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#### Abstract

Information about competitive wage and compensation packages is important to attracting and maintaining a productive workforce. A 1986 survey of compensation practices of Ohio Agribusiness firms revealed that bonuses and profit-sharing plans play a more important role in determining pay level than they did in 1982. Larger firms, measured by gross annual sales, still pay more than smaller firms; but trends by geographic location are not as distinct as they were in 1982. Non-managerial agribusiness employees still earn less than their metropolitan counterparts, but the gap is decreasing.
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I. Introduction

Attracting and keeping productive people is a major challenge for agribusiness firms across the Midwest. Information on competitive compensation packages is important for wage and salary decisions, but can be difficult or impossible to obtain. Sensing that need, the Ohio Grain \& Feed Association surveyed its member companies in June of 1986 . The objectives of this research were:

1) To compile compensation levels of Ohio grain-based firms;
2) To compare those levels with a similar survey conducted in 1982;
3) To analyze trends in Ohio's grain industry compensation practices;
4) And to compare Ohio agribusiness compensation levels with those in Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois.
II. Data Collection

The Ohio Grain \& Feed Association patterned its survey after a similar one used by Fiske and Hahn to obtain agribusiness compensation levels in Ohio in 19821. The survey focused on seven employee categories: manager, assistant manager, department manager, elevator employee, office-clerical employee, outside salesperson, and seasonal/part-time employee.

One survey was mailed to each member of the Ohio Grain \& Feed Association, usually the manager or the owner. For each employee category, member firms were asked to indicate demographic information about the employee, average annual salary,
and benefit information. If more than one person was employed in a particular category, then the survey asked for the "typical" employee in that category.

The firms were also asked about sales volume, geographic location, number of employees, source of new employees, form of business organization, and percentage of their total sales volume represented by sales of grain and beans, general farm supplies, feed, fertilizer, chemicals, seed, and other services.

Three hundred and twenty surveys were mailed and 149 were returned, after a follow up mailing. All 149 were usable. These 149 firms represent 229 of the 645 Ohio Department of Agriculture grain licensees with storage facilities. At the time of the survey, ODA reported 678. actual grain licenses. But 33 of them did not have storage facilities and were only brokers, truckers, or farmers. Thus, the sample yielded a $45.6 \%$ response rate and represents $35.5 \%$ of licensed grain handlers in the state. In 1982, 436 surveys were mailed with a $26.8 \%$ response rate. Because survey methods were generally consistent and the same population was sampled in 1982 and 1986, the data can be compared.

The licensed grain storage capacities of the elevators responding to the survey were compared to the licensed capacities of all Ohio licensed grain facilities and were not significantly different. This is important, since it helps validate the results for all Ohio grain handlers.

III. Product Mix \& Employee Work Force

The company size and product mix are shown in Table One (p. 3). The dollar figure represents annual volume of sales. Fiftysix percent of the 1986 respondents indicated their annual volume of sales was more than $\$ 5$ million -- only $44 \%$ were above $\$ 5$ million in 1982.

Again in 1986, the proportion of grain \& bean merchandising is directly related to the volume of business. Although more firms reported sales above $\$ 5$ million, grain \& bean merchandising represented a lower percentage of total sales in 1986 than in 1982, in every sales category. And not surprising with the recent depressed farm economy, agribusiness firms at every level of sales employed fewer people in 1986 than in 1982. This comparison, however, is complicated because in 1982, firms indicated the number of employees. In 1986, firms indicated the number of full-time and number of part-time employees.

Since the 1986 survey included specific categories for feed, seed, and the 1982 survey did not, the results for farm supply, fertilizer, chemical and "other" are not directly comparable.
IV. Summary of Employee Compensation: All Firms

Table Two (p. 4) summarizes salary, bonus, and benefits for six employee categories for all respondents in the sample. All levels of employee compensation are higher in 1986 than in 1982. Managers base salary is up $32 \%$; assistant managers up $26 \%$; department managers' up 36\%; elevator employees'up 38\%, office clericals up $29 \%$, and outside salespeoples up $35 \%$.

At first glance, this information looks like good news for
employees of agribusiness firms, but a closer look at Table Two (p. 4) reveals conflicting information. The pattern for bonuses is not as clear. Managers bonuses in 1986 were less than half what they were in 1982 ( $\$ 3,578$ in $1986 \mathrm{v} . \$ 7,543$ in 1982). Assistant managers surveyed in 1986 were taking home bonuses $41 \%$ larger than those reported in 1982.

The cost of benefits as a percentage of base salary is increasing for all categories, except outside salespeople (32\% in 1982 vs. $22 \%$ in 1986) and managers ( $21 \%$ in 1982 and $20 \%$ in 1986.)

Adding salary, benefits, and bonus gives a picture of total compensation. To make an accurate comparison between the two years requires "deflating" of the 1986 total compensation to 1982 levels. GRAPH A (above) makes the comparison using the Gross National Product Implicit Price Deflator (where $\$ 10.00$ in 1982 equals $\$ 11.45$ in 19862). This translates to $14.5 \%$ inflation over the four-year period, from 1982 to 1986. By comparison, inflation for the previous four years from 1978 to 1982 was $38.5 \%{ }^{3}$.

