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## PREFACE

The estimates of farm labor requirements in this publication are part of e continuing nationwide research program centered on agricultural production. This program includes the development and maintenance of many kinds of farm efficiency measures.

This report contains State estimates of the man-hours of labor used in 1959 for producing the major kinds of livestock. Sinilar estimates are developed every fifth year after data from the agricultural census are available. The quinquennial state estimates are weighted into regional averages. which serve as benchmarks for annual series. Each year the regional averagess (man-hours per head or unit of production of livestock, together with comparable data for crops) are applied to tha estimates of acres, numbers, and production of crops and livestock, prepared by the StatemFederal crop reporting system, Statistical Reporting Service, to arrive at total man-hours of labor used by enterprises, for regions, and for the country as a whole. The total man-hours are converted to indexes which, with comparable indexes of production, are usel to compute indexes of production per man-hour. The aggregale man-hours are also used as the labor component in an index measure of total production inputs in farming. These aggregates and indexes are published annually in Changes in Farm Production and Efficiency, Statistical Bulletin No. 233.

Two additional publications containing State estimates of 1959 labor requirements for farm enterprises are in process:

Labor Used to Produce Field Crops, Estimates by States, 1959
Labor Used to Produce Vegetables, Estimates by States, 1959
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# LABOR USED TO PRODUCE LIVESTOCK 

Estimates by States, 1959
by

Reuben W. Hecht<br>Agricultural Economist<br>Farm Production Economics Division<br>Economic Research Service

## INTRODUCTION

Man-hours used to care for livestock either per head or per unit of production vary greatly among States and regions. Significant reasons for the wide differences include variation in slze of herd or flock, extent of mechanization, and the kind or form of the livestock product that is marketed.

The data presented in this publication are estimates of the average number of man-hours used in caring for the various classes of livestock in each State in 1959. Also included for most kinds of livestock are national averages by 5 -year periods from 1910 to 1962.

Tte State estimates are in terms of man-hours per head, except for hogs, for which man-hours per 100 pounds of liveweight production were estimated. For most other kinds of livestock, the per-head data were converted to man-hours per unit of production, such as 100 pounds of milk or 100 eggs. Thesa lebor requirements per unit are shom along with information related to use of labor, such as size of herd or flock, milk production per cow, and rate of lay of hens and pullets. Estimates of man-hours for each kind of livestock are I imited to States for which the Crop Reporting Board prepares estimates of numbers and production on farms.

For some kinds of livestock, man-hours per head are shown for two sizes of herds or flocks, or for different methods of production. This was not practical for all kinds of livestock, as dato indicating the prevalence of herds or flocks of various sizes were lacking. Also, because of the scarcity of appropriate data, State estimates of labor used in 1959 for chickens raised for replacement in laying flocks and for meat were not developed.

The man-hours per head and per unit of livestock production in this publication are based chiefly on secondary data collected by State and Federal agencies and published in reports, such as State agricultural experiment station and extension service bulletins, and information from studies of farm practices and farm mechanization. 1/ Many data in these publications, however, apply to livestock in a particular part of a State or on specific kinds of farms. This necessitated considerable adjustment for a State-average situation.

The labor rates represent the average quantity of labor used per head or per unit of production, rather than standards or goals to be achieved. On individual farms, or groups of farms, man-hours per head of the various kinds of livestock may be considerably above or below average, because of various methods used and conditions existing on these farms.

[^0]Man-hours used for livestock include direct labor only for such operations' as heuling feed if purchased or stored away from livestock, preparirig feed, feeding, cleaning barns and pens, moving animals to and from pasture or range, general care, and disposing of the animals and their products. Time required to grow feed and maintain pastures is not included. Time spent on general overhead jobs or farmmeintenance work olso is excluded. This kind of work includes such jobs as constructing and maintoining fences and buildings and irrigating, draining, and improving land; regairing machinery and farm power units; working on permanent pasture and farm woodlots; conducting the farm business; taking business trips; and other miscellaneous overhead tasks.

LABOR USED TO PRODUCE LIVESTOCK, UNITED STATES, 1910-62
A good deal less lisbor is now used per head or per unit of production of liven stock than was used a half century ago (table l). Changes in many aspects of work on livestock are responsible for the reduction per head. Additional but related facets of livestock management are involved in the underlying reasons for the drop in men-hours per unit of production. Most of the reduction in labor requirements for livestock since 1910-14 occurred in the last half of the period, or since 1935-39, and the following discussion is directed toward changes since then.

In 1935-39, almost 150 man-hours annually were spent in feeding, milking and caring for a milk cow and the milk she produced. In recent years, widespread use of equipment such as milking machines, automatic and self-feeders, feed and litter carriers, barn cleaners, convenient water supply, and labor-saving milking parlors and barns has reduced the labor needed to fewer than 100 hours per cow. Handling more milk in buik and by pipeline has also helped drop time requirements per cow. The increased availability of electric power on farms made the installation of new equipment feasible. Without it, the drop in time required for dairy chores would have been considerabiy less.

Larger herds of milk cows have resulted from and are partly due to the new equipment and methods. In 1939, there were 5 milk cows per reporting farm; by 1959 there were 9. As certain dairy chores can be done for a large herd in almost the same time as for a small herd, the trend toward larger herds has helped reduce manhours per cow.

Concurrently, improved breeding, better feeds and feeding, and superior management resulted in more milk per cow. Production rose from 4,400 pounds per cow in 1935-39 to almost 7,200 in 1960-62. This increase, coupled with the one-third drop in man-hours per cow, has meant a decrease of more than 60 percent in man-hours per hundredweight of milk produced. (See cover chart.)

