UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Department of Agriculture and the County Extension Services of .Beltrami, Carlton, Clearwater, Hubbard, Itasca, Koochiching and St. Louis Counties Cooperating

-- 0 ---

Fourth Annual Report of the Farm Management Service for Farmers of Northern Minnesota for the year 1934 (April 1, 1934 to April 1, 1935)

-- 0 ---

Name:_____

Mimeographed Report No. 70 Division of Agricultural Economics University Farm St. Paul, Minnesota May 1935 Third Annual Report of the Farm Management Service of Beltrami, Carlton, Clearwater, Hubbard, Itasca, Koochiching and St. Louis Counties for the Year April 1, 1934 to April 1, 1935

Prepared by W. P. Ranney, G. A. Pond, S. A. Engene, and J. B. McNulty

INDEX

Pa	age
Introduction	1
Summary of Farm Inventories	5
Summary of Farm Earnings (Cash Statement)	6
Summary of Farm Earnings (Enterprise Statement)	7
Analysis of the Reasons for Differences in Operator's Earnings	8
Effect of Well Balanced Efficiency on Operator's Earnings 1	11
Measures of Farm Organization and Management Efficiency 1	12
Find Your Weak Links 1	13
Distribution of Acres in Farm 1	14
Crop Yields 1	15
Livestock Summary 1	16
Distribution of Farm Produce Used in House]	17
Distribution of Household and Personal Expenses 1	17
Comparison of Various Items with Previous Year 1	18
Comparison of Farm Earnings with Previous Year]	19

INTRODUCTION

The Division of Agricultural Extension and the Division of Agricultural Economics of the University of Minnesota and the farm bureaus of Beltrami, Carlton, Clearwater, Hubbard, Itasca, Polk, St. Louis, and Wadena Counties organized early in 1931 the Farm Management Service Project, to operate in the above named counties, beginning April 1, 1931. There were no cooperators in Polk County in 1933 and 1934 and none in Wadena County in 1934; three cooperators from Koochiching County were included in 1934. This service is offered to men who desire to keep farm records, and to have these records summarized and analyzed in connection with those of other farmers. An annual fee of four dollars per record is charged to cover a part of the cost of the service.

The project is under the direction of S. A. Engene and J. B. McNulty of the Division of Agricultural Extension, and G. A. Pond and W. P. Ranney of the Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota. Hearty support and assistance have been rendered by the county agricultural agents of the above named counties, respectively: M. B. Taylor, Geo. Chambers, Howard Balk, William Olson, A. H. Frick, Robert Shaw, S. H. Rutford, Kenneth Ingwalson, Clement Chase.

RECORDS KEPT

The records kept by the cooperators included inventories at the beginning and end of the year, cash receipts and expenses, crop production, and a record of farm produce used by the farm family. Once or twice during the year and again at the end of the year, each farmer was visited by a representative of the University who checked the records for completeness and accuracy. The books were then taken to the central office at University Farm, where every entry was again checked and omissions were noted. Any discrepancies found were referred back to the farmers for correction. This double checking insured a high degree of accuracy and completeness in each individual record.

CLIMATE, SOIL AND TOPOGRAPHY

The growing season is a little shorter in the eastern part of the area included in this report, including the three counties Carlton, St. Louis, and Itasca, due to their nearness to Lake Superior. Otherwise the weather conditions normally are fairly uniform in the eight counties.

There is a wide variation in soil type on the farms included in this report, from the heavy red clay of some of the farms in Carlton and St. Louis counties to the Jack Pine sand of some of the farms of Hubbard and Beltrami counties. Certain of the farms of these latter counties and Itasca county have clay subsoil. The Clearwater farms have a black loam soil with a clay subsoil. The land is mostly level, or slightly rolling. Most of these farms were originally covered with timber. There is considerable land remaining to be cleared on some of them.

TYPE OF FARMING

There is a considerable variation in type of farming in these counties, altho in general, dairying is the most important enterprise. These farms, therefore, conform to the center type in this area, but are considerably above the average farm in size and quality of business. Altho some milk and cream is sold in Duluth and smaller cities, cream for manufacture into butter is the principal dairy product sold. This is marketed mostly through farmer owned cooperative creameries specializing in the manufacture of high quality butter. The skimmilk is retained on the farm and fed to calves, hogs and poultry.

