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ABSTRAGT
The food and fiber system accounted for 20 percent of total U.S. business activity in 1980 and nearly 24 percent of total U.S. employment. Farmers' net casin income of $\$ 32.6$ billion in 1980 declined 15.2 percent from 1979. Net farm income dropped 39 percent. Mainly due to drought conditions, productivity decreased 3 percent from its 1979 record high. Farm output, which increased 28 percent from 1970 to 1979 , dipped 5 percent in 1980. Savings, an important factor in increasing farm capacity output and productivity, continued at a high level--totaling 31 percent of gross cash inflows and 44 percent of net cash income.
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Farmers' net cash farm income in 1980 declined 15.2 percent from the year before to $\$ 32.6$ billion. Weak consumer demand and large supplies of meat and grain combined to limit returns to farmers. Rapidly rising interest rates and debt, high costs of petroleum-based inputs, and a surplus farm product inventory further blunted U.S, agriculture's earnings, triggering a 39-percent sag in net farm income. Agricultural exports remained bright in 1980 , posting the $12 t h$ consecutive record-high earnings of $\$ 41.2$ billion, up 19 percent from 1979.

This report examines developments in the 1980 Earm sector, and summarizes data from national and State economic and balance sheet statistics as well as production and efficiency statistics. Also, three separate articles analyze the methodology of procedures in gathering farm data.

The increasing importance of off-farm income to farmers continued with a $\$ 2.8$-billion rise from 1979 to $\$ 36$ billion. Capital gains (excluding farm households) surged to $\$ 78.2$ billion, which pushed the net worth of farm proprietors up by $\$ 62.4$ billion. Equity registered more than $\$ 755$ billion, continuing the static farm debt-to-farm asset ratio with increases in farm debt virtually matching increases in farm asset values.

Borrowing ${ }^{\text {'s }}$ role in total cash flow widened, increasing farm susceptibility to default. Borrowing equaled 51 percent of cash farm income in 1976-80, sharply higher than the 28-percent rate of 1971-75, which significantly shifted cash flow toward interest payments. Capital expenditures in 1980 (excluding farm households) declined 7.4 percent, mirroring the high cost of borrowing. Drought limited farm output in 1980, forcing a 5-percent slide from 1979's record farm productivity level. In 1980, food spending absorbed 16.6 percent of the consumer dollar, matching 1979's level; hosever, the farm value of food, which increased by 4.4 percent, was outdistanced by the $11.7-p e r c e n t$ rise in retail value.

The food and fiber system continued as an important employer, retaining 24 percent of the U.S. work force and generating 20 percent of total U.S. business activity.

# Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector: 
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FOOD AND FIBER
SECTOR DEVELOPMENTS

The food and fiber sector produced about $\$ 426$ billion worth or goods in 1980, consisting of $\$ 260$ billion in consumer purchases of domestically produced food, $\$ 41$ billion of agricultural exports, $\$ 105$ billion of consumer expenditures for clothes and shoes, and $\$ 20$ billion of consumer expenditures for tobacco (fig. 1). Farmers purchased $\$ 99.7$ billion of inputs in 1980 comprised of $\$ 32.9$ billion of farm-origin inputs and $\$ 66.8$ billion from the farm input sector. Food marketers purchased $\$ 81.4$ billion of farm goods in 1980. Processing and distributing these goods added another $\$ 178.6$ billion in costs. Food marketing profits before taxes in 1980 equaled 4.2 percent of sales.

Pre-tax net farm income of $\$ 19.9$ billion in 1980 equaled 13.2 percent of gross farm income. Returns to equity from current income was 1.5 percent, becoming 11.4 percent with nominal capital gains added. Net cash farm income must also be used to acquire farm production capital as well as meeting family living needs. Gross farm savings in 1980 were 31 percent of gross cash inflows and 44 percent of net cash farm income.

Farm sector output and capacity have been increasing in response to substantially larger planted acreages, increased livestock production, increased productivity, and sustained high levels of farm saving. Farm output increased 28 percent for the 10 years from 1970-79, an annual compound rate of 2.5 percent per year. The farm sector's potential was not fully realized in 1980 when drought caused farm output to fall 5 percent. Crop output increased 44 percent from 1970 to 1979 but fell 9 percent in 1980. Livestock output increased 8 percent from 1970 to 1980. Savings were important in increasing farm productivity and capacity output. Fertilizer, agricultural chemicals, improved crop varieties, and improved animal breeding were also vital to increasing productivity. The level of farm production inputs remained stable during the seventies because increased use of machinery and equipment offset the decline in labor and land. The mechanical power and machinery input index increased 28 percent from 1970 to 1980, while the farm labor input index declined 27 percent and the index of farm real estate declined 5 percent. The input

FARM SECTOR DEVELOPMENTS

1ndex of agricultural chemicals (fertilizer, lime, and pesticides) increased 51 percent from 1970 to 1980 .

Rapidly increasing interest rates, escalating costs of petroleum-based farm inputs, and a decline in farm inventory change dropped net farm income from $\$ 32.7$ billion in 1979 to $\$ 19.9$ billion in 1980, a decline of 39 percent (table 1 and fig. 2). Net cash farm income declined 15.2 percent to $\$ 32.6$ billion. Total income of farm operator families from farm and off-farm sources totaled $\$ 55.8$ billion, or $\$ 23,822$ per farm (fig. 3).

The decline in farm income hurt livestock producers more than crop growers. Cash receipts for livestock and livestock products declined slightly from $\$ 68.5$ billion in 1979 to $\$ 67.4$ billion in 1980 as the index of livestock prices received by farmers deciined 3 percent and the volume of marketings increased 2 percent (tables 2 and 3). In contrast, cash receipts from crops climbed from $\$ 63.4$ billion in 1979 to $\$ 69$ billion in 1980, a 9-percent 1ncrease (table 3). Total farm production expenses $\ddagger n c r e a s e d ~ 9$ percent, pushed by a 12-percent increase in prices paid by farmers (fig. 4).

Figure s
The Food and Fiber Sector, 1980


Table 1-Major net farm income components (inciuding net Commodity Gepdit Corporacion loans and farm householdal, 1970-80


Figure 2

## Net Farm Income

$\$$ billion


Figute 3
income of Farm Operator Families


Net farm income inctudes an adfustment for changes in yearend crop and fivestock inventories and fepresents returns to operator tamiltes' fabor, capital, and managernent.

## Gross Fam Income

Cash Recelpts

Offsetting the rapld increase in prices paid was the 2 -percent decrease in the level of inputs used by farmers (table 2). Interest paid, fuel, fertilizer, and depreciation accounted for 78 percent of the $\$ 10.9-b i l l i o n$ increase in total farm production expenses. Livestock purchases declined $\$ 2.2$ billion.

Gross farm income of $\$ 151$ billion in 1980 was composed of cash receipts, net farm inventory change, Government payments, other farm income, gross rental value of farm dwellings, and home consumption. Cash receipts in 1980 totaled 91 percent of gross farm incoge. Noncash imputations for home consumption, the gross rental value of operators' dwellings, and net farm inventory change accounted for 7 percent of gross farm income.

Higher receipts from dairy products and broilers failed to offset reduced receipts from cattle, calves, hogs, and eggs. Cattle and calf marketings, which equaled about one-half of all livestock recefpts and about a quarter of receipts from all commodities, were down $\$ 3.2$ bilion, or 9 percent. Reduced prices, not the volume marketed, triggered most of the reductions in cattle and calf receipts. The index of prices recelved for meat anfmals declined 6 percent from 1979 to 1980. Cash receipts to dairy producers increased 13 percent, reflecting a 9 -percent increase in prices and a 3 -percent increase in wilk production. Receipts from broilers and chickens increased 6 percent. Recefpts from sheep, eggs, turkeys, and hogs changed only slightly.