Using this analysis, managers total compensation packages have just kept pace with inflation, while some employee categories have average compensation packages worth $20 \%$ more in "real dollars." The following are the percentage changes in real dollars for six employee categories of Ohio agribusiness firms from 1982 to 1986: Manager -- down 0.2\%; Assistant Manager -- up 15.5\%; Department Manager -- up 23.1\%; Elevator Employee -- up 24.5\%; Clerical Employee -- up 15.9\%; and Outside Salesperson-up 4.4\%.
V. Summary of Employee Benefits: All Firms

As in 1982, firms participating in 1986 were asked to indicate whether they provided certain benefits to their employees. The results are summarized in Table Three (pp. 7 \& 8). The benefit categories were identical to ones used by Fiske \& Hahn in 1982. They are: profit sharing, commission, hospital insurance, major medical insurance, life insurance, income continuation, retirement contribution, uniforms, Social Security, Workers Compensation, and vehicle.

The 1986 data indicate a trend toward paying for management performance. In 1982, $33 \%$ of managers received profit sharing. In 1986, nearly one half did. Three percent of the managers reported receiving commissions in 1982 , $11 \%$ reported the same in 1986.

Agribusiness willingness to provide a company vehicle is changing, too. Seventy percent of outside salespeople were provided a vehicle in 1982, only $52 \%$ received the same benefit in 1986. In 1982, $55 \%$ of the managers surveyed had the use of a company vehicle, in 1986, 51\% did. The vehicle figures for assistant managers are: $28 \%$ in 1982 and $23 \%$ in 1986. The data indicate, however, that department managers fare better: $16 \%$ had a vehicle in 1982, but $21 \%$ received a vehicle in 1986.

A higher percentage of employees in all categories, except clerical employees, have income continuation plans in 1986 than in 1982. Likewise, a higher percentage of employees in all categories have retirement plans paid for, at least in part, by
their employer. Also, more firms are providing, or sharing the cost of employee uniforms.

As one would expect, agribusiness firms reported a high compliance with Social Security and Workers Compensation regulations.
VI. Employee Compensation and

Characteristics by Sales Class
Table Four (p. 10) summarizes and reports average salary, benefit costs, and bonus for employees by sales category for 1982 and 1986. These categories are annual sales of less than $\$ 2,000,000$; annual sales of $\$ 2,000,000$ to $\$ 5,000,000$; between $\$ 5,000,001$ and $\$ 15,000,000$; and greater than $\$ 15,000,001$. GRAPH $B$ (p. 11) is a pictorial representation of the percentage of respondents in each sales class.

Fiske and Hahn ${ }^{4}$ outlined several cautions about these data in their 1982 study, and they are applicable to the 1986 study. Specifically, firm size is associated with line of business and geographic location. The extent to which these two factors, rather than sales level, contribute to compensation is not clear in this report.

Smaller firms are more likely to be sole proprietorships. The firm's owner/manager may report a salary that represents a return to management and a return to the owner's investment. This survey, like the one in 1982, may not have adequately divided/reported this aspect of compensation.

Again in 1986, the average salary in each employee category, except outside salesperson, increased as the amount of annual
sales volume increased. Following the pattern of salaries, average cos of benefits increased as sales volume increased, across all el -oyee categories except salespeople.

Table Fs: $r$ ( p .10 ) reports interesting findings on employee bonuses. " e largest sales class, those with more than $\$ 15$ million in a al sales, reported bonuses two, three, and even five times l.rger in 1986 than in 1982. While those firms with less than $\$ 2$ : $111 i o n$ in annual sales reported lower bonuses in every category. The "middle two" sales categories do not show trends as distinct as those of the largest and smallest.
VII. Employee Compensation and Characteristics by Geographic Region

Table Five (p. 13) reports the average salary, benefit costs, and bonus of employees of agribusiness firms by geographic region for 1982 and 1986. Geographic region refers to the quadrant of the state: northwest, northeast, southwest, and southeast. GRAPH C (p. 11) is a pictorial representation of the location of firms responding to the survey.

In 1982, a pattern emerged with agribusiness firms in the northern half of the state paying more than firms in the southern half of the state. The 1986 data do not reveal the same trend.

This may be true for several reasons. First, a low number of responses in southeastern Ohio ( 7 in the manager category) and an extremely high range on several employee categories, may have skewed the results.

Second, economic opportunities that may have been better in

1982 in northeastern Ohio, have dimmed. Fiske and Hahn5 hypothesized that the industrialized northeast part of the state may require that agribusiness firms pay more to attract employees. But problems of "rust belt" industries may have dimmed those opportunities. The labor force in northeast Ohio in 1986 was only $95 \%$ of its 1982 level. Nearly 125,000 fewer people were in the northeastern Ohio labor force at the time of the 1986 survey, compared with the 1982 survey (2,271,648 in 19826; 2,147,200 in 19867). In that same time period, the northwest Ohio labor force increased slightly (723,819 in 1982; 726,900 in 1986). Excepting southeast Ohio where the data may not be valid for the reasons outlined above, Northern Ohio agribusiness firms continue to pay more in each category than southwest Ohio. But northeast average salaries are no longer higher in every category than northwest Ohio.

