

Prairie View A&M University

Digital Commons @PVAMU

---

All Theses

---

5-1949

## Farm Tenancy In Robertson County, Texas

Doyle Lee McDaniel

*Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pvamu.edu/pvamu-theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

McDaniel, D. L. (1949). Farm Tenancy In Robertson County, Texas. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.pvamu.edu/pvamu-theses/494>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @PVAMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @PVAMU. For more information, please contact [hvkoshy@pvamu.edu](mailto:hvkoshy@pvamu.edu).

FARM TENANCY IN ROBERTSON  
COUNTY, TEXAS

---

McDANIEL

1949

Binding  
4-17-50  
1

FARM TENANCY IN ROBERTSON COUNTY, TEXAS

By

Doyle Lee McDaniel

HD  
1775  
T4M32  
1942

A Thesis in Agricultural Economics Submitted

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the

Degree of

Master of Science

In The

Graduate Division

of

Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College  
Prairie View, Texas

May, 1949

The W. R. Banks Library  
Prairie View A. & M. College  
Prairie View, Texas

Approved by:

Major Professor \_\_\_\_\_

Division \_\_\_\_\_

Minor Professor \_\_\_\_\_

Division \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

Graduate Division

Date \_\_\_\_\_

4-17-50

Binding

DEDICATED

To my devoted wife whose encouragement has  
meant much to me in the continuation of my education.

D.L. McD.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his appreciation and indebtedness to Dr. J. M. Coruthers, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Prairie View A & M College, Prairie View, Texas for the suggestions and criticisms, which were necessary for the completion of this thesis.

D.L. McD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PART</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Introduction	4
A. Statement of Problem	7
B. Purpose of the Study	8
C. Scope of the Study	9
D. Method of Collecting Data	10
II. Farm Area	11
A. Acres Owned	
B. Acres Cash Rented	
C. Acres Rented Out	
D. Acres in Crop	
E. Acres in Tillable Land Lying Out	
F. Acres in Permanent Pasture Tillable	
G. Acres in Open Pasture Not Tillable	
III. Types of Farming	15
A. General	
B. Truck	
C. Poultry	
D. Livestock	
IV. Annual Farm Receipts	19
A. Crops Sold	
B. Livestock and Livestock Products	
1. Poultry	
2. Eggs	

- 3. Dairy Products
- 4. Cattle
- 5. Hogs
- 6. Others
- C. Other Farm Income
- D. Other Not Farm Income
- V. Annual Farm Operating Expenses 22
  - A. Feed Purchased
  - B. Crop Expense
  - C. Machinery Repair
  - D. Auto and Truck Expense
  - E. Tractor Expense
  - F. Building and Land Up Keep
  - G. Miscellaneous Livestock Expense
  - H. Hired Labor
  - I. Taxes and Insurance
  - J. Rent
  - K. Others
- VI. Annual Family Operating Expenses 28
  - A. Food
  - B. Clothing
  - C. Personal Care
  - D. Medical Care
  - E. Household Operation
  - F. Minor Housing



G.	Minor Furnishing and Equipment	
H.	School, Church, Gifts, and Recreation	
I.	Transportation	
J.	Life Insurance	
VII.	Annual Capital Expenditures	32
A.	New Building	
B.	Land Improvements	
C.	Machinery and Equipment purchased	
D.	Livestock Purchased	
E.	Poultry Purchased	
F.	Major House Improvements	
G.	Major Furniture and Equipment	
VIII.	Summary	35
IX.	Recommendations	38
	Bibliography	40
A.	Survey Form	41

The principal livestock raised in this County are beef cattle, hogs, and sheep for market. Dairying and poultry are becoming well developed because of the large increase in livestock production.

Franklin (2,005) is the county seat of Robertson County. Hearne is the principal shipping point with a diversified income from agricultural products.<sup>1</sup>

The profits in farming might be measured in several ways. The majority of farmers measure their profit by the amount of money they make. The labor farm income is used as a standardized measure of the money made from farming. It represents the receipts of the farm from which are deducted the expenses and a further allowance of five or six percent interest on the capital invested. In addition to this the farmer has his house to live in and a portion of the produce of the farm which he needs for personal use. For the student of rural sociology this definition of farm income may not be satisfactory. He would reason that the farmer obtained a great deal from the farm other than the things which can be measured by the standard of money. It is true that the

---

<sup>1</sup> ~~The Texas Almanac, published by the Dallas Morning News,~~  
1945-1948, p. 509.

farm may offer better opportunities for the physical and moral welfare of the family than can be found in the City. There are times when this is the greatest advantage a farmer may have, yet it is a benefit which is very difficult to measure. However, it should be kept in mind.<sup>2</sup>

This survey includes information on:

1. Rental arrangement and other land lord-tenant relationships.
2. Farm organization, management and income.
3. Level of living and social status of the farm family.