Table 2--Economic indicators of farm Income developments

| Economic indicator | : | 1977 : | 1978 : | $1979$ | 1980 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1,000 acres |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Principal crops: | : |  | 336,787 | 346,756 | 356,924 |
| Planted | : | 345,207 |  |  |  |
| Harvested | : | 333,604 | 326,766 | 337,686 | 340,905 |
|  | : |  | 1967:100 |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume of inputs index | : | 105 | 105 | 108 | 1.06 |
|  | : |  | 1977-100 |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Volume of marketings index: | ; |  |  |  |  |
| All commoditles | : | 100 | 102 | 106 | 108 |
| Livestock | : | 100 | 100 | 100 | 103 |
| Crops | : | 100 | 104 | 113 | 114 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Prices recelved by farmers index: | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  | 115 | 132 | 134 |
| Livestock | : | 100 | 124 | 147 | 144 |
| Crops | : | 100 | 106 | 116 | 125 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Prices paid by farmers index: All production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | ; |  | 109 | 225 | 140 |
|  | : | 100 | 109 | 225 | 140 |

Table 3-Cash receiprs from marketings of livestock and crops (Including net Comodity Credit Corporation loans), 1977-80

| Commodicy | : | 1977 | $1978$ | $1979$ | $1980$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | " | Militon dollars |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| All commodities | : | 96,289 | 112,924 | 131,916 | 136,431 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Livestock and products | ! | 47,639 | 59,213 | 68,522 | 67,405 |
| Cattie and calves | : | 20,225 | 28,248 | 34,399 | 31,173 |
| Dairy products | : | 11,752 | 12,690 | 14,659 | 16,598 |
| Hogs | : | 7.281 | 8,753 | 9,027 | 8,920 |
| Broilers and farm chickens | : | 3,239 | 3,851 | 4,189 | 4,431 |
| Eggs | : | 2,918 | 2.953 | 3,317 | 3,248 |
| Turkeys | : | 1,059 | 1,326 | 1,400 | 1,458 |
| Sheep and lambs | : | 386 | 453 | 474 | 471 |
| Other livestock products ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | : | 778 | 939 | 1,058 | 1,106 |
| Grops | : | 48,650 | 53,711 | 63,394 | 69,026 |
| Feed crops | : | 11,906 | 11,427 | 14,023 | 16,794 |
| Oll-bearing crops | : | 9,722 | 13,023 | 14,358 | 14,540 |
| Food grains | : | 6,055 | 5,839 | 9,048 | 10,532 |
| Vegerables | : | 5,638 | 5,941 | 6,647 | 6,817 |
| Fruit and tree nuts | : | 4,613 | 5,764 | 6,443 | 6,472 |
| cotton and cottonseed | : | 3,470 | 3,465 | 4,305 | 4,476 |
| Tobacco | : | 2,331 | 2,606 | 2,271 | 2, 572 |
| Other crops ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | : | 4,915 | 5,645 | 6,298 | 6,724 |

1/ Ducks, geese, pigeons, wool, horses, mules, mohair, honey, beeswax, bees, and fur animals. 2/ Sugar crops, greenhouse and nursery products, forest products, legumes and grass seeds, hops, mint, broomcorn, popcorn, hemp fiber and seed, and flax fiber.

Fiqure 4
Prices Received and Paid by Farmers


Prices paid inciudes commodities and services, inlerest, faxes, and wage rates.

Net Inventory Change

Principal crops were planted on 357 mililon acres in 1980 , up 10 million acres from 1979 and the largest acreage since 1953. Harvested acreage of principal crops totaled 341 million acres, up only 3 million acres from a year earlier. Two major droughts brought heavy abandonment of row crops and a 4 -percent decline in acreage harvested from hay. The drought in the Nerthern Plains region began in January and continued to plague parts of the area during much of the summer. The drought in the South, coupled with high moisture demand because of the excessive heat, placed crops, ifvestock, and pastures under persistent stress from June to lite September when heavy rain finally fell.

Crop cash receipts increased $\$ 5.6$ billion in 1980 as the index of prices received by farmers for all crops was up 8 percent from a year earlier. The increases in corn cash receipts of $\$ 2.6$ billion and wheat cash receipts of $\$ 1.2$ billion accounted for 68 percent of the increase in crop cash receipts.
Soybeans, corn, and wheat accounted for one-half of the crop cash receipis. Soybean cash receipts were up only 3 percent, while cotton lint and cottonseed cash receipts increased 4 percent.

The value of the change in inventory in 1980 was minus $\$ 2$ billion, reflecting the drought-reduced 1980 crop production and a decline in the hog inventory. Crop inventory values fell $\$ 3.7$ billion because of declines in corn and soybean production. Livestock fnventories rose $\$ 1.7$ billion on the strength of increasing cattle and sheep inventories.

Other Farm Income

$\frac{\text { Farm Production }}{\text { Expenses }}$

Direct Government paymentà equaled $\$ 1.3$ billion in 1980, down 6 percent from the previous year. Home consumption of products grown on the fannstead of $\$ 1.2$ billion also declined 6 percent. The imputed gross rental value of farm dwelings climbed 15 percent to $\$ 11.4$ billion. Income carned from customwork, machine hire, and farm recreation increased 4 percent to $\$ 2.2$ billion. The gross rental value of farm dwellings of $\$ 11.4$ billion, less operator dwelling expenses of $\$ 5.6$ billion, totaled a net rental value of $\$ 5.8$ billion in 1980.

Farm production expenses (excluding farm households) of $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 5 . 9}$ billion in 1980 were up $\$ 10.9$ billion from the previous year, the third largest increase on record, exceeded only by 1973 and 1979. Farm production expenses rose 9 percent spuried by rapidily rising interest rates paid on increasing levels of farm debt, surging costs of the petroleum-based inputs of fertilizer and fuel, and a 12 -percent increase in the prices paid by farmers for all production items. Despite the increase in planted acreage, the volume of inputs used for farming declined 2 percent.

Interest paid increased $\$ 3$ billion, fertilizer costs rose $\$ 1.9$ billion, and fue 1 , ofl, and electricity costs jumped $\$ 2$ billion (table 4). The cost increase of these three inputs in 1980 averaged 21 percent, and accounted for 62 percent of the $\$ 10.9$-billion increase in total farm production costs. The cost of farm origin inputs declined about 1 percent due to a 17-percent drop in livestock purchased. The cost of all other remaining inputs increased $\$ 4.2$ billion, up only 7 percent from 1979. The increases in capital consumption allowances (a noncash expense) of $\$ 1.7$ billion registered 39 percent of the \$4.2-billion increase.

Interest paid soared more than any other farm produrtion input in 1980 when both debt outstanding and the average interest rate paid rose dramatically (tables 5 and 6). Total farm debt, excluding CCC loans, increased $\$ 15.7$ billion, the third largest increase on record. Interest paid on nonreal estate debt increased 29 percent as nonreal estate debt outstanding rose 11 percent and the average interest rate on nonreal estate debt increased from 9.4 percent in 1979 to 10.8 percent in 1980.

The 19 -percent increase in interest paid on real estate debt was substantially lower than the 29 -percent increase in nonreal estate interest paid. While real estate debt outstanding rose 11 percent, the average rate of interest paid on real estate debt increased only one-half point from 8.1 percent in 1979 to 8.6 percent in 1980. In addition to new borrowings, refinancing requirements also caused an increase in the average interest rate. Refinancing requirements are naturally greater for nonreal estate debt, which is shorter in term than real estate debt.

Table 4-Total farm pitduction expenses (exciuding farm households), 1977-80


Table 5--Total outstanding farm debt (excluding farm households), Jan. 1, 1977-81


1/ Excludes debt on operators dwellings. 2/ Excludes debt for nonfarm purposes. 3/ Preliminary.