## VIII. Multi-state Comparison

Concurrent with the Ohio Grain \& Feed Association survey, Michigan Agri-Dealers Association, Indiana Grain \& Feed Association and the Grain \& Feed Association of Illinois were sponsoring similar surveys in their respective states. The survey methods they used were consistent. The three additional states had the following response rates: Michigan, mailed 201 surveys -- 23.3\% returned; Indiana, mailed 365 surveys -- $34.5 \%$ returned; and Illinois, mailed 651 surveys -- $19.4 \%$ returned. GRAPH D (p. 15) compares total compensation (salary, benefits, and bonus) for six employee categories for Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois.

Ohio has the lowest total compensation for every employee category, except outside salespeople, where Illinois is the lowest. On the average, Michigan managers, assistant maragers, elevator employees and clerical employees have larger total compensation packages. The total compensation of department managers and outside salespeople is highest in Indiana.

GRAPH E (p. 15) compares agribusiness managers salary, benefit costs, and bonus for Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois. Illinois has the highest average salary at $\$ 33,975$. Indiana's managers average $\$ 30,772$, the lowest among the four states. But Indiana's managers have the highest cost of benefits -- $\$ 8728$, and Ohio's the lowest -- $\$ 6477$. Michigan's managers received the highest bonus in 1986 -- \$6836, and Ohio's the lowest -- $\$ 3578$. When one considers the entire package, Ohio has the lowest total compensation for agribusiness managers.
IX. A C ison of Compensation of Nonsupervisory Employees: Agr ness Versus Metropolitan Manufacturing and Service Ind es

The au of Labor Statistics Area Wage Surveys offer some comparative statistics for elevator employees and office clerical employees. The area wage surveys are conducted annually in the major meror litan areas of Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo 8, 9, 10 \& 11.

Table S.x (p. 16) is a rough comparison between metropolitan employees and agribusiness employees -- usually small-town or rural. Fiske and Hahn ${ }^{12}$ suggested that metropolitan employees
would earn more (given higher costs of living, ease of mobility and presence of labor unions.)

Again in 1986, the comparisons are not direct. To approximate the responsibilities of an agribusiness office/clerical employee, two BLS catagories, secretary and accounting clerk, were averaged. To approximate the responsibilities of the typical elevator employee, four categories were selected-representing a metropolitan composite employee/ laborer. The four job titles selected were: truck driver, warehouseman, material handling laborer, and forklift operator.

The BLS reports office/clerical wages in weekly earnings, others were reported in hourly increments. The agribusiness employees' earnings were adjusted to reflect 5240 -hour weeks. This analysis does not account for additional hours worked by agribusiness employees during peak planting and harvesting seasons.

As in 1982, metropolitan employees earned more in 1986 than their colleagues in agribusiness. But several interesting trends did emerge. In 1982, the agribusiness clerical employee earned $87 \%$ of what the composite metro office employee earned; in 1986 it was only $77 \%$. The typical elevator employee was doing better in 1986 than 1982, relative to his/her big-city counterpart. In the earlier survey period, elevator employees were earning $68 \%$ of what the metropolitan composite employee laborer earned. But in 1986, that comparison had improved to $76 \%$.

## X. Implications of the Study

The implications of this study are important to agribusiness because of comparable historical data. Some of the most distinctive data come from the trends emerging over the four-year period.

As discussed earlier, managers' compensation had just kept pace with inflation from 1982 to 1986, while some employee catagories took home $20 \%$ or more real dollars. This trend is not surprising, since more managers reported compensation packages determined in part by profit-sharing and commissions. To the extent that the agricultural economy has been depressed, you'd expect managers compensation packages to reflect lackluster overall performance.

Both in 1982 and 1986, an agribusiness employees' compensation was associated with the annual sales volume of his/her employer. One important element of this association is employee bonuses. As more firms tied employee bonuses to company performance, bonuses from the biggest firms got bigger and bonuses from the smallest firms got smaller.

The relationship between geographic region and compensation was not as well defined in 1986. Northeast Ohio was the compensation leader in 1982, but that picture had changed by 1986. Declining economic opportunities in northeast Ohio resulted in a 5\% reduction in labor force over the four year period, and an unemployment rate that still hovers above the state and national average. If agribusiness compensation was affected by the strong industrial base of northeast Ohio in 1982, that influence was less in 1986 as industry and people left.

The comparison between metropolitan composite employee/laborers and elevator employees reflects the significant gains the elevator employees made in real-dollar compensation. Using the same inflation deflator discussed earlier, the metropolitan composite employeelaborer realized a $3 \%$ increase in real dollars in 1986 over 1982. The elevator employees realdollar gain was $24.5 \%$. The differential between agribusiness clerical employees and metro composite clerical employees widened, because the earnings reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate a real-dollar increase of $28 \%$, while agribusiness increased its clerical employees compensation 15.9\%.