The principal crops grown are oats, barley, hay, and potatoes. Some truck crops are grown, especially in the area near the Duluth market. Sunflower silage in the eastern part of the area and corn silage and fodder in the western part are grown for additional roughage feed for cattle. Other crops include wheat, rye, flax, and in the western part of the area, some corn for grain and clover for seed.

This report shows that receipts from the sale of dairy products and dairy cattle, constituted approximately two-fifths of the average cash income of the 20 farmers included in this report. The receipts for crops constituted one-third of the total cash income.

PURPOSE OF PROJECT

The Farm Management Service renders assistance to the cooperators in keeping such records as will enable each operator to know the returns for his labor and management, the returns to capital and family labor, and the actual earnings from the farm that the family had to spend for living and personal use. The main purpose of the service is to secure such data and information, which when compared with that secured on other farms, will enable the cooperator to increase his efficiency in various enterprises and to organize his farm on a more profitable basis. For the latter purpose, it was necessary for all the cooperators, tenants, as well as owner operators to include the whole farm business in order that the results would be on a comparative basis. For the purpose of comparison, the earnings as shown in this report are computed as if each farm was owned by its operator; however, each tenant is supplied a statement of his earnings on the basis of the rental system under which he was operating.

ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS

On pages six and seven are presented financial summaries of the year's business, showing the average results for the 20 farms on which the work was completed for the twelve months' period, April 1, 1934 to March 31, 1935, the average results for the highest one-half of the farms in respect to Operator's Labor Earnings, and the average for the lowest one-half. In the "your farm" column, in the copy sent to the farmer, the results of his individual farm business are inserted in order that he may compare his figures with the averages of the various groups.

The data on pages 8 to 17 should suggest to each cooperator some possibilities for improvement in his production, control of expenses, and in his organization of the various enterprises and of the business as a whole. There are some variations in soil and climatic conditions and available markets in this area, which, of course, affect the choice of crops and classes of livestock. Each farm is an individual problem and has its particular advantages and limitations in respect to natural resources and markets. However, it is significant that the same general factors account for financial success in all of the eight counties.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN FARM BUSINESS

The data on page 5 shows that the average size of the farms in this report was 198 acres. The average farm inventory was \$8,900. This does not include the value of the house in which the operator lived. In 1934, 51 per cent of the average farm inventory consisted of land; 20 per cent of permanent improvements; 6 per cent of feeds and supplies; 11 per cent of machinery and equipment; and 12 per cent of livestock, of which about two-fifths or an average of \$457 was the average inventory value of milk cows.

RETURNS TO OPERATORS FOR THEIR LABOR AND MANAGEMENT (See page 6)

The average cash receipts per farm were \$2,139. In addition, farm produce to the value of \$255 was consumed by the farm family and there was an average inventory increase of \$13 per farm. The total average receipts per farm were the sum of these three items, \$2,407. The average total expense per farm, \$1,031, includes \$993 cash expense and an estimated allowance of \$38 for board of hired labor. The difference between the total income and total expense figure is \$1,376. This is the return which the farmer received for his own labor and management, the services of members of his family and the use of his capital. After deducting a charge of 5 per cent on the average inventory valuation, \$445, for the services of capital, there remains \$931 for the services of the farmer and his family. The average value of family labor used, if computed at hired man's wages, was \$347. The average operator's labor earnings are the farmer for his labor and management over and above a 5 per cent return for his capital and going wages for other members of the family.

This average return is undoubtedly considerably above the average for all farmers in these counties, for, as stated previously, these 20 farms represent, on the average, a higher type of organization and management than the average of all farms.

The average total value of farm produce used in the house, \$255, represents an important item in the farmer's income. This produce is figured at farm prices; if it was purchased at retail prices, the total value would be approximately double this figure. On many farms a saving could be made if more produce were raised on the farm rather than purchased. The table on page 17 shows the average amounts and values for each item included in the total of farm produce used in the house.