The greatest proportional decrease in labor requirements, both per head and per unit of production, has occurred in the production of broilers. Man-hours per 100 pounds of turkeys produced has consistently been around 3 times as high as for broilers, but the reduction since 1935-39 has about matched that for the frying chickens. Both broilers and turkeys have grown from sideline enterprises to commercial status during the last quarter-century. Liveweight production of broilers is now more than 30 times as high as in 1935-39. During the same time turkey production has more than quadrupled. The average flock of turkeys raised in 1959 contained about 950 birds-more than 13 times as many as in 1939. In the earliest year for which national data on brollers per farm are available, 1954, broiler producers reported an average of about 16,000 birds sold per ferm. Since then, the average size of the broiler enterprise has increased greatly. In 1959, broiler sales averaged almost 34,000 birds per producer. Wide adoption of mechanical and automated methods of brooding, feeding, and caring for broilers and turkeys has accompanied this increased production. Labor used per unit of production in 1960-62 averaged only about 12 percent as much as a quarter-century earlier.

Table 1.--Livestock: Man-hours per unit of production and related factors, United States, indicated periods,
1910-62


1/ Preliminary.
2/ Production inciudes beef produced as a by-product of the milk cow enterprise.
3/ Liveweight production.
4/ Per layer on farms Jan. I.

Time used for work on beef cattle and hogs has dropped less than on other kinds of livestock. Men-hours per unit of production has moved down only about 30 percent since 1935-39. Many producers are currently using such labor saving equipment as tractor-mounted torks and scoops for feeding and cleaning sheds and lots, but much hand work is still cone. Modern feeding systems requiring little operating labor are available, including such components as selt-fed and autonatically-timed teed grinders and mixers and pheumatic feed distributors. Such systems, however, usually involve considerabie investment in new or remodeled buildings, power units, and equipment, and have not been installed on a broed scale by average producers.

The labor story on laying and roplacement flocks of chickens is similar to that of cattle and hogs. Progressively fower farms maintain laying flocks, but the average size of flock has grown. Flocks averaged more than 160 birds in 1959 compared with 66 birds in 1939. Some mechanization has occurred but methods currently used in caring for birds vary all the way from exclusively handwork to completely automated systerns. Since 1935-39, labor used per bird in laying flocks has dropped about 35 percent, but because of the tremendous increase in rate of lay, man-hours per 100 eggs has decreased about 65 percent. Time spent on chickens raised chiefly for replacement has decreased from 30 man-hours per 100 birds in 1935-39 to 17 hours in 1960-62.

LABOR USED TO PRODUCE LIVESTOCK, BY STATES, 1959

## Milk Cows

Estimated labor used per milk cow in 1959 varied by regions, from 90 man-hours in the Pacific States to 121 in the Appalachian region (table 2). The prevalence of labor-saving dairy buildings and equipment is undoubtedly the most significant reason for the wide difference. The level of mechanization of work on milk cows, however, is related to other aspects of dairying. Stares and areas where labor-efficient dairy barns and equipment are more common also have larger herds and higher-producing cows, market a greater proportion of the milk as whole milk, and tend to buy rather than perform certain operations--such as preparing and hauling feed and dairy products to market. Most of these factors have a lowering effect on man-hours per cow and per unit of milk produced.

Of the mechanical developments, the modern milking parlor (with pipeline milker, autcmatic feeder, operator pit, and buik milk tank) is anong the innovations that result in decreased man-hours per cow. The regular milking machine also saves considerable time over hand milking. In 1958 in the Pacific region, 87 percent of the cows were milked with machines - 41 percent with pipeline milkers and 46 percent with regular machines. 2/ The prevalence of machine use was about the same as this in the Northeast and Lake States, except for greater use of regular machines and less of pipeline installations. More than half of the cows were hand milked in the Appalachian, Southeast, and Delta regions.

Milk production per cow affects the time used per head, as more time is required to care for high-producing cows and handle their milk. However, per cow production more directly affects man-hours per 100 pounds of milk; labor used per unit of milk produced tends to vary inversely with production per cow. The Pacific States have the highest milk production per cow and the fewest man-hours per 100 pounds of milk produced.

2/ Dairy Cows: Housing and Methods of Milking. U. S. Dept, Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., ERS-15.

In 1959 in the Northern Plains region, only 38 percent of the milk was retailed by farmers or sold to plants or dealers as whole milk for manufacturing or fluid use. In other regions, 77 percent or more of the milk was marketed by these methods, and the proportion reached 95 percent in the Northeast. Strict sanitery practices, which take considerable time, are followed when milk is produced for fluid and related uses. Dairy barns are cleaned more frequently and more thoroughly, for example, by producers who sell milk for fluid use than by those who sell farm-separated crean.

## Cattle and Calves Except Milk_Cows

Cattle and calves consist of a great variety of animals of both dairy and beef breeding. Time spent on them differs greatly among states and regions (table 3). Estimated time spent in feeding and caring for a beef cow averaged almost 20 hours in 3 regions, but was only 8 hours per cow in 4 of the Mountain States. Many cows in the lafter States are in large ranch herds and are grazed a good part of the year. Other cattie in these areas are malinly young beef stock. They receive much the same kind of care as beef cous and require relatively little time. Other cattle take more time in areas like the Northeast and Lake States where a majority are young dairy heifers and heifer calves. Here, young stock are housed more trequently and for a greater part of the year, and more time is spent on them than in other areas.