Finally, based on the results of this survey, Ohio managers' salaries rank third out of the four states. When you consider total compensation, Ohio agribusiness employees receive less than their counterparts in Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan in all employee categories except outside salespeople.
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## TABLE ONE

Percentage of Total Sales Derived from Selected Products And Employee Work Force of Ohio Agribusiness Firms, Averages by Sales Class, 1982 and 1986.

* FIRMS UNDER $\$ 2,000,000$ annual Sales *

| ITEM | 1982 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVERAGE | NUMBER | AVERAGE | NUMBER |
| Grain \& Beans \% | 43.8 | 20 | 36.4 | 21 |
| Feed \% ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 41.9 | 22 |
| Farm Supplies \% | 29.9 | 18 | 7.9 | 22 |
| Fertilizer \% | 25.7 | 20 | 10.3 | 21 |
| Chemicals \% | 10.5 | 20 | 6.1 | 19 |
| Seed \% ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | 14.5 | 25 |
| Other \% | 16.3 | 22 | 9.2 | 17 |
| No. of Employees ${ }^{3}$ | 6.2 | 26 |  |  |
| Full-time employees |  |  | 4.1 | 26 |
| Part-time employees |  |  | 2.1 | 17 |

* FIRMS bETWERN $\$ 5,000,001$ and $\$ 15,000,000$ annual Salles *

| ITEM | 1982 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVERAGE | NUMBER | AVERAGE | NUABER |
| Grain \& Beans \% | 63.1 | 34 | 55.5 | 50 |
| Feed \%1 |  |  | 16.6 | 44 |
| Farm Supplies \% | 14.4 | 31 | 7.3 | 43 |
| Fertilizer \% | 15.0 | 30 | 13.8 | 43 |
| Chemicals \% | 7.4 | 30 | 8.1 | 43 |
| Seed \%2 |  |  | 5.0 | 43 |
| Other \% | 15.0 | 29 | 10.8 | 39 |
| No. of Employee ${ }^{3}$ | 18.7 | 37 |  |  |
| Full-time employees |  |  | 16.1 | 54 |
| Part-time employees |  |  | 3.1 | 43 |

* FIRMS OVER $\$ 15,000,001$ annual Saldes *

| ITEM | 1982 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVERAGE | NUMBER | AVERAGE | NUMBER |
| Grain \& Beans \% | 58.1 | 36 | 50.5 | 30 |
| Feed \% 1 |  |  | 15.3 | 27 |
| Farm Supplies \% | 17.2 | 32 | 5.3 | 27 |
| Fertilizer \% | 16.9 | 30 | 13.8 | 27 |
| Chemicals \% | 7.1 | 33 | 6.8 | 26 |
| Seed \% ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | 11.8 | 31 |
| Other \% | 11.2 | 25 | 7.9 | 27 |
| No. of Employees ${ }^{3}$ | 10.2 | 38 |  |  |
| Full-time employees |  |  | 9.3 | 31 |
| Part-time employees |  |  | 1.8 | 21 |


| ITEM | 1982 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVERAGE | NUABER | AVERAGE | NUMBER |
| Grain \& Beans \% | 67.3 | 10 | 66.9 | 15 |
| Feed \% 1 |  |  | 11.1 | 13 |
| Farm Supplies \% | 9.9 | 9 | 4.1 | 12 |
| Fertilizer \% | 9.4 | 8 | 9.0 | 13 |
| Chemicals \% | 3.1 | 8 | 4.2 | 12 |
| Seed \%2 |  |  | 3.0 | 13 |
| Other \% | 13.8 | 9 | 12.3 | 8 |
| No. of Employees ${ }^{3}$ | 55.8 | 10 |  |  |
| Full-time employees |  |  | 42.5 | 15 |
| Part-tıme employees |  |  | 9.6 | 14 |

[^0]TABLE TWO
Summary of Annual Compensation Values by Employee Category for Ohio Agribusiness Firms, 1982 and 1986.

|  | * MANAGER * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 |  |  |  | 1986 |  |  |  |
|  | Range |  |  |  | Range |  |  |  |
| TTEM | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER |
| Salary | \$24,073 | \$11,700 | \$60,000 | 111 | \$31,780 | \$5,000 | \$99,999 | 149 |
| Benefits | 5,009 | 160 | 12,000 | 94 | 6,477 | 0 | 36,600 | 127 |
| Bonus | 7,543 | 50 | 25,000 | 46 | 3,578 | 0 | 33,000 | 100 |

