Eggs per hen | 113 | 117 |

Table 38. Summary of Miscellaneous Items by Years (Continued)
Items
$1940 \quad 1941$

PRICE RECEIVAD PER:

| Pound butterfat sold to creaneries | $\$ .31$ | $\$ . .37$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 100 pounds feeder cattle | 8.81 | 10.13 |
| 100 pounds feeder sheep | 8.74 | 10.08 |
| Pound of wool | .29 | .38 |
| loo pounds of hogs | 5.15 | 9.07 |
| Dozen egss | .15 | .21 |
| Pound of turkeys | .14 | .18 |

## PRICE OF FEED

| Shelled corn, bu. | $\$ .47$ | $\$ .54$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Oats, bue | .26 | .32 |
| Barley, bu. | .31 | .39 |
| Alfalfa hay, ton | 7.50 | 8.50 |
| Timothy hay, ton | 4.80 | 5.45 |
| Corn silage, ton | 2.10 | 2.55 |
| Bran, cwt. | 1.20 | 1.50 |
| Iinseed oilmeai, cwt. | 1.75 | 2.00 |
| Tankage, cwt. | 2.50 | 3.20 |
| Meat scraps, cut. | 2.55 | 3.20 |

Suggestions for Improvements


[^0]:    *For a more complete description of the area see Zngene; S. Aog and Pond, G. A.,
    "Agricultural Production and Types of Farming in Minnesota," Minn. Bul. 347, May, 1940.

[^1]:    *Acres in timber not pastured, poads waste and farmstead were not included.

[^2]:    *Given as a percentage of the average.
    **Crops are marked in Table 16 as (A), (B), (C) and (D). All of acres in (A) crops, onemhalf of acres in (B) crops, and one-fourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.
    ***An index weighted by the animal units of livestock.
    ****Acres in timber not pastured, roads, waste and farmstead were not included.

[^3]:    *Not including nutrients received from pasture.

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

[^5]:    *Six farms did not have horses. The number of horses, crop acres and expenses per crop acres are averages of 166 farms.
    **Two colts equal one horse.