Table 6--Average interest rates on business and farm borrowings, 1977-81


1/ Average, first month of quarter.
$\frac{2}{2} /$ First full business week of second month of quarter.
3/ Dollar welghted average of effective rates on loans of $\$ 1,000$ or more made in the week indicated.
4/ Average of most common rates at banks representative of farm lending, first day of quarter.
5/ Average of typical rates at agricultural banks, first day of quarter.
6/ "Large banks" (survey strata 1 to 3) correspond roughly to banks with over $\$ 450$ million in total assets in 1981 .
7/ Unweighted average of quoted rates, first day of quarter. Stock purchases and loan fees
required of borrowers from these cooperatives are not taken into account in the rates shown.
Source: Mellchar, Emanuel, and Paul T. Balides. Agricultural Finance Databook. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Division of Research and Statistics, Washington, D.C.

Costs of Production

Total Income per Farm Operator Family

Fuel and oil costs increased 29 percent in 1980, equaling slightly less than $\$ 1.9$ billion, almost as much as the increase in fertilizer costs. As with fertilizer, most of the fuel and oil cost increases were attributable to rising prices rather than increasing use. Diesel use declined 7 percent, while liquified petroleum gas (LPG) use declined 10 percent. Gasoline use rose 4 percent. In contrast to the trends in use, the index of fuels and energy prices paid by farmers (1977=100) jumped 37 percent.

Fortilizer expenses increased $\$ 1.9$ bilion in 1980 , a 27 -percent increase. Nost of the fertilizer cost increases were traced to rising prices rather than to increasing use. The index of primary plant nutrients used, including nitrogen, phosphate, and potash ( $1967=100$ ), increased 2 percent, but the index of fertilizer prices paid by farmers (1977=100) increased 24 percent.

In addition to looking at production expenses on an aggregate basis, USDA also calculates expenses on a per acre or head basis for the major crop and livestock commodities. Costs of crop production for 11 major U.S. crops rose by an average of 12.4 percent per acre in 1980 . The average cost per acre including land, increased by 17 percent for corn, 11 percent for sorghum, 15 percent for wheat, 13 percent for rice, 11 percent for soybeans, and 6 percent for cotton (table 7). Costs per acre were relatively unaffected by the drought which reduced yields and harvests significantly for all 11 crops.

Costs of livestock production, excluding land, increased for all livestock commodities except feeder pig finishing. Dairy production costs per hundredweight (cwt) of milk increased from $\$ 10.61$ in 1979 to $\$ 12.20$ in 1980 (table 8 ). Fed cattle costs of production per cwt in the western United States rose from $\$ 66.96$ in 1979 to $\$ 72.62$ in 1980 , an 8.5 -percent increase. Midwestern U.S. fed cattle costs of production increased 13 percent. Hog farrow-to-finish production costs per cut rose 9.3 percent to $\$ 60.30$.

Costs of production and total. farm production expenses are not synonymous. Total farm production expenses are allocated by State but are not broken down by commodity. Costs of production for the various crop and livestock commodities in tables 7 and 8 also include additional charges for the operators' labor, management, and capital.

Net farm income (before inventory adjustment) varied widely by value of sales class. Farms with sales of $\$ 20,000$ or more earned about 90 percent of cash receipts in 1980. Net farm income per farm for farms with sales of $\$ 20,000$ or more was $\$ 19,325$, compared with $\$ 9,002$ for all farms (table 9). Net farm income per farm for farms with sales of $\$ 19,999$ or less was $\$ 2,401$. Net farm income of small farms was less affected by changes in farm production and prices than larger farms because noncash imputations for dwelling value and home consumption were a greater proportion of net farm income. For

Table 7--Crop production costs, 1975-80

$N / A=$ Not available.

Table 8--U.S. livestock production costs exciuding land, 1976-80

$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}=$ Not available.

Table 9--Income per fatm operator family (including farm households), by major sources, by value of sales class, 1960-80


NA $=$ Not available, $1 /$ The numbers in parentheses present the weighted average of the first two columns. $2 /$ Includes Government payments, the value of farm products consumed infam households, and the rental value of farm dwellings. $3 /$ Based on the 1974 Census of Agriculture definftion of a farm that has sales of $\$ 1,000$ or more, and applies to 1977 and all following years.

Balance Sheet
example, net farm income for farms with sales of $\$ 19,999$ or less declined only $\$ 281$ per farm from 1979 to 1980 ; net farm income per farm for all farms declined $\$ 2,254$.

The well-being of small farmers was greatly influenced by off-farm income, and capital gains had a great impact on the well-being of large farmers. Seventy-four percent of off-farm income was received by farms with sales of $\$ 19,999$ or less, averaging $\$ 18,000$ per farm. However, off-farm income remained a significant source for income to larger farners. Off-farm income equaled 29 percent of total income received by farms with sales of at least $\$ 40,000$.

Capital gains reached $\$ 78.2$ billion, or approximately 400 percent of net farm income. During the past 4 years, real estate appreciation equaled 82 percent of total capital gains. In contrast to off-farm income, the recipients of the benefits realized from capital gains were large farms. Approximately 65 percent of farmiand was held by landowners producing sales of at least $\$ 40,000$.

Despite the dampening effects of declining farm income, declining capital expenditures, rising interest rates, and drought, the value of farm production assets increased $\$ 78$ billfon during 1980, 9 percent above the previous year (table 10). Net worth increased $\$ 62.4$ billion because of capital gains increases of $\$ 78.2$ billion. Land value per acre tncreased 9 percent, accounting for 85 percent of the $\$ 78.2-$ billion capital gains. An increasing debt of $\$ 15.7$ billion and net farm disinvestment of $\$ 2.9$ billion offset the increase in capital gafns. Net farm disinvestment of minus $\$ 2.9$ b£llion occurred because of the farm inventory value change of minus $\$ 2$ billion and the $\$ 1$ billion of farmland converted to nonfarm uses. Farm financial assets increased $\$ 2.7$ billion.

The total farm debt increase of $\$ 15.7$ billion, up 11 percent from 1979, was the second largest on record, exceeded only by the 1979 increase of $\$ 20.9$ billion. The debt-to-asset ratio has been fairly stable since 1966 as increases in farm debt have been matched by increases in farm asset values. The debt-to-asset ratio during 1966 - 81 ranged only 1.8 percent from a low of 16.2 percent in 1977 to a high of 18 percent in 1970. The 1981 debt-to*asset ratio was 16.6 percent compared with 16.3 percent in both 1980 and 1979, and 17 percent in 1978.

All caregories of nonreal estate lending levels dec1ined in 1980 except for merchants, dealers, individuals, and others who, perhaps, either could, or were required, to provide more Favorable lending terms (table 11). Emergency loans due to severe drought conditions caused a $\$ 2.4$-billion increase in lending by the Farmers Home Administration.

Federal land banks accounted for 67 percent of the $\$ 8.6$ billion in real estate debt outstanding in 1980 (table 12). Federal land bank debt became a larger proportion of total

Table $10-$ Change In farm balance sheet account (excluding fatm households), 1980

$\frac{1}{2}$ Cipital acquired less captal consumption, capital assets transferred, and debt incurred.
2/ Total value change less total transactions.
If Adjusted for CCC loan activity of $\$ 133$ militon. Crop lnventories in the balance sheet include crops under cCC loans because debt outstanding includes CCC loans. Crop inventory change in the farm income statement exciudes CCC stocks to prevent double accounting because net CCC loans made are counted as cash receipts. Crop capital galns in the thange in balance sheet account must therefore be adjusted for the net change in ccc loans outstanding to prevent double accounting of capital gatins.

Table 11--Outstanding farm nonreal estate debt (exciuding farm households), Jan. 1, 1977-81 1/


1/ Excludes debt for nonfarm purposes. 2/ Data for 1978-8l include farm loans owed to the Small Business Administration. 3) Preliminary.