ASSISTANT MANAGER *


|  | * ELLEVATOR EMPLOYEE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 |  |  |  | 1986 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TTEM | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER |
| Salary | 12,267 | 1,300 | 20,500 | 108 | 16,932 | 7,800 | 77,000 | 140 |
| Benefits | 2,291 | 168 | 8,200 | 83 | 3,974 | 145 | 19,487 | 121 |
| Bonus | 500 | 50 | 1,500 | 40 | 561 | 0 | 5,000 | 82 |


|  | * CLERICAL EMPLOYEE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 |  |  |  | 1986 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH | NUMBER |
| Salary | 10,366 | 3,500 | 19,000 | 98 | 13,412 | 650 | 23,500 | 134 |
| Benefits | 2,057 | 90 | 8,000 | 76 | 3,168 | 150 | 17,000 | 113 |
| Bonus | 507 | 50 | 1,046 | 39 | 573 | 0 | 4,500 | 76 |

* OUTSIDE SALESPERSON

1982
1986

| TTEM | Range |  |  | NUMBER | AVERAGE | Range |  | NUMBER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH |  |  | LOW | HIGH |  |
| Salary | 15,549 | 9,100 | 25,000 | 32 | 21,050 | 1,700 | 50,000 | 73 |
| Benefits | 5,030 | 780 | 10,000 | 26 | 4,675 | 0 | 17,480 | 68 |
| Bonus | 1,488 | 50 | 4,143 | 12 | 1,321 | 0 | 7,000 | 52 |

TABLE THREE
Percentage of Employees of Ohio Agribusiness Firms
Receiving Selected Benefits ${ }^{\text {a }}$, All Firms, by Employee Category, 1982 and 1986.

|  |  |  | ANAGER * |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1982 |  |  | 1986 |  |
| TTEM | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 33 |  |  | 47 |  |  |
| Commission | 3 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 77 | 21 |  | 78 | 18 |  |
| Major Med. Insur. | 75 | 19 |  | 76 | 18 | 1 |
| Life Insurance | 50 | 17 | 4 | 54 | 19 | 2 |
| Income Continuation | 25 | 11 | 3 | 32 | 9 | 9 |
| Retirement Contr. | 30 | 26 | 2 | 34 | 28 | 3 |
| Uniforms | 29 | 11 | 2 | 31 | 14 | 2 |
| Social Security | 33 | 53 | 3 | 29 | 63 | 6 |
| Workers' Comp. | 85 | 8 |  | 97 | 1 |  |
| Vehicle | 55 | 7 |  | 51 | 4 | 1 |


| ITEM | * ASSISTANT MANAGER *1982 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 33 |  |  | 48 |  |  |
| Commission | 7 |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 72 | 23 | 2 | 75 | 22 |  |
| Major Med. Insur. | 68 | 23 | 2 | 73 | 22 | 1 |
| Life Insurance | 48 | 15 | 8 | 52 | 18 | 2 |
| Income Continuation | 17 | 10 | 7 | 32 | 6 | 6 |
| Retirement Contr. | 28 | 20 | 7 | 36 | 24 | 2 |
| Uniforms | 27 | 12 | 3 | 30 | 13 | 2 |
| Social Security | 40 | 48 | 3 | 28 | 66 | 4 |
| Workers' Comp. | 78 | 15 | 2 | 97 | 1 | 1 |
| Vehicle | 28 | 2 | 3 | 23 | 1 | 3 |


| * DEPARTMENT MANAGER *1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 42 |  |  | 49 |  |  |
| Commission | 44 |  |  | 16 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 72 | 26 | 2 | 75 | 22 | 1 |
| Major Med. Insur. | 74 | 25 | 2 | 71 | 24 | 2 |
| Life Insurance | 51 | 21 | 5 | 47 | 24 | 6 |
| Income Continuation | - 25 | 12 | 2 | 30 | 13 | 11 |
| Retirement Contr. | 39 | 28 |  | 30 | 36 | 4 |
| Uniforms | 40 | 14 |  | 38 | 17 | 4 |
| Social Security | 33 | 56 | 5 | 30 | 63 | 5 |
| Workers' Comp. | 79 | 16 | 2 | 97 | 1 | 1 |
| Vehicle | 16 | 5 |  | 21 | 1 | 2 |

a"Company" indicates that the benefit was entirely company-paid. "Shared" indicates that the cost was split in some proportion. "Employee" indicates that the employee only paid for the benefit.

TABLE THREE (Con't)
Percentage of Employees of Ohio Agribusiness Firms
Receiving Selected Benefits ${ }^{\text {a }}$, All Firms, by Employee Category, 1982 and 1986.