This survey deals with the farm management and income phase of the study. Major emphasis is given to the relationship of the tenure of the farm operator to the performance of the farm unit. This survey includes land use, crop and livestock organization, a financial summary of the 1947 farm business and income. The data is analyzed and presented according to the tenure of operation in order that comparisons can be made of farm performance as related to tenure, and to furnish an economic basis for the social and land lord-tenant relationship phases of the study.

---

2

App. Frank, Farm Economics: Management and Distribution. Philadelphia, Chicago and London, The J.B. Lippincott Company, 1934. P. 14.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. To determine the tenancy rate income of fifty Negro farmers in Robertson County, Texas.
2. To arrive at some recommendations for improving farming practices as a result of this study.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study is intended to determine:

1. The extent to which fifty Negro farmers of Robertson County, Texas are engaged in the various types of farming that are best suited or adopted to their area.
2. Whether the fifty Negro farmers studied are using their factors of production to the best advantage, in order to realize the highest possible farm income.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study is based on data received from fifty Negro farmers engaged in permanent agriculture in Robertson County, Texas. It covers the types of farming and the farm incomes of the fifty Negro farmers chosen for the study.

METHODS OF COLLECTING DATA

The material for this study was collected by personal survey, the assistance from the Negro county extension agents of Robertson County, Texas, plus a few private library references. Fifty Negro farmers representing a cross-section of Robertson County were very cooperative in providing the wirtter with the necessary information.

PART II  
FARM AREA

The concept of the farm\_\_\_ According to common American usage, a farm consists of all land, with appropriate equipment, that is operated by an individual, partnership or corporation for the production of agricultural products. When two or more distinct tracts are operated from a common center, each tract may or may not be considered a farm. In comparison with this common usage, the census defines a farm as: "All the land which is directly farmed by one person either by his own labor alone or with assistance of members of his household or hired employees". The land operated by a partnership is also a farm. A farm may consist of a single tract of land, or a number of separate tracts, and these separate tracts may be held under different tenures, as where one tract is owned by the farmer and the other tracts are rented by him. When a land lord has one or more tenants, croppers, or managers, the land operated by each is considered a farm.<sup>1</sup>

The farm areas of the total number of farms studied

---

<sup>1</sup> Forrester, G.W. Farm Organization and Management, New York, The Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946. P.2.



by the writer were 4,077 acres. The larger percentage of this acreage was in crops with permanent pastures coming next in the size of acreage. There was a small percentage of land cash rented by the fifty farmers studied. There were ninety (90) acres rented and these acres were used for peanut production.

TABLE I. THE SIZE OF THE FARM AREAS

---

Group	Size in Acreage	Number of Farms	Percentage of Farm
I	18 to 38	12	24
II	39 to 60	15	30
III	61 to 90	6	12
IV	91 to 125	2	4
V	126 to 160	15	30
Total	4,077	50	100

---

According to Table 1, fifty-four percent of the farms studied are less than sixty acres in area. Almost two-thirds of the farms are less than one-hundred acres in area, and approximately one third of the farms studied have an area of one-hundred acres or more. Approximately sixty percent of the average or the one-third farms having an area of one-hundred acres or more was in pasture land.

TABLE II. THE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL FARM AREAS STUDIED

Group	No. of Acres	Percentage of Farms
I Acres in Open Pasture Not Tillable	192	5
II Acres in Permanent Pasture	1,561	38
III Acres in Tillable Land Lying Out	607	15
IV Acres in Crops	1,717	42
Total	4,077	100

Table II, shows that almost one-half (42%) of the total acreage studied is in crops. There is slightly more than one-third (38%) of the total area being used as permanent pasture. Cotton and corn, respectively, are the major crops that are grown on the acreage being used for crop production.

## PART III

TYPE OF FARMING

Type of Farming is a term used to designate the chief product or combination of products grown on a typical farm in a given area. Thus we say that this is a dairy farming area or that is a wheat farming area. As a rule, this does not mean that one area produces only dairy products and the other only wheat but that each of these is the main product. Some farms have two or more main products and may be designated, for example, as beef cattle and hog farms or as fruit and vegetable farms.