Table l2--Outstanding farm real estate debt (excluding farm households), Jan. 1, 1977-81 1/


1/ Excludes debt on operators dwellirgs. 2/ Preliminary.
real. estate debt for two reasons. First, the Federal land banks have the lowest cost funds because of the Farm Credit Administration policy of basing interest rates on their average cost of funds (see table 6). Second, farmers in 1980 restructured their short-term debt into long-term debt to obtain more favorable repayment terms. Farmers reported using 14.8 percent of their 1980 Federal land bank borrowings to refinance nonreal estate debt compared with 9.8 percent in 1979 (table 13). This ratio averaged 10.8 percent from 1972 to 1978.

Cash F1ows
Cash flow analysis in table 14 is concerned with the adequacy of current cash flows to meet loan repayment requirements and to acquire farm production capital. A primary concern is the current reliance on annual borrowing to provide an ever-increasing share of cash inflows, thus increasing farmers' susceptibility to default in periods of low income or

Table 13--Percentage distribution of Federal land bank farm loans made, 1972-80


1/ Purchase livestock and machinery and for general operating expenses.
Primarily land bank stock but includes miscellaneous purposes.
Source-Farm Credit Administration, Characteristics of Federal Land Bank Loans, 1980, Economic Analysis Division, Stat. Bud1. 27, Washington, D. $\bar{C}$.

Table 14--Analysis of farm sector cash flows (excluding farm households), 1977-80


N/A = Not available.

Capital Flows
tight credit. Net farm borrowing of $\$ 15.7$ billion in 1980 equaled 48 percent of net cash income. From 1968 to 1970 , borrowing totaled only 13 percent of cash farm income. This ratio more than doubled to 28 percent for the period 1971-75. Borrowing, as a percentage of operators' cash farm income, almost doubled again for the period 1976-80, equaling 51 percent.

Interest payments have exceeded the amount of annual net borrowing because of the past high borrowing levels. Interest paid in 1980 reached 101 percent of annual net farm borrowing (table 14). Individual circumstances naturally varied for each farmer. But, for the farm sector as a whole, interest payments exceeding the net inflow of borrowed funds represented a significant financial drain. For many farmers, restoring farm profitability and financial health will require a better balance between borrowing and earnings.

Capital expenditures in 1980 for land improvements, motor vehicles, tractors, other machinery and equipment, and buildings for farm production purposes dropped to $\$ 18.4$ billion, down 7 percent from the previous year (table 15). With the effects of inflation removed, gross capital ixpenditures in constant dollars $(1977=100)$ declined 13 percent. Net capital formation in 1980 registered minus $\$ 2.8$ billion, caused by the negative fatm inventory change of $\$ 2$ billion and net real estate transfers of $\$ 1$ billion.

Net capital formation in the capital flows account was new net capital avallabie for production. All entries in the capital flows accounts were economic activities recorded in the farm income accounts except net real estate transfers to nonfarm sectors. Thus, by monitoring the capital accumulation process, the capital flows account can reflect the direct effects of farm income on the balance sheet. Published estimates of farm sector capital gains were based on the farm sector balance sheet and the capital flows account.

Sales and purchases of farm real estate within the farming sector represented only a transfer of ownership and not a change in the magnitude of capital available for the production of crops and livestock. It is therefore inappropriate to include purchases of real estate as gross capital expenditures in the capital flows account based on national income and accounting procedures, except to the extent that net acquisition of real estate from nonfarm sectors was positive. The net decline in acres in fams reported in Number of Farms and Land in Farms was valued by the average per acres sold to nonagricultural uses reported in Farm Real Estate Market Developments. This procedure estimated net real estate transfers to nonfarm sectors in the capital flows account. The decline of 875,000 acres in the farming sector in 1980 was valued at $\$ 1,192$ per acre to estimate the net real estate transfer value of more than $\$ 1$ billion $\ddagger n$ the capital flows account.

Table 15--Farm sector capital flows (excluding farm households), 1970-80


Gross saving rates, as a percentage of gross cash inflows and net cash income in 1980, dropped substantially from 1979 (table 16 and fig. 5). A major future concern is whether farm proprietors will maintain their historically high rates of saving in conditions of deciining farm income, inflation, high interest rates, and high debt servicing requirements.

From 1970 to 1979, farm output increased 28 percent (fig. 6). During this period, the use of mechanical power and machinery increased 30 percent, and the use of labor decreased 26 percent. Tractor horsepower on farms increased 33 percent. The decline in farm output and productivity in 1980 , caused by

Table 16--Analysis of farm sector gross saving (including net CCC loans and excluding farm households), 1977~80

| Item | : | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Million dollats |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash flow summary: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net rent to all landlords |  | 4,606 | 5,552 | 6,115 | 6,597 |
| Cash income from farmingFarm proprietors' cash farm income |  | 26,118 | 35,395 | 37,636 | 33,025 |
|  |  | 30,724 | 40,947 | 43,751 | 39,622 |
| Change in loans outstanding Gross cash flow |  | 12,306 | 14,828 | 20,869 | 15,743 |
|  |  | 43,030 | 55,775 | 64,620 | 55,365 |
| Saving summary: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross capital expenditures |  | 15,012 | 17,948 | 19,874 | 5 |
| Farm inventory change |  | 971 | 572 | 5,345 | -1,997 |
| Gross farm saving |  | 15,983 | 18,520 | 25,219 | 16,408 |
| Addenda: <br> Farm proprietors' cash farm income plus inventory change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 31,695 |  |  |  |
| Gross cash flow plus inventory change | : | 31,695 | 41,519 | 49,096 | 37,625 |
|  |  | 44,001 | 56,347 | 69,965 | 53,368 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Percent |  |  |  |
| Saving analysis summary: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross capital expenditures as a percentage of-- | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm proprietors' cash income | : | 48.9 | 43.8 | 45.4 | 46.5 |
| Gross cash flow |  | 34.9 | 32.2 | 30.8 | 33.2 |
| Gross farm saving as a percentage of - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |
| Farm proprietors' cash farm income plus: inventory change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 50.4 | 44.6 | 51.4 | 43.6 |
| Gross cash flow plus inventory change | : | 36.3 | 32.9 | 36.0 | 30.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fighro 5
Farm Sector Saving Rate as a Percentage of Income and Cash Flow
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Productivity
the two severe droughts, can be regarded as an aberration in the long-term trend. Farm output in 1980, despite a drop of 5 percent, was still 19 percent above 1970.

Productivity declined 3 percent in 1980 when output fell 5 percent but inputs dropped only 2 percent (table 17). Farm output fell 5 percent as the 9 -percent decrease in crop production offset a 4 -percent increase in livestock production. All categories of livestock and livestock products including meat animals, dairy products, and poultry and eggs increased. Decreases in crop production were led by oil crops, cotton, and feed grains. The index of cotton output dropped 23 percent; the index of oil crop production declined 22 percent; and the index of feed grain output fell 17 percent. The index of food grain production increased 9 percent.

The index of total farm inputs declined 2 percent. The use of farm labor continued its decline, dropping 1 percent. The input index of farm real estate held constant. The input index of mechanical power and machinery declined 2 percent, only the second decline in this input since 1963. The input Index of agricultural chemicals decreased 5 percent, only the second decline since 1933.

As discussed earlier, diesel and LPG used for farming declined 7.2 and 9.6 percent, respectively, from 1979 to 1980 , and gasoline use increased 4 percent. The 37 -percent increase in fuel and energy prices paid forced less intensive tillage and

Table 17--Indexes of farm output, input, and productivity, United States, 1945-80 (1967=100)


1/ Data computed from unrounded index numbers. 2/ Preliminary.