| * ELEVATOR EMPLOYEE *1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TTEM | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 24 |  |  | 41 |  |  |
| Commission | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 71 | 27 | 1 | 73 | 23 | 1 |
| Major Med. Insur. | 67 | 26 | 2 | 72 | 23 | 2 |
| Life Insurance | 47 | 17 | 6 | 49 | 20 | 4 |
| Income Continuation | 20 | 8 | 3 | 31 | 10 | 5 |
| Retirement Contr. | 28 | 24 | 3 | 31 | 31 | 3 |
| Uniforms | 35 | 13 | 1 | 37 | 20 | 3 |
| Social Security | 34 | 55 | 4 | 28 | 64 | 6 |
| Workers' Comp. | 88 | 7 |  | 95 | 3 | 1 |
| Vehicle | 5 | 2 |  | 4 |  |  |


| * CLERICAL EMPLOYEE *1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 25 |  |  | 43 |  |  |
| Commission |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 63 | 27 | 2 | 70 | 23 | 1 |
| Major Med. Insur. | 51. | 26 | 2 | 68 | 23 | 3 |
| Life Insurance | 31 | 14 | 6 | 49 | 20 | 4 |
| Income Continuation | 28 | 15 | 3 | 30 | 12 | 6 |
| Retirement Contr. | 20 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 33 | 4 |
| Uniforms | 20 | 8 |  | 23 | 15 | 2 |
| Social Security | 35 | 53 | 3 | 29 | 64 | 5 |
| Workers' Comp. | 83 | 10 | 1 | 95 | 3 | 1 |
| Vehicle | 3 | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 |


| * OUTSIDE SALESPERSON *1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TTEM | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE | COMPANY | SHARED | EMPLOYEE |
| Profit Sharing | 48 |  |  | 49 |  |  |
| Commission | 45 |  |  | 37 |  |  |
| Hospital Insur. | 79 | 21 |  | 77 | 17 |  |
| Major Med. Insur. | 76 | 24 |  | 75 | 18 |  |
| Life Insurance | 58 | 15 | 3 | 51 | 25 | 2 |
| Income Continuation | - 27 | 18 |  | 33 | 17 | 8 |
| Retirement Contr. | 30 | 27 | 3 | 32 | 43 | 1 |
| Uniforms | 42 | 15 | 3 | 34 | 26 | 2 |
| Social Security | 36 | 55 | 3 | 28 | 62 | 6 |
| Workers' Comp. | 85 | 9 |  | 95 | 3 |  |
| Vehicle | 70 | 6 |  | 52 | 7 |  |

a"Company" indicates that the benefit was entirely company-paid. "Shared" indicates that the cost was split in some proportion. "Employee" indicates that the employee only paid for the benefit.

## TABLE FOUR

Summary of Average Compensation Values of Ohio Agribusiness Firms, by Employee Category and Sales Class, 1982 and 1986.

|  | Under \$ $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |  |  | \$2,000,000 - \$5,000,000 |  |  |  |  | \$5,000,001 - \$15,000,000 |  |  |  |  | Over \$15,000,001 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | - 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | nge |  |  |  |  | nge |  |  |  |  | nge |  |
| ITEM | AVG. | AVG. | LOW | HIGH | NO. | AVG. | AVG. | LOW | HIGH | NO. | AVG. | AVG. | LOW | HIGH | NO. | AVG. | AVG. | LOW | HIGH | NO. |

## Manager

| Salary | 18,572 | 20,902 | 9,308 | 45,000 | 25 | 22,032 | 26,896 | 15,000 | 90,000 | 45 | 26,504 | 35,543 | 5,000 | 99,999 | 60 | 34,261 | 46,939 | 24,750 | 80,000 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benefits | 3,674 | 4,815 | 0 | 12,000 | 23 | 5,669 | 5,642 | 500 | 21,500 | 40 | 4,968 | 6,948 | 1400 | 36,600 | 49 | 8,283 | 9,715 | 3,495 | 17,500 | 15 |
| Bonus | 9,273 | 2,145 | 0 | 18,000 | 20 | 6,033 | 3,285 | 0 | 33,000 | 30 | 5,354 | 3,868 | 0 | 30,000 | 40 | 3,950 | 6,168 | 0 | 25,000 | 10 |
| Assistant Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 14,555 | 18,689 | 14,000 | 42,000 | 15 | 17,347 | 21,602 | 12,000 | 35,000 | 24 | 19,322 | 26,094 | 15,600 | 60,000 | 36 | 28,575 | 32,663 | 18,800 | 65,000 | 11 |
| Benefits | 2,061 | 3,468 | 0 | 8,000 | 14 | 3,145 | 4,429 | 0 | 7.850 | 22 | 3,412 | 5,345 | 1,800 | 20,090 | 30 | 6,250 | 6,918 | 1,850 | 12,623 | 11 |
| Bonus | 1,261 | 399 | 0 | 2,100 | 12 | 3,155 | 1,615 | 0 | 13,000 | 20 | 2,119 | 3,311 | 0 | 26,700 | 24 | 1,600 | 6,280 | 0 | 15,000 | 6 |

## Department <br> Manager

| Salary | 12,930 | 15,497 | 9,360 | 24,000 | 8 | 16,502 | 19,339 | 10,000 | 45,000 | 23 | 17,915 | 22,180 | 14,675 | 35,000 | 47 | 19,604 | 26,157 | 21,470 | 30,144 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Benefits | 2,320 | 2,795 | 0 | 6,000 | 8 | 2,973 | 4,710 | 1,000 | 15,000 | 20 | 3,541 | 5,178 | 2,000 | 28,580 | 41 | 4,833 | 6,045 | 2,360 | 10,500 | 13 |
| Bonus | 567 | 309 | 0 | 2,000 | 7 | 681 | 836 | 0 | 5,000 | 17 | 1,249 | 1,265 | 0 | 8,600 | 33 | 525 | 2,840 | 0 | 10,000 | 7 |