HOUSEHOLD AND PERSONAL EXPENSES

In the case of a farm with no debt, the family has, besides the operator's labor earnings, two other sources of income to expend for living and personal expense. One is the amount charged as interest on investment, and the other is the amount allowed for family labor. On the other hand, a farm with a heavy debt (some of these farmers had mortgages covering the full value of their farms and other debts in addition) must pay interest and in most cases at a higher rate than the 5 per cent charged. In these cases, the Operator's Labor Earnings and the allowance for family labor constitute practically the only sources of funds for family living; and if in these cases the farm shows a minus Operator's Labor Earnings more than enough to offset the allowance for family labor, it means that there is no income for family living expenses outside of the farm produce furnished by the farm for the household. These farmers and others, whose family incomes are not sufficient to cover household and personal cash expenses, must go deeper and deeper in debt, in order to meet these expenses.

It is important to know the family income and the reasons why it is not higher. It is also worth while to know the household and personal expenses and whether they are within the family income. Fifteen farmers included in this report kept a detailed record of personal and household expenses. The distribution of these expenses is shown on page 17, with averages for the 15 farms, and for the 7 most profitable and 7 least profitable in this group. Taking into consideration the number of members (adult equivalents)* in his family and the number in the average family, each farmer can compare his item of expense with those of the average.

* All members of the family including women and children are reduced to a full man equivalent on the basis of relative food consumption. The "other" adult equivalents as shown in the table on page 17, are the hired help boarded. They must be added to the adult equivalents as shown for the family in studying the food expense per adult person.

-	5
---	---

Items	Your farm	Average of 20 farms	lO most profitable fa r ms	lO least profitable farms
Size of farm (acres)		198	201	195
Size of business(days of prod. work)(1)	<u></u>	494	507	481
Average farm inventory (without house)	-	\$8900	\$8770	\$9031
Land		4559	4745	4372 .
Farm improvements		1775	1475	2076
Machinery & equipment (total)		960	954	966
Gen. machinery & equipment		653	68 9	617
Tractor		155	102	208
Truck		63	58	68
Auto (farm share)		64	72	57
Gas engine (farm share)		24	33	14
Electrical equipment (farm share)		l	0	2
Feeds and seed		\$519	\$558	\$480
Miscellaneous supplies		34	31	38
Horses (total)		262	260	264
Horses		237	246	229
Colts		25	14	35
Productive livestock (total)		\$791	\$747	\$ 83 5
Cows		457	. 435	. 479
Other cattle	*****	136	135	136
Hogs		35	30	41
Sheep		131	130	131
Poultry		32	17	48
TOUTOTÂ		30	1. í	~ * 0

(1) Explanation of term, "Days of Productive Work."

The total "Days of Productive Work" for any one farm are a measure of size of that farm business. The average number of "ten-hour days" of man labor required per head of productive livestock and per acre of crops is used in combining the crops and the livestock in one single measure of size of business.

The number of days of productive work for each animal and each acre of crops, computed from labor data secured on detailed accounting routes conducted in Polk and Pine counties, is listed as follows:

Item	Per	No.of days of prod.	Item	Per	No. of days of prod.
		work			work
Cows	Cow	18.5	Small grain	Acre	1.3
Other cattle	Animal unit*	7.2	Corn (husked) "	2.6
Sheep	Animal unit*	3.0	Corn (fodder) "	2.3
Poultry	100 hens	30.0	Corn (silage) II	3.1
Hogs	100 lbs. pork	.9	Sunflower si	lage "	3.6
	produced	1	Summer fallo	w ti	1.6
Alfalfa	Acre	1.75	Potatoes	tt	6.0
Tame hay	11	.8	Rutabagas	15	9.0
Wild hay	17	.6	Cabbage	11	10.0
Small grain hay	11	1.3	Beans	11	3.0
Hay (seed crops)	<u> </u>	1.0			

* Animal unit represents one cow, one bull, two head of young cattle, seven head of sheep, fourteen lambs, 5 hogs, 10 pigs, or 100 hens.