Agricultural Trade

Marketing Bill

Income and Employment in the Food and Fiber Sector
cultivation because planted acreage increased 10 million acres and harvested acres rose 3 million acres.

The growing dependence of foreign countries on U.S. agriculture and the importance of the export market to farm income are shown in table 18 . Food grains were produced primarily for export. The United States exported 65 percent of its wheat for crop year 1979 and 68 percent of 1979 crop year rice. About $S 5$ percent of $U, S$. soybeans are exported either as beans or meal. About twomthirds of feed grain production is retained in the United States to support the livestock and poultry industries.

Only a small percentage of U.S. livestock and poultry meat is exported. Domestic meat consumption averaged 210 pounds per person in 1980, one of the highest per capita levels in the world. However, nearly two-thirds of U.S. cattle hides produced are exported to leather goods industries worldwide, particularly shoe industries. Nearly half of U.S. edible tallow goes overseas to be processed into soap and other products. The major textile producers in China, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Thatland relied increasingly on U.S. cotton to meet their growth in textile production for exports, and, in the case of China, to meet domestic demands.

Consumer expenditures for domestically produced food increased 9.3 percent in 1480 . The farm value of domestically produced food rose only 4.4 percent, offsetting the 11.7 -percent increase in food warketing charges (table 19). The tood marketing increase was led by upturns in transportation (18.8 percent), packaging (14.2 percent), and labor ( 10.6 percent). The farm value of retail expenditures for domestically produced food ranged from a low of 30 percent to a high of 37 percent during 1970-80 (table 19).

Expenditures for food in relation to disposable income remained at the 1979 level of 16.6 percent (table 20). Approximately $2 /$ percent of consumers' food expenditures were for food eaten away from home. Food expenditures in table 20 include foreign imports and tishery products as well as domestically produced food.

The food and fiber system accounted for nearly 24 percent of employment in the domestic U.S. economy and 20 percent of total business activity in 1980 (table 21). Approximately 23.1 million workers were employed in the food and fiber sector. The farm sector employed 3.3 mflli on people, or about 3 percent of total U.S. employment. Nonfarm- employment in the food and fiber sector totaled 20.4 million people, or 19.5 percent of total U.S. employment. Farm sector employment held fairly steady from 1972 to 1980 , ranging from 3.3 to 3.4 million for most years. Total food and fiber sector employment increased to 23.7 million in 1980 from 20.7 miliion in 1972. Agricultural exports in 1980 accounted for 700,000 jobs in the nonfarm food and tiber sector.

Tabin 18--U.S. agricultural production, exports, and export shares: volume by selected commodity, 1977/78 through 1980/81

c- = Negligible. 1/ Exports include products. 2/ Shelled basis. 3/ Cattie hides in thousand pieces. 4/ Export weight. 5/ Production in

[^0]Table 19-Marketing bill, 1970-80


Table 20 --Food expenditures in relation to disposable income, 1960-80

$\frac{1 /}{f}$ Includes purchases for off-premise consumption and food produced and consumed on farms.
2/ Includes food furnished commercially to Government employees and purchased meals and beverages.

Table 21--The food and fiber sector and the domestic economy, 1972-80


1) Represents the available work force.
$\frac{2}{2 /}$ Value added equals profits, rent, interest, wages, indirect business taxes, and depreciation.

Roger P. Strickland*

Two series of cash receipts from the marketing of farm produced commodities are estimated and published in the Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector series. One series includes the net value of Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) loans made and repaid, and the second new series includes only those loans which are not repaid and the crop forfeited to CCC (table 22). Budget constraints do not now permit the continued estimation of both series. Therefore, this paper reviews and analyzes the appropriate income accounting treatment of CCC loans in the USDA farm cash receipt series. The conceptual problem surrounding the appropriate income accounting of CCC loans is whether to treat CCC loans as borrowed funds or as income. Farm cash receipts should include only CCC loans forfeited if CCC loans are considered as borrowing.

CCC loan programs have been an important marketing tool for U.S. farmers for several decades. Prior to 1980, CCC loans were accounted for in USDA's farm income estimates by adding the value of new loans made to open market sales at the farm gate. Old loans repaid were subtracted in order to avoid double-counting when the commodity was subsequently marketed.

This procedure had been questioned on the grounds that, if CCC loans are indeed loans and not sales, they should be treated like other loans and distinguished from open market sales receipts. The alternative to including CCC loan payments as receipts when received is to account for only those loans which the farmers never repay, referred to as loans forfeited or liquidated. The value of loans forfeited or liquidated would be added to open market sales when the Ioan is terminated and the Government takes ownership of the commodity.

About 2 years ago, a decision was made to estimate two series of cash receipts from the marketing of farm-produced commodities, one including the net value of CCC loans made and repaid and the second including only those loans liquidated. At first, the plan was to publish both cash receipts series and the resulting two farm income series so as to acquaint users with the new series. After several years the old series would be discontinued. Both series of cash receipts and farm income were published in the 1980 and 1981 issues of the Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector series.

In one key aspect, the treatment of the CCC loans really is not critical to the estimation of net faxm income. All production must be accounted for as marketed, either directly or via livestock, or added to inventory stocks. Thus, a change in quantity marketed due to a change in the treatment of CCC loans has an offsetting effect on quantity in

[^1]Table $22-$ Crop cash receipts including and excluding net CCC loans, 1977-80

inventory. If net farm income is defined to include the value of inventory change, then the treatment of CCC loans will not substantially affect net farm income. It can, however, have a significant effect on realized net farm income, defined to exclude the value of inventory change.

The conceptual argument against the new series and supporting the old series is as follows. An analysis of the terms and payments under the CCC loans program indicates that, although a CCC loan does possess some attributes of other types of loans (bank, Production Credit Association, and others), the loan has several key attributes of a sale. In fact, a case can be made that a CCC loan is a sale to CCC or to the Goverment for a price that is at or above market price with an option (for a fee labeled as interest) to purchase an equal quantity at a later date, if it becomes advantageous to the producer.

CCC loans possess the following nonloan features:

1. The decision as to whether to "repay the loan" or "forfeit the collateral" and complete the sale is solely at the discretion of the payee.
2. If the farmer decides it is not desirable to pay the interest cost associated with the agreement, the loan is not repaid nor is it revoked, buc the option of reclaiming the commodity is lost.
3. The collateral specifies a quantity and grade of the commodity held in reserve. It does not specify a particular bushel of grain in the way that an automobile loan specifies a particular automobile. So, the right to repay the CCC loan and reclaim a quantity of the commodity is really an option to buy a certain quantity at a given price. Under a true production loan from a bank or PCA that is secured by the commodity, the farmer would be
expected to repay the loan and dispose of the collateral. The farmer would bear all risk of a drop in the commodity price. Under a CCC loan, the farmer bears no downside risk and reclaims the commodity only if the current market price exceeds the loan or "call" price.

The Internal Revenue Service (TRS) allows the farmer the option of reporting the funds recelved either when the loan proceeds are received or when the contract is terminated, either by forfeiting and deilvering ownership of the comodity to CCC or by reclaiming and selling the commodity. In cases where payments from CCC are reported when received but the option to reclaim and market the grain is exercised, only the portion of the sale value above the amount originally reported is taxable income reportable in the year of sale. Once a farmer selects one of the two options, permission to change must be requested from $\operatorname{IRS}$. This requiment tends to discourage Erequent year-to-year switches.

The test that IRS usually applies to determine when a payment becomes reportable income is the point at which the payee has control over the money to do with as he or she pleases. Thus, one can have reportable income before receiving money, that is, because payment is delayed due to an action or decision of the payee. One can have earned income, but it is not reportable income because the money is not yet available. For example, profit from the sale of common stock is not reportable until the settlement date, which is a week after the sale date. The seller knows on the day of sale how much profit was made but cannot get access to the funds until settlement date.