Farms were classified into types of farming by the 1930 United States Census. Twelve major types and five sub-types were used. The twelve major types were as follows: general, cash grain cotton, crop specialty, fruit, truck, dairy, animal specialty, stock ranch, poultry, self-sufficing, and abnormal. The five sub-types were as follows: institution or county estate; part-time; boarding and lodging; forest products and horse-farm, feeding-lot, or livestock dealer.<sup>1</sup>

Each area of farming in the United States is adapted to some particular crop or livestock enterprise. The individual farmer must first settle for himself which type of farming

---

<sup>1</sup> Hudelson, Robert R., Farm Management. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1944. P. 38.

will be most agreeable to him. Some men are attracted by fruit growing, others by vegetable gardening, some by cotton or corn raising, and others by grain raising. Under certain conditions livestock raising is attractive. Many farmers cannot raise all kinds of livestock, therefore, a choice has to be made. It will be necessary to determine the possibilities for marketing dairy products and beef products and a decision has to be made between cattle raising or horse raising as the main business. Sheep, swine and poultry raising must also be given consideration and fitted into the plan of farming when they can be added to advantage. Besides the personal preference, the adaptability of soil and climate and the demands of the market, of facilities for marketing goods, and the labor supply, must all be considered. Often the amount of capital that can be invested will determine the type of farming.

Types of farming are usually classified on the basis of the source of income, i.e., whether from wheat, or from corn, or from livestock, or some other form of produce. The types may be classified on several other bases such as: (1) The relation to maintenance of fertility, where it is spoken of as exploitive farming, if no attempt is made to maintain soil fertility; (2) On the intensity of land operation, whether extensive, as wheat and flax growing

on large acreages on the prairies, or intensive, as adapted to truck growing of various kinds; (3) on the diversity of crops or products, thus we have single crop farming as cotton raising or tobacco growing; and the dominant crop farming, where some crop is made the leading line of production and is supported by two or more supplementary crops.<sup>1</sup>

This study made by the writer reveals the fact that although varying crops and livestock enterprises were apparent from one to another, the writer was inclined to conclude that the type of farming common to the total number of farmers, was of a general type. Some farms showed outstanding livestock enterprises, some had outstanding crop enterprises, but judging from a community standpoint and from the source of the farmers incomes, general type farming practices is very apparent.

Truck farming is classified under crop, growing. Truck gardening must be intensive, and because it is usually necessary to locate a truck farm in the vicinity of a large City or in a particularly favored locality, it calls for high capitalization. Large amounts of labor are required on a truck farm and land may be limited and the area must be highly cultivated, because of high capi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Boss, Andrew. *Farm Management*, New York and Chicago, Lyons & Carnahan, 1914. PP. 39-41.

talization. This type of farming requires two to ten acres of land per family. The profits from this type of farming are somewhat uncertain though under favorable conditions they may be large. One of the advantages lies in the quick returns from the capital investment.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>

Ibid., pp. 41-42.

TABLE III. ANNUAL CROP RECEIPTS

Group	Amount of Sales	Number of Farms	Percentage of Farms
I	0 to \$299	6	12
II	\$300 to \$799	35	70
III	\$800 to \$1299	6	12
IV	\$1300 to \$1790	1	2
V	\$1800 to \$2300	2	4
Total	\$39,607.80	50	100

Table III, shows that seventy percent of the total number of farmers studied had annual crop sales ranging from \$300 to \$799. There were only six percent of the total number of farmers studied having crop sales above \$1300, whereas, twelve percent of the total number had crop sales averaging below \$300. The main source of the crop receipts was from cotton and corn production.



TABLE IV. ANNUAL LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS RECEIPTS.

Group	Amount of Sales	Number of Farms	Percentage of Farms
I	0 to \$99	2	4
II	\$100 to \$199	29	58
III	\$200 to \$299	13	26
IV	\$300 to \$399	4	8
V	\$400 to \$499	1	2
VI	\$500 to \$599	0	0
VII	\$600 to \$700	1	2
Total	\$11,044.46	50	100

According to Table IV, fifty-eight percent of the total farmers studied had livestock and livestock products receipts ranging from \$100 to \$199. There was only two percent of the total number having livestock and livestock products receipts ranging from \$600 to \$700. Twenty-six percent of the total number had livestock products receipts ranging from \$200 to \$299. The main source of the livestock and livestock products sales came from beef cattle and swine enterprises.