## Elevator Employee

| Salary | 10,734 | 14,132 | 7,800 | 24,000 | 24 | 13,416 | 15,521 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 42 | 14,869 | 18,438 | 12,000 | 77,000 | 58 | 16,417 | 19,498 | 14,950 | 26,000 | 14 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Benefits | 1,828 | 2,920 | 145 | 12,000 | 21 | 2,762 | 3,592 | 500 | 7,000 | 37 | 3,050 | 4,473 | 500 | 19,487 | 48 | 3,467 | 4,793 | 1,680 | 8,750 | 15 |
| Bonus | 462 | 219 | 0 | 1,500 | 15 | 450 | 467 | 0 | 2,000 | 25 | 527 | 535 | 0 | 2,600 | 33 | 525 | 1,549 | 0 | 5,000 | 8 |

## Clerical Employee

| Salary | 8,788 | 9,595 | 650 | 15,000 | 16 | 11,546 | 12,869 | 3,300 | 23,500 | 43 | 12,687 | 14,365 | 8,000 | 20,000 | 57 | 13,557 | 15,574 | 766 | 23,000 | 15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Benefits | 1,000 | 1,603 | 150 | 6,000 | 15 | 2,459 | 2,822 | 500 | 7,000 | 37 | 2,533 | 3,625 | 300 | 17,000 | 47 | 3,033 | 4,229 | 1,450 | 5,500 | 14 |
| Bonus | 342 | 247 | 0 | 1,500 | 10 | 602 | 429 | 0 | 2,500 | 22 | 539 | 510 | 0 | 2,400 | 34 | 525 | 1,290 | 0 | 4,500 | 8 |

Outside

| Salary | 14,120 | 23,835 | 8,840 | 50,000 | 4 | 15,445 | 18,252 | 1,700 | 26,000 | 18 | 17,150 | 20,605 | 10,000 | 26,000 | 37 | 18,500 | 25,037 | 15,575 | 35,000 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Benefits | 4,020 | 4,607 | 1,350 | 10,000 | 4 | 3,380 | 4,561 | 0 | 17,480 | 18 | 3,744 | 4,093 | 0 | 9,000 | 32 | - | 6,646 | 3,650 | 12,250 | 13 |
| Bonus | 1,375 | 255 | 0 | 514 | 3 | 1,736 | 1,740 | 0 | 6,000 | 14 | 717 | 1,042 | 0 | 5,000 | 26 | - | 2,355 | 0 | 7,000 | 7 |

## TABLE FIVE

Summary of Average Compensation Values of Ohio Agribusiness Firms,
by Employee Category and Geographic Region, 1982 and 1986.