In addition to the amount of labor used per beef cow and per head of other cattle, many other factors affect man-hours per 100 pounds of 1 iveweight beat produced. Beef produced as a byproduct of the milk-cow enterprise-veal calves and the increase in weight of milk cows-affects man-hours per 100 pounds of beef produced. The labor used in caring for these animels is included under milk cows. Labor used per beef cow and per head of other cattle is greatly above average in the Northeast region, but man-hours per 100 pounds of beet produced is about the same as the national average because of the beef produced by milk cows and their veal calves. A similar but less pronounced situation exists in other dairy areas. Manchours per 100 pounds of beef produced is relatively high in the 3 Southeast regions.

## Hogs

Information on the prevalence of automatic feeding systems, self-feeders, self-waterers, and other labor-saving equipment and practices in hog production is not available on a netional basis. However, use of efficient equipment is usually well correlated with size of enterprise. Hog prodicers in the Corn Belt on the average farrowed 11.5 sows in the spring of 1959 and sold 105 hogs and pigs during the year. Comparable national averages are 7.8 sows and 64 hogs and pigs. As these figures indicate, scale of hog production in the Corn Belt States is considerably above the national average, and labor used per 100 pounds of production is relatively low (table 4).

The one-litter system of hog production usually takes more labor per 100 pounds of hogs produced than the two-litter system. The ratio of fall-to-spring litters gives some indication of the prevalence of these systems. Farrowings from June to November are counted as fall fitters; in many of the less important hogproducing States--particularly in the northern part of the country--there are a good many dune and July litters. These fall litters increase the ratio but in many instances represent one-litter operations.

Large litters of pigs have a lowering effect on man-hours used per market hog and per unit of production. The regional average number of pigs per litter was highest in the Lake States and Corn Belt regions, where labor requirements also were low. Large litters add to the size of the hog enterprise and spread the care of the breeting animals over more market hogs and thus help reduce labor requirements per unit of hog production.

## Sheep

There are 2 major systems of caring for stock sheep. These might be called the pasture system and the herding system. The latter is essentially limitod to the range States (Texas plus Mountain and Pacitic States) and particularly to grazing situations in these States where fences are impractical. As the name implies, the herding system involves use of herders at least part of the year and ties up considerable manpower. Not all sheep considered to bo in range flocks ( 300 head or more per farm) are herded. Many large ranches have all their grazing land under fence. Care of sheep requires little time under such conditions (table 5).

The pasture system prevails in the East and on irrigated farms in the West. The sheep graze in tenced pastures of fields and need little care during the grazing season. Man-hours per head of stock sheep in farm flocks tend to vary inversely with the size of flock, and directly with the predominance of ewes that raise lambs. More rime must be devoted to ewes that raise lambs than to other stock sheep. Lambs raised in 1959 equalled 75 percent of the number of stock sheep on farms and ranches at the beginning of the year. Because some lambs were twins or triplets the proportion of ewes that raised lambs was sonewhat less than this percentage. Ewes that raise lambs make up thigh proportion of stock sheep in States and regions where rigid culling of the breeding flock is practiced and where a high percentage of the tambs are marketed $a t$ an early age.

According to the Crop Reporting Board there were almost 4.5 million head of sheep and lambs on feed in 26 States on January $1,1959.1+$ was estimated that less than one hour of labor per head was required to care for these animals from the time they were put in the feedyard until marketing.

Chickens - Laying Flocks
The amount of fabor absorbed by laying flocks of chickens tends to vary inversely with the size of flock. Man-hours per layer were estimated for two sizes of flocks, which are referred to as noncommercial (fewer than 400 birds) and commercial flocks ( $\mathrm{t} a \mathrm{~b}$ (e 6). The dividing point between flocks represents the size at which specialized buildings, equipment, and management practices begin to be economical.

Labor used per layer varies considerably within each group of flocks. The smallest noncomercial flocks often are kept chiefly to provide products for home use. These flocks do not receive a great deal of care but are so small that labor per bird is high. The larger noncommercial flocks receive more care but flock size is still too small to achieve the labor efficiency associated with cormercial flocks. According to the 1959 census, more than 12 percent of chickens 4 months oid and over on farms were in flocks composed of 10,000 or more birds. Man-hours per hen in these flocks average substantially lower than for all commercial flocks.

Comercial flocks predominate in the Pacific and Northeast regions, with 93 and 86 percent of the birds, respectively, in flocks of 400 or more. Average menhours per hen are lowest in these regions.

The rate of lay has some effect on man-hours per layer. A large number of eggs per hen means more time for gathering, handling, and marketing. However, as rate of lay goes up, man-hours per 100 eggs decreases. In 1959, the most eggs per hen or pullet on farms January 1 were produced in the Pacific region, and labor used per 100 eggs was lower there than in other regions.

## Chickens - Broilers

Production of broilers is fairly well concentrated in the eastern and southeastern parts of the country. In 1959, the Northeast and Southeast regions accounted for about half of national production. Another 30 percent came from the Appalachian and Delta States. Available studies of broiler production show a definite relationship between the amount of labor used per bird and size of lot. For this reason, broiler farms were divided into small and large units, based on numbers sold per producer. These units are, respectively, those with sales of fewer than 8,000 birds and 8,000 or more. As the overage producer has about 4 lots per year, the dividing point between small and large lots was 2,000 birds. Computed this way, the everage timall lot in the United States in 1959 consisted of about 1,100 birds; the average large lot contained a few more than 10,000 birds (table 7).