TABLE V. INCOME FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FARM

Group	Amount of Income	Number of Farms	Percentage of Total Farms
I	\$50 to \$199	7	14
II	\$200 to \$349	20	40
III	\$350 to \$499	15	30
IV	\$500 to \$649	6	12
V	\$650 to \$800	2	4
Total	\$17,400.00	50	100

As shown by Table V, the total number of farmers studied received a greater percentage of their income with the exception of crop sales, from sources other than the farm. The writer found in his study the main sources of the income, other than the farm to be that gotten from the transporting of field laborers, farmers working around public institutions, rice field workers, roundhouse workers, etc. This study revealed that many farmers engaged in non-farming occupations during the dull period of their farming season. Where farmers have sources of income other than from the farm, their living standards are higher than would be in the case, if they were depending upon the income that comes only after harvesting seasons.

TABLE VI. ANNUAL FEED COST FOR TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMS STUDIED.

Group	Values of Feed Purchased	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Farmers
I	\$20 to \$49	18	36
II	\$50 to \$69	8	16
III	\$70 to \$89	7	14
IV	\$90 to \$109	11	22
V	\$110 to \$129	3	6
VI	\$130 to \$149	0	0
VII	\$150 to \$170	3	6
Total	\$3,589.50	50	100

According to Table VI, slightly more than one-half (52%), of the total farmers studied spent less than seventy (\$70), dollars last year for feed per individual farm. According to the above table, slightly more than one third (36%), of the total farmers studied spent seventy (\$70), to one-hundred and ten (\$110), dollars for feed last year per individual farm. Six percent of the total number of farmers studied had an annual feed cost of one hundred and fifty (\$150), dollars to one-hundred and seventy (\$170), dollars per individual farm.

TABLE VII. ANNUAL CROP EXPENSE OF TOTAL FARMS STUDIED.

Group	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Percentage of Total Number of Farms
I	0 to \$29	7	14
II	\$30 to \$59	19	38
III	\$60 to \$89	8	16
IV	\$90 to \$119	7	14
V	\$120 to \$149	7	14
VI	\$150 to \$180	2	4
Total	\$3,442.50	50	100

Table VII, shows that slightly more than one half (50%), of the total number of farmers studied had annual crop expense of less than sixty (\$60), dollars per individual farm. About one third (32%) of the total farmers studied had an annual crop expense of as much as ninety (\$90) dollars, and exactly one-twenty-fifth (4%), spent as much as one-hundred and fifty (\$150) dollars on last year's crop production per individual farm.

TABLE VIII. ANNUAL AUTO AND TRUCK EXPENSE FOR THE  
TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Percentage of Total Farmers Studied
I	\$30 to \$59	14	28
II	\$60 to \$89	15	30
III	\$90 to \$119	10	20
IV	\$120 to \$149	7	14
V	\$150 to \$179	2	4
VI	\$180 to \$210	2	4
Total	\$4,332.00	50	100

According to Table VIII, slightly more than one-half (58%), of the total farmers studied spent less than ninety (\$90) dollars for auto and truck expenses per individual farm last year. There were slightly more than one-fifth (22%) of the total farmers studied spending as much as one-hundred and twenty (\$120) dollars for auto and truck expenses whereas only one-twenty fifth (4%), of the total number of farmers spending as much as one-hundred and eighty (\$180) dollars for their annual auto and truck expenses.

TABLE IX. ANNUAL TRACTOR EXPENSE FOR THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farms	Percentage of Total Farmers
I	\$10 to \$39	41	82
II	\$40 to \$70	6	12
III	\$200 to \$310	3	6
Total	\$1,213.38	50	100

As shown in Table IX, slightly more than eight-tenths (82%), of the total number of farmers studied had an annual tractors expense of less than (\$40) dollars per individual farmer last year, and only six percent of the total farmers studied had an annual tractor expense to exceed two-hundred (\$200) dollars per individual farmer. The writer made note of the fact that the farmers spending between two-hundred (\$200) and three-hundred and ten (\$310) dollars for tractor expense, had exchanged their old tractors.

TABLE X. ANNUAL COSTS OF HIRED LABOR FOR THE  
TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMS STUDIED.