Items	Your farm	Average of 20 farms	lO most profitable farms	lO least profitable farms
Cash Expenses:				
Tractor (new and exp.)	\$	\$ 83	\$ 46	\$ 119
Truck (new and exp.)		76	135	17
Auto (new and exp.) (farm share)		64	61	67
Gas engine (new and exp.) (farm share)		7	11	3
Electricity (new and exp.) (farm share)		1	0	3
Machinery and equipment (new)	<u></u>	60	74	47
Machinery and equipment (exp.)		28	30	26
Bldgs., fences, tiling (new)		53	31	74
Bldgs., fences, tiling (exp.)		20	19	20
Hired labor	<u> </u>	94	115	73
Feed for livestock	······	154	165	144
Other expenses for livestock		27	19	35
Horses bought	·····	31	23	38
Cows bought	• • • • • • • •	14	25	3
Other cattle bought		6	3	10
Hogs bought		9	6	TS
Sheep bought		9	18	
Poultry bought		8	3	13
Crop (seed, twine, spray)		116	136	99
Taxes and insurance	<u> </u>	111	102	119
General larm		22	15	28
(1) Total cash expense	\$	993	1037	947
(2) Decrease in farm inventory		. –		105
(3) Board for hired labor		. 38	55	22
(4) Total expense (sum of $(1)(2)\&(3)$		1031	1092	1074
Cash Receipts:				
Horses	\$	\$ 1	Ş 3	S O
Cows		. 66	62	71
Dairy products		. 819	1015	622
Other cattle		. 59	53	64
Hogs		100	93	107
Sheep			100 .	123
Poultry		. 35	6	64
Eggs		- 53	29	77
Small grain	B. Sailann B. Saillinn	244	352	137
Corn		- 11		
Hay	6.1	55	78	31 07
Root crops		159	220	30 007
Other crops		_ ~84	304	∠03 05
Miscellaneous		- 77	2 9	90 07
Income from work off the farm		- 64	42	87
(5) Total cash receipts	\$	_\$2139	\$2433	\$ 1844
(7) Therease in farm inventory		 	200	222
(r) raim produce used in nouse (R) motol possible (gym of $(E)(c)(c)$		 5400	2852	2066
(c) Total receipts (sum of $(5)(6)\&(7)$		<u>∧++</u> ∪(1092	1074
TOURL EXPENSES (4) (9) Dot to com & fom lobom(0)minum(4)		בטטב מיסיר	1760	992
(\mathcal{I}) review cap.& ran.rabor(\mathcal{I})minus(4) (10) Interest on farm inventory			4.38	452
(11) Family labor corring (9) minus(10)		- 	1322	540
(12) Unpaid family labor			266	429
(13) Operator's labor earning(11) minu	5		200	100
(12)	• • • •	_ 584	1056	1 11

Summary of Farm Earnings

Sunmary of Farm Earnings (A)					
Items	Your farm	Average of 20 farms	l0 most profitable farms	lO least profitable farms	
STRATT THE THE STRATT					
Total power machinery & equipment Hired Tractor	\$	\$ 208 36 64	\$ 2 3 0 43 50	\$ 187 30 78	
Auto Gas engine Elec.plant or current (farm share)			64 8 0	72 4 · 3	
Gen. machinery and equipment Permanent improvements Hired labor		114 41 94	126 56 115	102 25 73	
Prod. livestock misc. expense Misc. horse expense		19 3 66	17 3 69	21 3 63	
Personal property taxes Real estate taxes		8 8 87	8 79 15	8 9 5 16	
General farm Crops and feeds		22	15	28	
Board for hired labor Interest on farm inventory		38 445	55 438	22 452	
Unpaid family labor		. 347	266	429	
(1) Total expenses and net decreases	\$	\$15 08	\$1492	\$1537	
RETURNS AND NET INCREASES					
Increase in crops and feeds All productive livestock	\$	\$ 658 1380	\$ 889 1611	\$ 428 1149	
Cows (including milk to other livestoc Other cattle Hogs Sheep Poultry	ic)	933 145 120 69 113	1166 157 132 98 58	699 133 108 40 169	
Increase in horses Miscellaneous Income from work off the form		5 10 70	22 7	14	
 (2) Total receipts and net increases (3) Milk produced and fed on farm (4) Tot. ret.& net incr., (2)minus(3) Total expenses (1) (5) Operator's labor earn., (4)minus(1) 	\$	\$2123 31 2092 1508 584	\$2577 29 2548 1492 1056	\$1682 34 1648 1537 111	

(A) Cash receipts and expenses are adjusted for changes in inventory for each enterprise and for each item of expense in order to show gross returns and net increases, and total expense and net decreases. The operator's labor earnings are the same as those on page 6.