Since IRS allows the payee an option on when payments may be reported, this flexibility could be construed as evidence that it considers CCC payments to be income. IRS does not normally give taxpayers the opportunity to select the timing of payments to minimize their taxes; on the contrary, IRS has definite rules for determining when income is reportable.

The option granted by IRS gives the farmer two income tax strategies from which to choose. The CCC payments may be reported upon sale of the commodity instead of the receipt of loan disbursement. By continually rolling over a series of loans, the farmer could postpone reporting the sale of the crop placed under loan indefinitely or until the commodity is redeemed and sold. That may well occur during a year of high prices in which the storage bins are emptied.

Alternatively, the farmer can opt to report the payment as income when the loan is received. Under a progressive tax structure, taxes can be minimized by timing the sale of agricultural products to smooth the year-to-year variation in
taxable income reported. Postponing the reporting of receipts Erom CCC until the contract is terminated may result in reporting income from the sale of several years' production in a single year and in a year of high market prices.

Thus, the CCC commodity loans have attributes similar to those of other loan types, for example, repayment, interest, and collateral, but the disposition of the proceeds of CCC loans is solely at the discretion of the payee. The payee may opt not to pay the money back to CCC. The option to pay back would be chosen only if the grain could be sold for profit. In such a case, the farmer's additional income received in the current year would be the difference between the amount of the repayment to $C C C$ and the receipts from selling the commodity on the open market.

In December 1981, a decision was made by the Farm Sector Analysis staff to discontinue both the estimation and publication of the new cash receipts series. Conceptually, questions had arisen concerning the appropriateness of defining receipts to producers from CCC commodity-loan programs as loans. Historical data necessary for the re-estimation of cash receipts, and thus net farm income, under the new definition are only available for about 4 years. New budget contraints will not permit the continued estimation of both series. To discontinue the old series would have left USDA without the long historical series for cash receipts and net income that are required to support time-series statistical and trend analysis.

Land is among the most difficult items to value in the costs of production budgets, whether based on share rents, cash rents, or an imputation for farmer-owned land. The latter value varies significantly since some operators purchased land long ago at relatively low prices while others have had to pay current market prices. To complicate matters, capital gains are not considered as a return in costs of production estimates, although land costs are fully charged as an expense. The purpose of this article is to clarify the procedures used to value land in the costs of production enterprise budgets.

Crop Land Allocation
Estimating Land
Returns in
Costs of
Production
Cole Gustafson*
enterprise budgets.

Typically in the United States, a person raising crops has three methods of acquiring land for production: cash rent, share rent, and owner-operator. Cash rent means the operator pays a single fee for the right to use the land for one or more production periods. In share renting, the operator provides the machinery, labor, and a portion of the inputs needed to raise the crop and, in return, receives a portion of the crop. The landlord provides the land and the other portion of inputs in return for the remaining portion of the crop. An owner-operator raises crops on personally owned land. This person may or may not be making payments on the purchase; however, there are alternate uses for the land, which encourage opportunity cost calculations.

[^2]Cash Rent

Share Rent

Owner-operator

USDA conduct.s periodic costs-of-production surveys to obtain information for calculating each cost including the land allocation. For the cash rent component, the producers are asked to report any cash rent paid. Between survey years, the cash rents are adjusted using the index of rents reported by ERS in Farm Real Estate Market Developments.

The value of the crop is determined by multiplying the landlord's percentage of the production by the season average price. From this, the cost of inputs typically provided by the landlord is subtracted. This residual is the amount the operator forfeits for the use of the land and is the share rent cost.

For the owner-operator, cropland values by crop reporting district are weighted by crop acreages in these districts to produce a land value for each State. The land value derived in this way is then multiplied by the average annual interest rate charged for real estate loans by the Federal land bank to give an annual allocation. Average Earm real estate taxes are included. USDA calculates the owner-operator value of the land by different methods to reflect two different situations. First, the value of land in the current year is used as calculated above to approximate the return to land a new entrant would require to stay in business. Second, a 35 -year average of land values is used to reflect the position of the average operator. Approximately 3 percent of the farmland is sold each year. Theoretically, then, all land would change ownership over the 35 -year period.

In 1981, the average cash rent for corn was $\$ 63.80$ (table 23). Share renting land cost the operator an equivalent of $\$ 77.21$. Although the larger 1981 yield would tend to raise the cost of share renting, the lower price received for the crop in 1981 was more than enough to bring the cost down from the 1980 share rent of $\$ 93.54$.

For corn, the cost of owning land may be more or less than the costs of renting, depending on when the land was purchased. Interest on land purchased over the past 35 years amounted to $\$ 56.52$. A new entrant, however, would have to allocate $\$ 202.17$ based on a current valuation of land at $\$ 1,772.69$ per acre.

The situation is reversed for peanuts. The owned land estimates are lower than the costs of cash or share renting because the rental rates include the cost of renting peanut allotments as well as the cost of renting land.

The composite allocation at current value is a weighted average of the share rent, the cash rent, and the owner-operator land allocation using current land values. The composite allocation at acquisition value is a weighted average of the share and cash rent allocations and the owner-operator land allocation using the 35 -year average of

Table 23--Returns to land per acre, selected crops, 1981

land values. The weights needed to calculate the composite are obtained from the survey and are in proportion to each crop produced under each tenure situation.

For corn in 1981, as an example, \$63.80, \$77.21, and \$202.17 are multiplied by their respective weights of $0.19,0.30$, and 0.51 to arrive at the composite at the current value land allocation of $\$ 138.84$ per acre (table 23). The composite land allocation at acquisition value of $\$ 64.03$ is the weighted average of $\$ 63.80, \$ 77.21$, and $\$ 56.52$.

Production costs, as calculated by USDA, represent the portion of the crop produced by operators. Thus, the per acre return to land for the cash renter and the owner-operator can be divided by the total yield per acre to obtain a per unit return to land. When dividing the share rent return per acre, the operator's share of the yield is used, not the total yield per acre. Therefore, the share rent per unit and the resulting composites on a per unit basis cannot be multiplied by the total yield per acre in order to work back to the respective per acre allocation.

Livestock Land Allocation

A Shortcoming

Income Estimates for Crop and Livestock Farms Using Census of Agriculture Data*

Land in the ifvestock budgets consists of the feedlots, pasture, and any land farm buildings occupy. The land charge for feed production is implicitly contained in the livestock budgets by using market prices for feeds or cost of production, whichever is applicable to a particular area based on the survey. Interest on the investment in land is not charged as a cost of production in the livestock budget but is left to be covered by residual returns. In contrast to the crop budgets, taxes on the land used for livestock purposes are included in the ownership cost of the budgets on a cash cost (except for rented or leased land). The land taxes are based on the current value of land.

When land costs are imputed for the crop budgets, the financtal situation of the farm operator is not directiy obtained. Simply subtracting total costs from the revenues of production (yield $x$ price) leaves the operator in what appears to be a very unfavorable position. However, not all the returns are being accounted for. Anticipated capital gains are a potentially significant return especially in crop production. The survey shows that most producers own a large portion of the land they operate. Investment in land may be an attractive hedge against inflation. The production of some commodities may be used to. earn at least a portion of the costs incurred in owning land to obtain anticipated capital gains. USDA is currently developing a methodology for handing this return to land in the production cost computations.

As farms have become more specialized, estimating income by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) of farms has become more prominent. This article discusses methodology to estimate SIC farm income based on Census of Agriculture data. Comparability of data among the 1969, 1974, and 1978 censuses will be analyzed as well as comparability of census data with USDA data. The items to be examined are: farm numbers, farm marketings, other income items, and production expenses.