Group	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farms	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	\$10 to \$29	12	24
II	\$30 to \$49	13	26
III	\$50 to \$69	11	22
IV	\$70 to \$89	11	22
V	\$90 to \$110	3	6
Total	\$2,542.07	50	100

According to Table X, exactly one-half (50%), of the total farmers studied spent less than fifty dollars (\$50) for their annual hired labor expense last year per individual farmer. Slightly more than one-fourth (28%), of the total farmers studied spent as much as seventy (\$70) dollars as annual hired labor expense per farm last year, whereas, only six percent of the total farmers studied spent as much as ninety (\$90) dollars as hired labor expense last year.

TABLE XI. ANNUAL COSTS OF TAXES AND INSURANCE FOR THE  
TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Farmers
I	0 to \$19	4	8
II	\$20 to \$34	15	30
III	\$35 to \$49	10	20
IV	\$50 to \$64	6	12
V	\$65 to \$79	7	14
VI	\$80 to \$95	8	16
Total	\$2,429.75	50	1100

Table XI, shows that slightly more than one-half (58%) of the total number of farmers studied spent less than fifty (\$50) dollars for their annual taxes and insurance expenses last year. Slightly less than one-third (30%), of the total farmers studied spent as much as sixty-five (\$65) dollars, whereas, only sixteen percent of the total number of farmers spent as much as eighty (\$80) dollars for an annual expense for taxes and insurance per individual farm last year.



TABLE XII. ANNUAL FOOD COSTS FOR THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	\$60 to \$89	2	4
II	\$60 to \$119	8	16
III	\$120 to \$149	11	22
IV	\$150 to \$179	8	16
V	\$180 to \$209	15	30
VI	\$210 to \$239	5	10
VII	\$240 to \$270	1	2
Total	\$7,699.15	50	100

According to Table XII, forty-two percent of the total number of farmers studied spent less than one-hundred and fifty (\$150) dollars for the costs of food last year. Forty-two percent of the total farmers studied spent as much as one-hundred and eighty (\$180) dollars for food last year, whereas, only two percent of the total number of farmers studied spent as much as two-hundred and forty (\$240) dollars.

TABLE XIII. ANNUAL CLOTHING COSTS FOR THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	0 to \$39	1	2
II	\$40 to \$79	7	14
III	\$80 to \$119	15	30
IV	\$120 to \$159	6	12
V	\$160 to \$199	15	30
VI	\$200 to \$240	6	12
Total	\$6,880.67	50	100

As shown by Table XIII, slightly less than one-half (46%), of the total number of farmers studied spent less than one-hundred and twenty (\$120) dollars for their annual clothing expenses last year. Forty-two percent of the total number of farmers studied spent as much as one-hundred and sixty (\$160) dollars for their annual clothing expense per individual farm, whereas, only twelve percent of the total number of farmers studied spent between two-hundred (\$200) and two-hundred and forty (\$240) dollars as their annual clothing expenses per individual farmer last year.

TABLE XIV. ANNUAL COSTS OF PERSONAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR TOTAL FARMS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	\$10 to \$24	18	36
II	\$25 to \$39	17	34
III	\$40 to \$54	8	16
IV	\$55 to \$69	4	8
V	\$70 to \$85	3	6
Total	\$1,754.37	50	100

As shown by Table XIV, exactly seventy percent (70%), of the total number of farmers studied spent less than forty (\$40) for their annual personal and medical care last year. Slightly less than one-third (30%), of the total number of farmers studied spent as much as forty (\$40), dollars, whereas, only six percent of the total number of the farmers studied spent as much as seventy (\$70) for their annual personal and medical expenses last year.

TABLE XV. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD OPERATION COSTS FOR  
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Costs in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	\$15 to \$29	15	30
II	\$30 to \$44	16	32
III	\$45 to \$59	1	2
IV	\$60 to \$74	5	10
V	\$75 to \$89	7	14
VI	\$90 to \$104	3	6
VII	\$105 to \$120	3	6
Total	\$2,496.40	50	100

According to Table XV, slightly more than one-half (62%) of the total number of farmers studied spent less than forty-five (\$45) dollars last year for their annual household operation expenses. Slightly more than one-fourth (26%), of the total number of the farmers studied spent as much as seventy-five (\$75) dollars last year as their annual household operation expenses, whereas, only six percent as much as one-hundred and five (\$105) dollars last year as their annual household operation expenses.