The prevalence of small and large lots varied among States and regions, as did the average number of birds per lot. However, all lots of broilers contained the greatest number in the Pacific and Delta regions, and estimated man-hours per bird were lowest in these areas. Labor used per 100 pounds of broilers also was low in these areas, but the lowest rate per 100 pounds was in the Northeast region. This was because birds are sold at heavier weights in this area than in other parts of the country. They averaged 3.6 pounds in the Northeast compared with 3.3 pounds nationally.

## Turkeys

Turkey raising is widely scattered over the United States but in 1959 more than two-fifths of the production was in 3 States-California, Minnesota, and lowa. Production varies from sideline enterprises to large specialized turkey farms. Estimates of man-hours used per bird were made for breeder hens and turkeys raised in noncommercial and commercial flocks containing, respectively, fewer than 400 birds and 400 or more birds (table 8). Specialized housing and equipment and improved labor and management practices begins to be economical at about the 400 -bird level.

In 1959 the average breeder flock contained 600 or more hens in California, Minnesota, and New Hampshire. Labor requirements per hen, including an allowance for toms, were lowest in these States. In some States, average breeder flocks contoined mily 4 or 5 hens. Flocks this size usually receive relatively little care, but they contain so few birds that the time used per bird is high.

Nearly all the turkeys raised in the Pacific and Lake States in 1959 were in commercial flocks. In these regions, such flocks averaged more than 15,000 and 12,000 birds, respectively. They receive intensive care but producers who raise such flocks usually have modern buildings and equipment and stress labor-saving practices. This means little time per bird. Man-hours for all turkeys raised varied by regions from 36 hours per 100 birds in the Pacific to 71 hours in the Southern Plains region.

Table 2.-Milk cows: Man-hours par head and related factors, 1959

| State <br> region | Man-hours |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per hata |  |  | : Per 100 : | Cows | Milk |
|  | Machine milked | Hand milked | $\begin{gathered} A 11 \\ 1 / \end{gathered}$ | :pounds of: :milk pro-: iduced $2 /$ : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { per } \\ & \text { herd } 3 / \end{aligned}$ | production per cow |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | Hours | Heurs | Hours | hours | Number | Pounds |
| Ma inc-----------------: | 93 | 128 | 103 | 1.4 | 10 | 7,380 |
| New Hampshire--------: | 90 | 127 | 96 | 1.3 | 13 | 7,400 |
|  | 87 | 123 | 87 | 1.2 | 26 | 7,200 |
| Massachusetts-------- | 88 | 125 | 92 | 1.2 | 20 | 7,890 |
| Rhode 1sland--------: | 88 | 125 | 90 | 1.1 | 24 | 8,450 |
| Connecticut------m-m: | 83 | 125 | 90 | 1.1 | 20 | 8,220 |
| New York-------------: | 88 | 125 | 91 | 1.2 | 22 | 7,840 |
| New Jersey----.-.-.----: | 90 | 125 | 92 | 1.1 | 28 | 8,710 |
| Pennsylvania---------: | 90 | 126 | 96 | 1.3 | 14 | 7,460 |
| Delaware-------------: | 90 | 127 | 95 | 1.4 | 14 | 6,950 |
| Meryland------------*: | 88 | 125 | 94 | 1.4 | 18 | 6.960 |
| Northeast | 89 | 126 | 93 | 1.2 | 18 | 7,641. |
| Michigan-------------: | 90 | 126 | 96 | 1.2 | 12 | 7,830 |
| Wiscons in------------: | 90 | 125 | 94 | 1.1 | 20 | 8,240 |
| Minnesota-----.------: | 90 | 121 | 95 | 1.2 | 13 | 7,850 |
| Lake States | 90 | 124 | 95 | 1.2 | 16 | 8.054 |
| Ohio---------------- : | 94 | 131 | 105 | 1.4 | 10 | 7,390 |
| Indiana-------------: | 94 | 130 | 105 | 1.5 | 9 | 7,230 |
| Illinois-------------: | 94 | 131 | 105 | 1.5 | 10 | 7,180 |
| lowa----------------- | 94 | 123 | 104 | 1.5 | 9 | 6,820 |
|  | 96 | 129 | 111 | 2.0 | 7 | 5.470 |
| Corn Belt | 94 | 128 | 106 | 1.6 | 8 | 6,784 |
| North Dakota---------: | 95 | 122 | 107 | 1.8 | 9 | 6,080 |
| South Dakotam---...---: | 95 | 124 | 109 | 1.9 | 8 | 5,610 |
| Nebraskama-----------: | 95 | 127 | 112 | 1.9 | 7 | 5,950 |
| Kansas | 97 | 127 | 110 | 2.0 | 7 | 5.560 |
| Northern Plains-ma | 96 | 125 | 110 | 1.9 | 7 | 5.799 |
| Virginian----------- | 99 | 130 | 117 | 2.0 | 5 | 5,880 |
| West Virginia-----mom: | 120 | 140 | 133 | 2.7 | 4 | 4,980 |
| North Carol ina-------: | 108 | 144 | 131 | 2.3 | 3 | 5,640 |
| Kentucky--------------: | 99 | 150 | 119 | 2.4 | 5 | 4,900 |
| Tennessee------------: | 98 | 131 | 117 | 2.7 | 5 | 4.400 |
| Appalechior-------: | -101. | 133 | 121 | 2.4 | 5 | 5,069 |