Data to estimate SIC income are not Iimited to the Census of Agriculture. SIC data are also available from the annual Farm Production Expenditure Survey (FPES). However, census data are much more statistically reliable because the census sample size includes all farms. The FPES includes a sample size of less than 10,000 . The FPES will be examined at a later date as a possible data source to estimate SIC farm income between census bench mark years.

Type-of-farm classffication based on the SIC shows the degree of agricultural specialization and the pattern of agricultural production. To be classified as a particular type, a farm must have sales of a particular product or group of products equal to 50 percent or more of the total value of all farm products sold during the year.

[^3]Number of Farms

The SIC consists of 13 types of farms in the 1978 Census. This article classifies the farms into two major categories, all crop farms and all livestock farms. However, the methodolgy to estimate income for the 13 types of farms is the same as for all crop and all ifvestock categories. The following types of farms are classified as crop farms: cash grain farms; cotton farms; sugar crop farms; other field crop farms; vegetable and melon farms; fruit and tree nut farms; horticultural specialty farms; and general crop farms. The following types of farms are classified as livestock farms: beef cattle, hog, and sheep farms; dairy farms; poultry and egg farms; animal spectalty farms; and general livestock farms.

Farms for the 1969,1974 , and 1978 censuses are compared in table 24. However, the 1969 and 1974 censuses did not summarize SIC data for farms with sales of less than $\$ 2,500$. The 1978 census was the first time the less-than- $\$ 2,500$-sales class has been summarized since the 1959 census. Second, the definition of a farm for the 1974 census was changed to exclude farms with sales of less. than $\$ 1,000$.

In addition to these two factors, the Bureau of the Census found that the number of farms in the 1969 census should be increased 15 percent from 2.7 million to 3.1 million, and 10.7 percent in 1974 from 2.3 million to 2.6 million for undercounting. The majority of the undercount is for smaller farms, particularly those farms with sales of less than $\$ 2,500$. The undercount for farms with sales over $\$ 2,500$ was only 3.3 percent in 1969 and 4.7 percent in 1974. Distribution of total income and total expenses are not as greatly affected as per farm averages. For example, census farms with sales over $\$ 2,500$ accounted for 97.9 percent of total sales in 1969 and 99.2 percent in 1974.

USDA annually estimates the number of farms in the United States. Differences between USDA and the census total number of farms occurred because USDA adjusted its farm numbers for the census undercount and data collected in the USDA June Enumerative Survey. A detailed explanation of these differences can be found in the December 24, 1980, Farm Numbers publication by the Crop Reporting Board. In this article, it is assumed that the percentage distribution for the SIC types of farms for USDA and census are identical. In 1969 and 1974, the percentage distributions for farms with sales over $\$ 2,500$ are assumed to be the same as for all farms including farms with sales less than $\$ 2,500$. This assumption is not necessary in 1978 because data were available for all farms.

Type of farm classification expanded sifghtly between the 1969 and 1974 censuses. The number of farms in the other field crop category fumped from 31,000 farms in 1969 to 81, 000 in 1974. This change resulted from alfalfa, field seed, hay, and timothy farms being classified as general farms in 1969 and other field crop farms in 1974. Four new SIC farm categories

Table $24^{--}$Comparison of number of census SIC farms

$N / A=$ Not available.
1/ Includes sugar, Irish potatoes, hay, peamuts, and other field crop farms.
2/ Includes miscellateous farms that have been allocated to crop and livestock farms.
3/ Includes 571,000 fams with sales of less than $\$ 1,000$ that would have been excluded from the 1974 and 1978 farm definitions.
4/ Number of farms has not been adjusted for census undercount.
were added in 1974. Horticultural specialty farms, animal specialty farms, general crop farms, and general livestock farms were previously combined in general or miscellaneous farms. A comprehensive explanation of these changes can be found in the 1974 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, part 8, Standard Industrial Classification of Farms.

Three growth trends in the number of farms by SIC may exist for census years 1969, 1974, and 1978 (table 25). The number of farms apparently is decining for cotton, dairy, and poultry and egg farms. An upturn is seen for tobacco, vegetable and melon, and other field crop farms.

A third category of farms is the shifting classification between cash grain farms and beef cattle, hog, and sheep farms. Their classification seems to follow the percentage distribution of total cash receipts between crop cash receipts and livestock cash receipts (table 26 ). Perhaps cash grain farmers shift to increased livestock production when it becomes profitable. Changes in prices received by farmers can also shift the SIC classification of a farm even though physical production practices remain the same. These significant increases and decreases for the two major types of farms complicate the methodology to estimate SIC farm income. Cash grain farms and beef cattle, hog, and sheep farms equaled about 66 percent of total farms in 1978 and accounted for 57 percent of total cash receipts.

Farm Marketings The census divides the value of agricultural products into 14 major categories and summarizes them by 13 SIC types of farms. Farm marketings and their percentage distribution for the three census years are compared between crop and livestock

Table 25--Trends in number of SIC farms with sales of at least $\$ 2,500$


[^4]Table 26--Comparison between census cash grain farms and beef cattle, hog, and sheep farms

| Item | : | 1969 | : | 1974 | : 1978 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Farm type | : | Thousand |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Cash grain | ; | 369 |  | 580 | 525 |
| Beef cattle, hogs, and sheep | : | 648 |  | 494 | 705 |
| Total | : | 1,017 |  | 1,074 | 1,230 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | Percent |  |  |  |
| Percentage increase: | : |  |  |  |  |
| Cash grain | : | N/A |  | 57.2 | -9.5 |
| Beef cattle, hogs, and sheep | : | N/A |  | -23.8 | 42.7 |
| Total | : | N/A |  | 5.6 | 14.5 |
| Percent of total: | : |  |  |  |  |
| Cash grain | : | 36.3 |  | 54.0 | 42.7 |
| Beef cattle, hogs, and sheep | : | 63.7 |  | 46.0 | 57.3 |
| Total | : | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| Cash receipts | : |  |  | Million do | ars |
| Crop | : | 19,606 |  | 51,090 |  |
| Livestock | : | 28,573 |  | 41,359 | 59,213 |
| Total |  | 48,179 |  | 92,449 | 112,924 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  | Percent |  |
| Percentage increase: | : |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | : | N/A |  | 160.6 | 5.1 |
| Livestock | : | N/A |  | 44.7 | 43.2 |
| Total | : | N/A |  | 91.9 | 22.1 |
| Percent of total: | : |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | : | 40.7 |  | 55.3 | 47.6 |
| Livestock | ; | 59.3 |  | 44.7 | 52.4 |
| Total | : | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |

N/A $=$ Not available.

Farm Production Expenses and Other Incone Items
farms in table 27. USDA farm marketings are prorated in table 28 based on the census percentage distribution in table 27. USDA farm marketings for 1979 and 1980 are prorated based on the 1978 census distribution.

Census data on selected production expenses, other income items, and other farm values are shown in table 29. The percentage distributions are used to allocate USDA expenses and other income items between crop and livestock farms. Production expenses are heavily weighted toward the livestock farms at 74.7 percent in 1969, 64.6 percent in 1974 , and 66.3 percent in 1978.

Table 27 --Comparison of census market value of products soid by SIC farms


[^5]Table 2g-USDA farm marketings prorated on basis of census data


See footnotes at end of table.
Table 28--USDA farm marketings prorated on basis of census data--continued


## N/A m Not avallable.

1/ Includes sheep, lambs, and wool.
2/ Prorated based on 1978 census data.

Table 29--Comparispa of census production pxpenses, other facome treds, and other farm values

kid $=$ Not avallable.
ji For faras with saten wer $\$ 2$, rop.

Statement of Farn
Income

USDA expenses are allocated based on census data shown in table 30. Since data from the 1979 Farm Finance Survey has not been summarized, real estate and nonreal estate interest for 1978 are prorated on the basis of 1974 data. Other operating expenses are prorated on the basis of value of agricultural products sold. An example is cotton ginning expenses prorated from cotton sales. Some expenses such as building depreciation are prorated from the total of directly prorated expenses and indirectly prorated expenses.