TABLE XVI. ANNUAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR THE  
TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Cost in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Number of Farmers
I	\$20 to \$59	25	50
II	\$60 to \$99	8	16
III	\$100 to \$139	5	10
IV	\$140 to \$179	0	0
V	\$180 to \$219	4	8
VI	\$220 to \$259	4	8
VII	\$260 to \$299	3	6
VIII	\$300 to \$339	0	0
IX	\$340 to \$380	1	2
Total	\$5,466.66	50	100

Table XVI shows that slightly more than three-fourths (76%), of the total number of the farmers studied had less than one-hundred (\$100) dollars as their annual capital expenditure last year. Exactly two-twenty-fifths (8%) of the total number of farmers studied had as much as one-hundred and eighty (\$180) dollars as their annual capital expenditures last year, whereas, only two percent had as much as three-hundred and forty (\$340) dollars as an annual capital expenditure per individual farmer last year.

TABLE XVII. THE FARM INCOME OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS STUDIED.

Group	Earnings in Dollars	Number of Farmers	Percentage of Total Farmers
I	\$1,600 to \$1,700	1	2
II	\$1,500 to \$1,599	0	0
III	\$1,400 to \$1,499	0	0
IV	\$1,300 to \$1,399	1	2
V	\$1,200 to \$1,299	0	0
VI	\$1,100 to \$1,199	0	0
VII	\$1,000 to \$1,099	0	0
VIII	900 to 999	0	0
IX	800 to 899	0	0
X	700 to 799	0	0
XI	600 to 699	3	6
XII	500 to 599	2	4
XIII	400 to 499	3	6
XIV	300 to 399	6	12
XV	200 to 299	4	8
XVI	100 to 199	4	8
XVII	Plus 0 to 99	6	12
XVIII	Minus 0 to 99	7	14
XIX	" 100 to 199	5	10
XX	" 200 to 299	4	8
XXI	" 300 to 399	2	4
XXII	" 400 to 499	1	2
XXIII	" 500 to 599	1	2
Total	\$7,563.56	50	100

As shown by Table XVII, exactly two-fifths (40%), of the total number of the farmers studied failed to make a single cent last year, (went into the red). This unfortunate group made debts amounting to the sum of \$3,686.65. Exactly three fifths, (60%), of the total number of farmers studied came out better than even last year. This more fortunate group made profits amounting to the sum of \$11,250.21. Fifty per cent of the credits group made less than seven-hundred (\$700)

dollars as farm income last year, whereas, only four-percent of the total number of farmers studied made as much as thirteen hundred (\$1,300) dollars as their farm income last year.

## Part VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings in this study show that in communities typical of the ones studied by the writer, the types of farming carried on are pretty hard to determine. It was brought out in this study that the bulk of the annual receipts of the total number of farmers studied showed that sales from crops led all other sales. However, in attempting to determine the specific crop or crops being responsible for such high sales, one will find that there is no significant crop or combination of crops accounting for at least fifty percent of the farm income.

The farm type is largely determined by physical and economic factors not under the control of the individual, such as climate, soils and topography. There are many minor factors that will determine the type of farming as follows: capital, supply and demand, type of labor, risks and competition, insectpests, plant diseases, land values, changes of prices, environment, and personal likes and dislikes, together with the ability and training of the individual.

The writer found out through his study that the fifty farmers studied were engaged in diversified farming. It is quite common to see this practice of farming in this country



when one takes into consideration the fact that Hearne is among the leading trading centers of this section. The writer found through his study that the general type of farming prevailing among the fifty farmers studied was due to limited acreage.

There was also noted the fact that forty (40%) percent of the total number of farmers studied failed to come out even in their last year's farm business. Those farmers making up the unfortunate group were those having none or very little income from other sources than the farm. The writer was informed that the prime factors contributing to the unpleasant status of forty (40%) percent of the farmers in this study, was the additional purchase of high cost machinery and equipment on the one hand, and the lack of some modern machinery and equipment on the other. The farmers in this study were on an average with farmers of near-by counties. There were quite a few cattle (practically all native), on the pastures of the farmers taking part in this study. The writer made note of the fact that there was a very small percentage of the farmers in this group engaged in fluid milk production for the market. The sales from fluid milk have proved to be the sole source of year round income on many farms.

The writer's findings showed that the living standards were higher on those farms near centers offering employment

to the farmers during their inactive periods on the farm, and those living at distant points, who were forced to depend solely upon the farm as their only source of income.