Table 2.-Milk cows: Man-hours per head and related factors, 1959 -Cont inued

| Staie and region | Man -hours |  |  |  | : |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | :_._Per head |  |  | : Per 100 | Cows : | Milk |
|  | Machine milked | Hand milked | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Al} \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | :pounds of: :milk pro-: :duced 2/: | $\text { herd } 3 / \text { : }$ | production per cow |
|  | Hours | Hours | Hours | Hours | Number | Pounds. |
| South Carollna-------: | 103 | 136 | 126 | 2.7 | 4 | 4,750 |
| Georgia-------------: | 101 | 132 | 118 | 2.6 | 5 | 4,570 |
|  | 87 | 123 | 96 | 1.5 | 21 | 6,460 |
| Alabama- | 104 | 136 | 126 | 3.2 | 4 | 3,900 |
| Southeast- | 96 | 133 | 116 | 2.4 | 5 | 4,836 |
| Mississ ippi--------m: | 96 | 124 | 113 | 3.4 | 5 | 3,320 |
| Arkansas-mmon---o---: | 100 | 130 | [18 | 2.8 | 5 | 4,150 |
| Louis iana--n----------: | 96 | 127 | 112 | 3.3 | 5 | 3.410 |
| Delta States- | 97 | 126 | 114 | 3,2 | 5 | 3.569 |
| Oklahora=----------m-: | 98 | 129 | 114 | 2.2 | 6 | 5,300 |
| Texas- | 97. | 132 | 113 | 2.3 | 6 | 4,850 |
| Southern Plains- | 97 | 131 | 113 | 2.3 | 6 | 4,989 |
| Montana--------------: | 96 | 132 | 113 | 2.0 | 5 | 5,600 |
| 1 daho-----------------: | 94 | 130 | 101 | 1.3 | 9 | 7,800 |
| Wyoming-a------------: | 96 | 132 | 114 | 1.9 | 5 | 6,120 |
| Colorado------------: | 96 | 126 | 110 | 1.7 | 8 | 6,650 |
| New Mexico--m--------: | 90 | 130 | 107 | 1.9 | 7 | 5,620 |
| Arizona--------------: | 80 | 128 | 89 | 1.0 | 20 | 9,220 |
| Utah | 90 | 133 | 100 | 1.3 | 9 | 7,930 |
| Nevada- | 22 | 126 | 106 | 1.4 | 12 | 7,330 |
| Mountain | . 92 | 130 | 104 | +1.4 | 8 | 7.181 |
| Washington-----------: | 94 | 130 | 104 | 1.3 | 9 | 7,970 |
| Oregon~--------------: | 96 | 129 | 105 | 1.6 | 8 | 6,770 |
| Callforn ia------*---*: | B0 | 125 | 83 | . 9 | 39 | 9,570 |
| Pacific------------ | 84 | 128 | 90 | 1.0 | 18 | 8.891 |
| United States--m: | 92 | 129 | 103 | 1.5 | 9 | 6,815 |

$1 /$ Man-hours in 2 previous columns weighted by proportion handled by aach method as adafted from Deiry Cows: Housing and Methods of Milking. U. S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., ERS-15.

2/ Hours per head divided by 100 pounds of milk produced per cow.
3/ Milk cows, including heifers that have calved, per farm reporting, from 1959.
U. S. Census.

Table 3.--Cattle and calves, except milk cows: Man-hours per head and related factors, 1959


Table 3.--Cattle and calves, except milk cows: Man-hours per head and related factors, 1959 --Continued


1/ All caitie and calves, except cows 2 years old and over.
2/ Total man-hours of labor for all cattle and calves except milk cows divided by pounds of beef produced (liveweight). Total hours derived by applying data in 2 previous columns to the appropriate number of head on farms January 1.

3/ Heifers 1-2 years and heifer calves kept for milk divided by the number of all cattle and calves except cows.

Table 4,-mogs: Man-hours per 100 pounds produced and related factors, 1959


Table 4.--Hogs: Man-hours per 100 pounds produced and related factors, 1959 --Continued

| State and region | :Man-hours per: : 100 pounds (produced : (liveweight $)$ | Sows per herd上 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pigs } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { litter } \\ & 2 / \end{aligned}$ | Fall ifters percentage of spring litters $3 /$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hours | Number | Number | Percent |
| South Caroline- | 3.5 | 2.9 | 6.4 | 80 |
| Georgia- | 3.4 | 4.7 | 6.8 | 81 |
| Florida-m-- | 3.4 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 75 |
| Alabama- | 3.0 | 3.5 | 7.0 | 86 |
| Southeast | 3,3 | 4.0 | 6.8 | 82 |
| Mississippi---- | 4.1 | 2.7 | 6.4 | 97 |
| Arkansas- | 3.6 | 3.0 | 6.8 | 94 |
| Louis iana | 4.3 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 92 |
| Delta States- | 4.0 | 2.8 | 6.5 | 95 |
| Ok lahoma--------- | 3.6 | 3.6 | 6.9 | 98 |
| Texas- | 3.3 | 4.0 | 6.9 | 84 |
| Southern Plains | 3.4 | 3.9 | 6.9 | 88 |
| Montana-----...- | 3.3 | 4.9 | 7.3 | 75 |
| 1 daho- | 3.3 | 4.4 | 7.3 | 89 |
| Wyoming- | 3.3 | 4.5 | 6.9 | 80 |
| Colorado- | 2.9 | 5.3 | 6.8 | 89 |
| New Mexico- | 3.3 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 100 |
| Arizona- | 2.6 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 100 |
| Urah- | 3.7 | 3.7 | 6.8 | 114 |
| Nevada- | 3.1 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 100 |
| mountain | 3.2 | 4.8 | 7.0 | 89 |
| Hashington | 3.0 | 5.5 | 7.7 | 88 |
| Oregon--- | 3.0 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 86 |
| California | 2.0 | 13.7 | 6.2 | 83 |
| Pacific- | 2.6 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 85 |
| United States | 2.3 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 77 |

1 Spring farrowings per farm reporting, from 1959 U. S. Census.
2/ Total number of pigs saved divided by number of sows farrowing in spring, plus number farrowing in fall.