1

.

-7-

ANALYZING THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES IN OPERATOR'S EARNINGS

The financial statements on the preceding pages point out two important facts. One is that the average return to the farmer for his labor and management is very low. The other is that there is a wide variation in earnings, - from \$2993 to a loss of \$399, or a range of \$3392. The following diagram illustrates this fact:



Chart 1. Range of Earnings

Some of the causes for these differences in earnings may be beyond the control of the farmer. It is significant, however, that the data secured from the records on these 20 farms indicate that there are several very definite factors that enable some farmers to make a fair living even in a severe depression, while others fail to meet expenses. These factors and their relationship with earnings are the following:

Table 1. Relation of Dairy Production to Farm Earnings *

<u>Lbs. Butterfat Per Cow</u>		No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
260 and above	286	4	\$604
180 to 279	221	10	466
Below 180	126	4	225

* Two farms omitted from this table because their dairy herds were too small.

High production per cow lowers the cost of producing a pound of butterfat. This is very important on those farms on which butterfat sales are the major source of income.

Table 2. Relation of Feeding Efficiency to Farm Earnings.

Returns	Above	Feed	Cost	per	Animal
---------	-------	------	------	-----	--------

Unit of Productive	Livestock	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
\$35 and above	\$56	5	\$1038
5 to 34	16	10	564
Below 5	-3	5	168

These farms have, in addition to the dairy herd, quite an investment in other classes of productive livestock, as young cattle, hogs, sheep or poultry. Most or all of the feed raised is fed, and considerable additional feed is purchased. If the livestock itself or the methods of feeding and management are not efficient, the livestock returns may be too low even to cover the value of the feed. On the other hand, if the livestock returns a substantial margin above the value of feed without an increase in other costs such as labor, shelter, veterinary expense, etc., there will be an addition to the farm earnings.

Table 3. Relation of Amount of Productive Livestock to Farm Earnings

Animal Units of F Livestock per 100	roductive acres	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
18.0 and above	24.4	4	\$635
8.0 to 17.9	11.7	13	628
Below 8.0	5.6	3	321

If the livestock is yielding a net return, an increased amount of livestock adds to size of business and the opportunity to increase the farm earnings. Livestock produces manure and aids in keeping up the fertility of the land, and utilizes waste products on the farm. Livestock also helps to provide productive employment throughout the year. Any method that aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capacity should add to the farm income.

Table 4. Relation of Crop Yields to Farm Earnings

Per cent Crop Yie	lds are of the		
Average for all t	he 20 farms	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
130 and above	152	2	\$1844
70 to 129	100	16	479
Below 70	53	2	161

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

Table 5. Relation of Crop Selection to Farm Earnings

Fer cent of Tillab in High Return Cro	le Land ps*	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
45.0 and above	54.1	5	\$ 944
25.0 to 44.9	33.4	10	553
Below 25.0	18,1	5	303

* Legume hay, seed, and pasture, potatoes and truck crops.

On most of these northern Minnesota farms it is a problem to find a sufficient amount of productive work, in order profitably to utilize available labor. The more intensive crops such as potatoes and truck crops utilize a greater amount of labor and in most cases give higher returns for that labor than would less intensive crops.

The choice of cash crops depends on a number of factors, such as access to good markets, ability to produce special quality products, such as certified seed that command special prices, soil, climate, transportation facilities, available labor, and a general balance with the livestock program and cropping system.

As stated before, efficient productive livestock is another means for employing labor profitably. It is quite important to have the very best pasture crop so as to reduce grain and roughage feeding as much as possible. Also, as hay is bulky, necessitating high freight charges, if shipped in, it is important to raise all the hay needed and purchase concentrates, if necessary to supplement it.