| ITEM | Southeast |  |  |  |  | Southwest |  |  |  |  | Northeast |  |  |  |  | Northwest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  | 1982 | 1986 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Range |  |  | NO. | AVG. | AVG. | Range |  | NO. | AVG. | AVG. |  | Range | NO. | AVG. | AVG. |  | Range |  |
|  | AVG. | AVG. | LOW | HIGH |  |  |  | LOW | HIGH |  |  |  | LOW | HIGH |  |  |  | LOW | HIGH | NO. |
| Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 16,266 | 43,428 | 11,000 | * | 7 | 21,869 | 27,412 | 11,000 | 42,000 | 23 | 22,630 | 32,090 | 9,308 | 90,000 | 35 | 25,436 | 31,795 | 5,000 | 80,000 | 82 |
| Benefits | 5,151 | 6,101 | 0 | 17,500 | 7 | 4,625 | 5,651 | 2,400 | 21,500 | 18 | 4,272 | 6,366 | 500 | 13,000 | 28 | 5,279 | 6,709 | 1,400 | 36,600 | 72 |
| Bonus | 2,750 | 5,364 | 0 | 30,000 | 7 | 6,993 | 3,205 | 0 | 33,000 | 13 | 6,988 | 5,417 | 0 | 30,000 | 26 | 4,190 | 2,551 | 0 | 25,000 | 54 |
| Assistant Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 18,750 | 31,831 | 13,000 | 60,000 | 4 | 18,410 | 22,375 | 13,000 | 32,000 | 12 | 18,682 | 23,149 | 9,308 | 42,000 | 22 | 20,900 | 24,837 | 10,400 | 65,000 | 47 |
| Benefits | 3,000 | 5,318 | 0 | 15,000 | 5 | 3,496 | 4,415 | 0 | 7,850 | 10 | 3,037 | 4,648 | 1,232 | 8,000 | 18 | 4,310 | 5,158 | 1,800 | 20,090 | 43 |
| Bonus | 2,000 | 6,452 | 0 | 26,700 | 5 | 1,548 | 2,726 | 0 | 13,000 | 7 | 1,855 | 1,526 | 0 | 5,000 | 18 | 3,091 | 2,357 | 0 | 15,000 | 32 |
| Department Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 16,466 | 21,984 | 12,000 | 33,300 | 4 | 16,622 | 19,268 | 10,000 | 26,000 | 15 | 16,657 | 22,008 | 14,711 | 35,000 | 25 | 18,633 | 21,854 | 9,360 | 45,000 | 47 |
| Benefits | 3,266 | 4,984 | 0 | 8,325 | 5 | 3,090 | 3,968 | 2,145 | 7,400 | 12 | 2,990 | 4,822 | 1,000 | 8,100 | 19 | 3,826 | 5,284 | 840 | 28,580 | 45 |
| Bonus | 2,000 | 2,480 | 0 | 8,600 | 4 | 883 | 735 | 0 | 1,600 | 7 | 1,164 | 1,348 | 0 | 4,400 | 19 | 1,210 | 1,098 | 0 | 10,000 | 34 |
| Elevator Employee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 11,992 | 13,649 | 9,200 | 17,800 | 7 | 12,292 | 14,494 | 10,000 | 18,500 | 19 | 13,579 | 16,120 | 9,950 | 24,000 | 33 | 14,454 | 17,994 | 7,800 | 77,000 | 81 |
| Benefits | 2,813 | 3,842 | 800 | 12,345 | 7 | 2,575 | 3,476 | 1,350 | 7,000 | 16 | 2,604 | 3,731 | 500 | 12,000 | 26 | 3,203 | 4,181 | 145 | 19,487 | 71 |
| Bonus | 1,125 | 591 | 100 | 1,068 | 5 | 520 | 500 | 0 | 1,400 | 11 | 563 | 483 | 0 | 2,600 | 20 | 402 | 606 | 0 | 5,000 | 46 |
| Clerical <br> Eaployee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 11,010 | 11,027 | 6,000 | 18,100 | 6 | 10,818 | 12,594 | 5,000 | 17,700 | 21 | 11,709 | 13,034 | 3,700 | 20,000 | 30 | 11,945 | 13,970 | 650 | 23,500 | 74 |
| Benefits | 3,151 | 2,257 | 400 | 5,351 | 7 | 2,430 | 2,811 | 550 | 7,000 | 16 | 2,562 | 2,822 | 150 | 6,000 | 24 | 2,765 | 3,463 | 155 | 17,000 | 64 |
| Bonus | 250 | 565 | 100 | 1,068 | 4 | 549 | 420 | 0 | 1,400 | 11 | 720 | 465 | 0 | 2,400 | 18 | 435 | 603 | 0 | 4,500 | 42 |
| Outside Salesperson |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 18,666 | 20,050 | 18,000 | 22,100 | 2 | 15,900 | 17,369 | 1,700 | 25,000 | 14 | 17,000 | 23,700 | 15,000 | 50,000 | 15 | 18,194 | 20,877 | 0 | 35,000 | 42 |
| Benefits | 4,500 | 2,733 | 0 | 7,000 | 3 | 4,192 | 3,955 | 0 | 17,480 | 11 | 3,000 | 5,948 | 750 | 10,000 | 14 | 3,617 | 4,557 | 0 | 12,250 | 39 |
| Bonus | 2,000 | 3,000 | 0 | 6,000 | 2 | 1,473 | 1,163 | 0 | 5,000 | 10 | 1,800 | 1,836 | 0 | 5,000 | 12 | 553 | 1,061 | 0 | 7,000 | 27 |
| *Value omitted to protect identity of respondent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE SIX

A Comparison of Compensation of Nonsupervisory Employees: Agribusiness Versus Metropolitan, 1982 and 1986 .a

| OCCUPATION | 1982 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER | AVERAGE | NUMBER | AVERAGE |
| Office Clerical |  |  |  |  |
| Employee: Agribusiness | 98 | \$199/wk | 134 | \$257/wk |
| Composite Office- <br> Clerical Employee | 11,096 | 229/wk | 17,539 | 336/wk |
| Elevator Employee: <br> Agribusiness | 108 | $6.14 / \mathrm{hr}$ | 140 | $8.14 / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| Metropolitan Composite Employee/Laborer | 26,402 | $9.04 / \mathrm{hr}$ | 21,100 | $10.68 / \mathrm{hr}$ |

aSource: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Area Wage Survey, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo Metropolitan Areas, 1982 and 1986.



146 Firms Indicated Annual Sales Volume

# GRPPH C <br> Geographic Location of Firms Responding to 1986 Ohio Agribusiness Compensation Survey 

Northeast 23.8\%


147 Firms Indicated Geographic Location

GRPPH D
Summary of Total Compensation, Ohio Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois Agribusiness Firms, 1986


GRPPH E
Summary Agribusiness Managers'
Compensation, by state, 1986



[^0]:    1 Feed was not included in the 1982 survey.
    2 Seed was not included in the 1982 survey.
    31982 survey asked firms to indicate "Number of Employees."
    In 1986, firms were asked to indicate numbers of "Part-time" and "Full-time" employees.