3/ Number of sows farrowing in fall divided by number farrowing in spring.

Table 5.--Sheep: Man-hours per head and related factors: 1959

| State 8nd region | Man-hours_eer head_L/ |  |  |  | Sheep per 3/-- |  | ```:Lambs saved -- :percentage of stock sheep 4/``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Farm <br> flocks | : Range <br> flocks | : All | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ion } \\ & : \text { feed } \\ & ; 2 / \end{aligned}$ | Farm <br> flock | Range flock |  |
|  | Hours | Hours | Hours | Bouns | Number | Number | Percent |
| Mair r----------*-- | 4.2 | ---* | 4.2 | --- | 19 | - | 77 |
| Net Chapshire--...-s: | 4.8 | --- | 4.8 | --- | 11 | --- | 62 |
| Vermont----------- | 4.1 | --- | 4.1 | --- | 18 | --- | 67 |
| Massachusetts----- | 4.9 | --- | 4.9 | --- | 11 | --- | 67 |
| Rhode is landm-----: | 5.5 | - | 5.5 | --- | 12 | --m | 100 |
| Connecticut--------: | 5.2 | --- | 5.2 | --- | 10 | --- | 71 |
| New York-----n-----: | 4.1 | --- | 4.1 | 1.2 | 29 | -"- | 85 |
| New Jerseym------- | 4.7 | -- | 4.7 | --- | 13 | --- | 69 |
| Pennsyivaniam-----: | 3.7 | --- | 3.7 | --- | 24 | --- | 65 |
| Delaware----------- | 4.0 | --- | 4.0 | --- | 28 | --- | 80 |
| Maryland-----------: | 4.1 | $\cdots$ | 4.1 | $\cdots$ | 23 | $\cdots$ | 82 |
| Northeast | 4.0 | --- | 4.0 | 1.2 | 22 | $\cdots$ | 73 |
| Michigan----------- | 4.0 | -- | 4.0 | 1.1 | 37 | --- | 85 |
| Wisconsinm-------m: | 4.3 | --- | 4.3 | 1.1 | 21 | --- | 88 |
| Minnesota------m-m | 4,1 | $\cdots$ | 4.1 | 1.0 | 32 | $\cdots$ | 93 |
| Lake States----- | 4.1 | - | 4.1 | 1.0 | 30 | $\cdots$ | 90 |
| Ohio--------------- | 4.0 | - | 4.0 | 1.1 | 28 | --- | 81 |
| Indiana-----------: | 4.3 | --- | 4.3 | . 9 | 19 | --- | 83 |
| Illino is-----------: | 4.4 | --- | 4.4 | . 9 | 18 | --- | 81 |
| lowam-------------- | 4.1 | --- | 4.1 | . 8 | 29 | --- | 86 |
|  | 4.3 | - | 4.3 | 1.0 | 31 | - | 98 |
| Corn Belt-------- | $4 \times 2$ | $\cdots$ | 4.2. | $\underline{.9}$ | 25 | --- | 83 |
| North Dakota--.-----: | 3.5 | --- | 3.5 | 1.0 | 66 | --- | 88 |
| South Dakota-m.-.---: | 3.3 | --- | 3.3 | . 8 | 91 | --- | 83 |
| Nebraska--------m-m: | 3.7 | $\cdots$ | 3.7 | . 7 | 45 | --- | 81 |
| Kansas------------- | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | . 7 | 56 | --- | 80 |
| Northern Plains~- | 3.4 | -- | 3.4 | . 7 | 69 | - | 83 |
| Virginia----------- | 4.1 | --- | 4.1 | --m | 30 | -m, | 89 |
| West Virginia---~-*: | 6.0 | $\cdots$ | 6.0 | -- | 27 | --- | 85 |
| North Carolina-m---: | 4.4 | --- | 4.4 | --- | 17 | --- | 76 |
| Kentucky-m-.-.----- | 3.8 | --* | 3.8 | --- | 45 | -- | 89 |
| Tennessee----------- | 3.9 | $\cdots$ | 3.2 | --- | 31. | $=$ | 79 |
| Appalachlan---m--: | 4.3 | $\cdots$ | 4.3 | -- | 32 | $\cdots$ | 86 |