The optimal proration method is to have census data directly available for all USDA expense categories. Direct data are available fo: 54.7 percent of total expenses in $1969,56.6$ percent in 1974, and 55.1 percent in 1978. The second best method would be to use census data that are correlated to a specific expense. An example is using total real estate debt to prorate indirectly real estate interest expenses. Indirectly prorated data accounted for 32.4 percent of total expenses in $1969,28.8$ percent in 1974 , and 32.8 percent in 1978. Directly and indirectly prorated data accounted for 87.1 percent of expenses in $1969,85.4$ percent in 1974 , and 87.9 percent in 1978. Remaining expenses are prorated in the same ratio as total prorated expenses (table 30). The 1979 Farm Finance Survey will provide data to prorate building depreciation, building repairs, and accidental damage. Therefore, 92.5 percent of total expenses can be prorated in 1978. The only major expense item without a proration basis in the Census of Agriculture is farm rent. The 1980 FPES that collected share and cash rent might be used to make the rent distribution.

Income statements for crop, livestock, and all farms are shown in table 31. The income statements exciude farm inventory change. The income statements for 1979 and 1980 are based on the 1978 census distributions. Even though the 1979 and 1980 estimates are limited, general trends in the income and financial conditions of crop and livestock farms are, perhaps, better understood tuen failing to use any estimate. Home consumption is prorated on the basis of the number of fa:ms. Because data for recreational, rent, and Government payments income are not available from the 1979 Farm Finance Survey, the 1974 census data were used to prorate the 1978 USDA data.

Livestock farms accounted for a greater percentage of gross receipts than crop farms except for 1974. However, when comparing returns to operators, crop fams showed a greater percentage of the total returns except for 1969. Crop farms cotaled more than $\$ 6.4$ billion, or 49.7 percent, of the returns to operators in 1969; $\$ 21$ billion, or 81.9 percent, in 1974; \$13.2 billion, or 60.4 percent, in 1978; \$14.5 billion, or 65 percent, in 1979 ; and $\$ 12.5$ billion, or 78.4 percent, in 1980. Except for 1969, per farm average returns to operators were much more profitable for crop farms than livestock farms. Per farm returns for crop farms equal 374 percent of livestock farms in 1974, 180 percent in 1978,220 percent in 1979, and 429 percent in 1980.

## Directly prorated

Livestock and poultry purchased
Feed for livestock and poultry
nimul health
Sceds, bulbs, plants, and trees
Comerical fertillizer
Ofher agrteultural chemicals, fucluding lime
Petroleum products
Elertricity and orher energy produces
Heded farm labor
Cod farm labor
Custom work, micht ne inlre, and wachine rental Tolal, dtrectly prorated expenses
lidirectly prorated:
Protated on the hasis of census value of aachtnery und equipment:
beprectation, motor vehicles
Depreciation, other machinery and equibuent
Repatrs, motor veltiches and machinery
Persomi property tines
Subtolal, deprectation, repales, and personal property tax

Protated on the basis of census value of land and buildings:
Real estate taxes
prorated on the basls of census value of real estate debr:

Kend estate interest
Prorated on the basis of census value of nonreal:
estate debt:
Nonreal estate Interest
Prorated on the basis of sales of varlous
ngrjcultural products:
Ocher operuting expenses
Total, indirectly protated expenses
Nomprorated expenses:
Het rent, all landiords
Deprectation, butldings
Repalrs, bulddings,
insurance, fire, wind
Accidental daeage
Electrleity
Other
Total, nonprorated expenses
Tocal production expenses

## Million dollats



Table 30-USDA production expenses prorated on basis of census data-continued

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

N/A $=$ Not avillable.
-- Expenses not prorated. $1 /$ Inctuded in other prorated expenses. 2/ Incladed in nonprorated expenses. 3/ Prorated using 1974 Census of Agrifulture because data from the 1979 A官保ulture Census of Faim Finance are not yet avallable.

Table 31-Farm aectot SIC Income gtatement excluding inventory change


Table 3l-Farm sector SiC income statement excluding inventory chnrge--continued

|  |  | 1979 |  |  | 1980 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ltem | : | Crops | Lfuestock | Total | Crops | Livestock | Total |
|  | ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Million dollars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grows income: | : | 61,303 | 70,608 | 131,916 | 65,902 | 70,529 | 136,431 |
| Farm marketitugy | : | 61,325 | 550 | 1,375 | 772 | 514 | 1.286 |
| Government paymunta | : | 1,312 | 695 | 2,007 | 1,364 | 722 | 2,086 |
| Custom hare incora | : |  | 91 | 122 | 33 | 98 | 131 |
| Recreatlonal income | : | 31 405 | 322 | 727 | 436 | 347 | 783 |
| Lund rent to operator landord Value of home consuption | : | $\begin{array}{r} 566 \\ 64,447 \end{array}$ | 72,934 | 1,234 | 69,036 | 72,835 | 141,871 |
| Value of home consumption Total gross incpme | ; |  |  | 137,381 |  |  |  |
| Production expenges | : | 49.907 | 65,115 | 135,022 | 56,496 | 69.388 | 125,884 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returns to operators before inventory ndjustment | : | 14,540 | 7,819 | 22,359 | 12.540 | 3.447 | 15,987 |
|  | : |  |  | Thousands |  |  |  |
| Per farm averages: Number of farms | : | 1,115 | 1.315 | 2,430 | 1,114 | 1,314 | 2,428 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  | Doltars |  |  |  |
|  | : | 57,800 | $\begin{aligned} & 55,453 \\ & 49,517 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56,535 \\ & 47,334 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61,971 \\ & 50,714 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55,430 \\ & 52,807 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58,431 \\ & 51,847 \end{aligned}$ |
| Gross Income | ; |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pcoduction txperses | : | 44,760 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recturns to operitoes before Inventory adjustaent | ; | 13,040 | 5,946 | 9,201 | 11,257 | 2,623 | 6,584 |

Data deficiencies and definitional changes among the 1969, 1974, and 1978 Censuses of Agriculture make estimating farm income by type of farm difficult for years before 1978. Detailed SIC data from the 1978 Census of Agriculture and the 1979 Census of Farm Finance greatly improved the statistical basis to estimate net farm income by type of farm for 1978. Additional analysis of Census data is needed to estimate farm income for all thirteen SIC farm types. Analysis is also needed of the annual Farm Production Expenditure Survey to estimate SIC farm income for noncensus years.

The difference in farm income between crop farmers and livestock farmers was dramatic. Per farm returns for crop farms of $\$ 11,806$ in 1978 almost doubled the per farm returns for livestock farms of $\$ 6,553$. Per farm returns for crop farmers quadrupled livestock farmers in 1989. Farm income estimates by SIC type of farm greatly improved farm income and financial analysis.



[^0]:    carcass welghts.

[^1]:    *The author is leader of the Cash Receipts Project in the Farm Sector Analysis Section, Economic Indicators and Statistics Branch, National Economics Division, ERS.

[^2]:    * The author is an agricultural economist, Farm Firm Analysis Section, Economic Indicators and Statistics Branch, National Economics Division, ERS.

[^3]:    *Prepared by Farm Sector Analysis Section Staff, Economic Indicators and Statistics Branch, National Economics Division, ERS.

[^4]:    1/ Cotton, dairy, and poultry and egg farms.
    $\overline{2} /$ Tobacco, other fleld crops, and vegetable and melon farms.
    3/ Horticulture specialty, general crop, animal specialty, general livestock farms, and fruit and tree nut farms.

[^5]:    $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}=\mathrm{Not}$ available.
    If Includes sheep, lambs, and wool.