## PART IX

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer wishes to offer the following recommendations from his findings in this study:

1. There is great difficulty encountered in attempts made to secure important information from a majority of the farmers included in this study. The farmers seem to conceive the idea that the information asked for is of a very personal nature, as a result, they are very reluctant in supplying the complete information necessary. If studies of this nature are to be made in the future, the writer feels the necessity for an authorized individual, such as the County Extension Agent, or Agriculture Teacher, to inform those farmers of the importance of such a study. The writer feels that the student in the future would be able to do a better job of the studies, if these existing conditions were eliminated or greatly improved.

2. The selection of a pure bred dairy herd, for an increase in the production of fluid milk, and butter fat for the market, which would give a better income the entire year.

3. A sharp reduction in the cotton acreage, allowing an expansion of feed crops, thereby causing a great reduction in the annual feed costs of the total number of farmers included in this study.

4. An increase in the livestock(especially the type) on the farms studied, as a supplement to the farm income and as a cushion for the shock following unsuccessful crop production seasons.

5. The growing of some soil building crops adapted to this area, as substitutes for the cotton, during seasons of "rock-bottom prices", and inclement harvesting periods.

## Bibliography

1. App, Frank. Farm Economics: Management and Distribution. Philadelphia, Chicago and London: the J.B. Lippincott Company, 1924.
2. Bizell, William. Rural Texas. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1924.
3. Black, John D. Introduction to Production Economics. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1926.
4. Boyle, James E. Agricultural Economics. Philadelphia, London, Chicago, J.B. Lippincott Company, 1928.
5. Carey, Lewis. A Guide in Farm Organization and Operation. Minneapolis, Minnesota, The Burgess Company, 1938.
6. Forster, G.W. Farm Organization and Management. New York, The Prentice-Hall Inc., 1946.
7. Getman, Arthur K. The Young Man in Farming. New York, The Wiley Company, 1933.
8. Hart, Van Breed. Farm Management and Marketing. New York, John Wiley and Company, 1942.
9. Holtzclaw, Henry F. Agricultural Marketing. New York, The Ronald Company, 1931.
10. Hopkins, John Abel. Elements of Farm Management. New York, The Prentice-Hall Company, 1938.
11. Howe, Frank W. Farm Economics. New York, American Book Company, 1926.
12. Hudelson, Robert R. Farm Management. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1944.
13. Kains, Maurice G. Five Acres and Independence. New York, Greenberg Company, 1935.
14. Taylor, Henry C. Outlines of Agricultural Economics. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1931.
15. The Texas Almanac. Published by the Dallas Morning News, 1945-46.

## Survey Form

- I Farm No. \_\_\_\_\_
- II Farm Areas: 1. Acres Owned \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Acres Cash Rented \_\_\_\_\_
- III Type of Farming: 8. General \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Truck \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Livestock \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Poultry \_\_\_\_\_
- IV Annual Farm Receipts: 12. Crops Sold \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Livestock and Livestock Products \_\_\_\_\_ A. Poultry \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 B. Eggs \$ \_\_\_\_\_ C. Dairy Products \$ \_\_\_\_\_ D. Cattle \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 E. Hogs \$ \_\_\_\_\_ F. Others \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Other Farm Income \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Other Not From Farm \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Loans Received \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- V Annual Farm Operating Expenses: 18. Feed Purchased \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Crop Expense \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Machinery Repair \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 21. Auto and Truck Expenses \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 22. Tractor \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 23. Buildings and Land \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 24. Miscellaneous Livestock Expenses \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Hired Labor \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 26. Taxes and Insurance \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 27. Rent \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 28. Others \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- VI Annual Family Operating Expenses: 29. Food \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 30. Clothing \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 31. Personal Care \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 32. Medical Care \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 33. Household Operation \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 34. Minor Housing \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 35. Minor Furnish-

ings and Equipment \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 36. School,  
 Church, gifts, and recreation \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 37. Trans-  
 portation \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 38. Life Insurance \_\_\_\_\_  
 39. Others \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 40. Total \_\_\_\_\_

VII Annual Capital Expenditures and Debt Payments: 41. New  
 Buildings \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 42. Land Improvements \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 43. Machinery and Equipment Purchased \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 44. Livestock Purchases \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 45. Poultry Pur-  
 chases \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 46. Other \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 47. Major  
 House Improvements \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 48. Major Furniture and  
 Equipment \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 49. Total \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 50. Debt  
 Payments: Principal \$ \_\_\_\_\_ B. Interest \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 51. Total \$ \_\_\_\_\_