Table 5.-mSheep: Man-hours per head and related factors, 1959 --Continued

| State and region | $\frac{\text { Man-hours per head I I }}{\text { Stock-sheed }}$ |  |  |  | Sheep per 3/- |  | 'Lambs saved -:percentage of stock sheep 4/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Farm } \\ & \text { : locks } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | :Range :flocks | : All : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : on } \\ & \text { :feed } \\ & : 2 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Farm } \\ & \text { flock } \end{aligned}$ | Range flock |  |
|  | : Hours | Hours | Hours | Hours | Number | Number | Percent |
| South Carol ina-----: | : 37 | --- | 3.7 | --- | 23 | --- | 62 |
| Georg ia-------------- | : 3.4 | --- | 3.4 | --- | 29 | --.. | 58 |
| Florida----------- | + 3.4 |  | 3.4 | --- | 32 | --- | 62 |
| Alsbema- | 3.2 | $\cdots$ | 3.2 | --- | 35 | --- | 59 |
| Southeost---- | 3.4 | $\cdots$ | 3.4 | -- | 30 | -- | 59 |
| Mississippi--------: | : 3.2 | --- | 3.2 | $\cdots$ | 41 | --- | 55 |
| Arkansas-----------: | : 3.6 | --- | 3.6 | --- | 28 | - | 69 |
| Lou is iana----------: | -3.2 | --- | 3.2 | --- | 26 | --- | 48 |
| Delta States--- | 3.3 | -- | 3.3 | -- | 30 | $\cdots$ | 55 |
|  | 3.4 | --- | 3.4 | . 7 | 42 | --- | 72 |
| Texas- | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 7 | 56 | 761 | 59 |
| Southern Plains- | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 7 | 53. | 761. | 60 |
| Montana-------------: | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 68 | 891 | 70 |
| Idaho--------------: | - 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 52 | 1,227 | 93 |
| Wyoming---7---------: | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 79 | 1,361 | 66 |
| Colorodo-------.---: | : 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.0 | . 9 | 50 | 888 | 85 |
| New Mexico---------- | : 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | . 9 | 53 | 1,141 | 66 |
| Ar izona---------------- | : 3.7 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 8 | 23 | 7,086 5/ | 64 |
| Utah-------------------- | - 3.5 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 42 | 1,238 | 75 |
| Nevado | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 34. | 3.498 | 73 |
| Mountain- | -3.6 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 54 | 1,182 | 74 |
| Wesh h ngton----.-----.: | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 32 | 885 |  |
| Oregon-------------: | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.8 | . 9 | 49 | 705 | 82 |
| Cal ifornia--------- | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | . 8 | 34 | 1.142 | 76 |
| Pacific----------: | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.7 | . 8 | 40 | 1.003 | 79 |
| United States--: | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 | . 9 | 36 | 999 | 75 |

1/ Per head on farms January 1.
2/ Estimates were made only for those States in which numbers on feed were reported by the Crop Reporting Board.

3/ Sheep 1 year old and over, from the $1959 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. Census. In all except the range States, sheep are considered to be in farm flocks. In range States, farm flocks are those on farms reporting fewer than 300 per farm. The average size of range flocks (those on ranches reporting 300 or more) should not be confused with size of bands into which sheep are divided for herding.

4/ Based on data from the Crop Reporting Board. Indicates the relative importance of ewes that raise lambs. These ewes take more time than other stock sheep.

5/ The large size of flock results partly from counting sheep on an Indian reservation as one flock.

Table 6.-Chickens - laying flocks: Man-hours per bird and related factors, 1959


Table 6.--Chickens - laying flocks: Man-hours per bird and related factors, 1959 --Continued


1/ Man-hours do not include time for raising replacements. Chickens raised for replacement and for meat take from 10 to 30 man-hours per 100 birds. Noncommercial flocks and commercial flocks of chickens for egg production are those on farms reporting fewer than 400 , and 400 or more chickens per farm, respectively, from the 1959 U. S. Census.

2/ Hours per layer divided by rate of lay.
3/ Number of eggs produced during the year divided by number of hens and pullets on hand January $t$.

Table 7.--Chickens-broilers: Man-hours par bird and ralated factors, 1959

| State and region |  |  |  |  | Birds sold from 1/- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Smail flocks | Large flocks |
|  | Hours | Hours. | Hours | Hours | 1,000 | 1.000 |
| Maine- | 70 | 33 | 33 | . 88 | 4.5 | 47.3 |
| Now Hempshire-------: | 70 | 39 | 40 | 1.09 | 3.9 | 28.4 |
| Vermont---..---------: | 90 | 34 | 35 | 1.03 | 2.4 | 43.5 |
| Massachusetts--.----: | 83 | 32 | 34 | . 90 | 3.0 | 56.8 |
| Rhode Is land--------: | 72 | 33 | 35 | . 99 | 3.3 | 47.0 |
| Connecticut---------: | 73 | 33 | 34 | 1.00 | 2.9 | 46.0 |
| New York------------ | 83 | 36 | 38 | . 92 | 3.2 | 39.0 |
| Hew Jersey---------- | 72 | 39 | 42 | . 83 | 2.9 | 31.6 |
| Pennsyivania---.-----: | 71 | 34 | 37 | 1.01 | 3.8 | 43.8 |
| Delaware | 70 | 32 | 32 | . 92 | 5.9 | 51.3 |
| Maryland | 70 | 32 | 32 | . 92 | 4.6 | 51.1 |
| Northeast | 73 | 33 | 34 | . 93 | 3.8 | 48.1 |
| Michigan------------ : | 71 | 59 | 62 | 1.30 | 4.2 | 21.6 |
| Wiscons in | 72 | 32 | 33 | . 97 | 3.1 | 53.9 |
| Minnesota | 100 | 34 | 37 | 1.12 | 2.0 | 37.8 |
| Lake Sta | 75 | 35 | 38 | 1.05 | 3.3 | 43.9 |
| Ohio- | 72 | 39 | 41 | 1.22 | 3.7 | 34.1 |
| Indiana | 72 | 36 | 37 | 1.10 | 3.5 | 35.6 |
| llinois | 75 | 36 | 39 | 1.21 | 4.2 | 40.0 |
| lowa | 75 | 39 | 44 | 1.00 | 3.0 | 32.9 |
| Missouri | 71 | 34 | 35 | 1.09 | 4.2 | 40.9 |
| Corn Bel | 73 | 36 | 37 | 1.12 | 3.7 | 37.2 |
| Nebraska-m------m--- | 90 | 32 | 34 | 1.01 | $3 /$ | $3 /$ |
| Kansas- | 83 | 33 | 37 | 1.20 | $3 /$ | $3 /$ |
| Northern Plains | 87 | 32. | 36 | 1.09 | 3.0 | 96,8 |
| Virginia------------ | 71 | 36 | 38 | 1.23 | 4.1 | 38.3 |
| West Virginia------- | 75 | 50 | 52 | 1.55 | 4.3 | 29.4 |
| North Carol ina------: | 70 | 36 | 37 | 1.12 | 4.4 | 37.2 |
| Kentucky | 70 | 43 | 44 | 1.32 | 4.0 | 28.3 |
| Tennessee-------- | 70 | 39 | 40 | 1.24 | 4.8 | 31.9 |
| Appalachian- | 72 | 38 | 40 | 1.21 | 4.3 | 34,9 |

Table 7.-Chickens-broilers: Man-hours per bird and related factors, 1959 --Continued


1/ Small and large flocks are those produced on farms reporting fewer than 8,000, and 8,000 or more broiters sold per farm, respectively, from the 1959 U . S. Census.

2/ Total man-hours of labor for broilers divided by pounds produced (liveweight). Total hours derived by epplying date in the previous columns to appropriate numbers of birds.

3/ Not reported for sinall and iarge flocks separately bacause of small number of producers. Numbers sold per farm for all farms reporting were (1,000 broilers) 30.9 In Nebraska, 23.3 in Kansas, 32.6 in Idaho, 17.7 in Colorado, 100.0 in Arizona, and 18.3 in Utah.

Table 8.--Turkeys: Man-hours per bird and related factors, 1959


Table 8.--Turkeys: Man-hours per bird and related factors, 1959 --Continued

| State and region | - Man-hours Turkeys per-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per : Per 100 turkeys raised_l: Per 100 : Areeder:_Flock_raised i/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Breeder } \\ & : \quad \text { hen } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | : Noncom:mercial <br> :floaks | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Commer } \\ f \neq 0 \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ | All flocks | pounds <br> turkey <br> coducen | flock 3/ | Noncommercial | Commercial |
|  | : Hours | Hours | Hours | Hours | Hours | Birds | Birds | Birds |
| South Corolinar--: | : 3.2 | 245 | 40 | 46 | 3.3 | 22 | 13 | 9,598 |
| Georgia | 4.0 | 246 | 44 | 72 | 4.7 | 6 | 12 | 7,327 |
| Floride | 3.2 | 242 | 34 | 50 | 4.4 | 28 | 20 | 15,825 |
| Alabama | 4.0 | 244 | 46 | 86 | 6.7 | 5 | 12 | 5.492 |
| Southeast | 3.5 | 245 | 40 | 58 | 4.3 | 10 | 13 | 8.748 |
| Miss iss ippi------ | : 5.0 | 244 | 53 | 131 | 10.9 | 4 | 9 | 3.153 |
| Arkanses | 3.2 | 245 | 44 | 47 | 3.2 | 26 | 14 | 7,198 |
| Louisiana | 5.0 | 246 | 56. | 194 | 15.5 | 4 | 10 | 2.706 |
| Delta States- | 3.8 | 245 | 45 | 59 | 4.2 | 9 | 10 | 6.822 |
| Ok lanoma--------- : | $: 3.2$ | 229 | 46 | 51 | 4.4 | 27 | 37 | 5,654 |
| Texas | 3.0 | 219 | 46 | 74 | 6.2 | 35 | 47 | 5.739 |
| Southern Plains: | 3.0 | 220 | 46 | 71 | 5.8 | 34 | 45 | 5.715 |
| Montena---------- | : 5.0 | 245 | 62 | 179 | 12.9 | 4 | 16 | 1,476 |
| I daho | 3.2 | 236 | 33 | 47 | 3.1 | 29 | 28 | 22,058 |
| Wyoming | 4.0 | 244 | 60 | 208 | 15.9 | 5 | 17 | 1,879 |
| Colorado | 3.5 | 239 | 41 | 47 | 2.5 | 17 | 27 | 9,952 |
| New Mexico------- | : 3.5 | 245 | 52 | 113 | 7.0 | 12 | 20 | 3,574 |
| Arizona | 2.8 | 244 | 45 | 58 | 4.0 | 53 | 21 | 6,656 |
| Utah | : 2.6 | 242 | 37 | 38 | 2.1 | 131 | 23 | 14,053 |
| Nevada | 5.0 | 246 | --- | 246 | 12.5 | 4 | 1 | --- |
| Moun | 3.0 | 24.1 | 38 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 26 | 22 | 11.856 |
| Washington- | : 2.6 | 241 | 43 | 51 | 3.4 | 103 | 25 | 8,533 |
| Oregon | 2.2 | 238 | 43 | 46 | 4.1 | 461 | 27 | 7,493 |
| California | 2.1 | 24.1 | 34 | 35 | 2.5 | 886 | 24. | 17,609 |
| Pacific | 2.1 | 240 | 35 | 36 | 2.7 | 625 | 25 | 15,164 |
| United States: | : 2.5 | 228 | 41 | 47 | 3.4 | 57 | 28 | 8,949 |

1/ Noncommercial and commerciai flocks are those raised on farms leporting fewer than 400, and 400 or more turkeys raised per farm, respectively, as estimated from data in the U. S. Cansus.

2/ Total men-hours of labor for turkeys divided by pounds produced (liveweight). Total hours derived by appiying data in the previous columns to appropriate numbers of birds.

3/ Number of hens kept for breeding per farm reporting, from the 1959 U. S. Census.

$$
f
$$


(C) UPDATA 19EY政 :


[^0]:    1/ For a list of part of these publications see: Publications Containing Recent Farm Enterprise Input-Output Data. U. S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Farm Prod. Econ. Div., March 1963. Unnumbered.