There are also differences in the amount of feed produced per acre, in the value of that feed, and in the effect on soil fertility, among different hay crops. Legumes furnish more protein, which is an expensive feed to buy, and also add nitrogen to the soil. Among the legumes, alfalfa, where it can be grown successfully, yields more nutrients per acre than other legumes. There is considerable variation in the adaptability of these crops, and it is important for each farmer to determine the kind of crops best adapted to his farm, those that will give the highest net returns, taking into consideration livestock feed requirements, the value of crop as a feed, yields per acre, the development of a good crop rotation, and expenses of production.

Table 6. Relation of Expenses to Farm Earnings*

Expense**			
Per Day of Product	tive Work	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
Below \$2.00	\$1.68	· 4	\$525
\$2.00 to \$3.39	2,60	. 9	445
\$3.40 and above	4.77	4	88
			_

* Three farms omitted from this table because of non-typical expenses.

**Includes building, fencing, tiling and other land improvements, general machinery and equipment, and power machinery expense, depreciation and interest on the investment in these items, and horse expense, such as interest on investment, feed cost, depreciation and miscellaneous cash costs; hired labor and its board, and family labor other than the operator; and taxes, insurance, general farm expense, and miscellaneous crop and livestock expense.

The expense factor shows a higher relation with earnings when prices are very low than when they are high. In 1934 earnings were greatly reduced on 20% of the farms included in this report because of excessive expenses in proportion to the size of the business. Some of the cash expenses can be kept down by careful management, by making repairs and overhauling before spring work begins and on rainy days or other spare time. The depreciation and interest charges per day of productive work can be kept down by utilizing the equipment as nearly to capacity as possible. Reducing the number of horses to the minimum required for efficient operation of the farm helps reduce the horse expense. In some cases farmers can offset some or all of the depreciation and interest charge by using the machinery for outside work, or by making necessary repairs and improvements with the farm labor available rather than by hiring extra help. More days of productive work accomplished per worker reduce the labor expense per day of work. More days of productive work per acre of land reduce the real estate tax per day of work. Hence, if expensive equipment is not made necessary, an increase in the amount of productive livestock, of intensive crops, or of outside work tends to lower these miscellaneous expenses per day of work and to increase earnings.

Table 7.	Relation	of	Size	of	Business	(days	of	productive	work)	to	Farm
	Earnings	.,. <u>.</u>									

Days or Product Group	ive Work Average	No. of Farms	Average Earnings
600 and above	759	6	\$642
300 to 599	443	11	608
<u>Below 300</u>	152	3	379

Size of business tends to be a disadvantage to those who show a loss, for greater size is a factor serving to increase the loss. On the other hand, a farmer who is making a profit, could make a larger profit if he increased his size of business without at the same time, lowering materially the efficiency in some branch of the business. This fact leads to another factor that is very important, - well balanced efficiency.

EFFECT OF WELL BALANCED EFFICIENCY ON FARM PROFITS

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency. Quite often farm operators show efficient management in one part of the farm business, which is offset by poor results in other phases. These farmers get medium returns while those who fall down all along the line get the lowest returns and those few who can manage to get high all around efficiency receive returns well above the average. This is well illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8.	Relation	of	Operato	r's	Labor	Earnings	to	the	Number	of	Factors
*	in Which	the	Farmer	is	Above	the Avera	age				

No. of Factors in Which Farm Excels	No. of Farms	Your Farm	The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the aver- age Operator's labor earnings	Average Operator's <u>Earnings</u>
Four or more Three or less	10 10		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	\$924 244

The array in Table 8 suggests that it will be worth while for each cooperator to study carefully his ranking on pages 12 and 13, and learn through his standing in respect to each of the above factors the elements of strength and weakness in his farm business.

on and Man	agement Ei	ficiency	
Your	Average	10 most	10 least
Iarm	oi 20 forms	forme	forme
	<u>+ d+ m5 , </u>	_1 04 10 0	1 (11 111)
\$	\$5 84	\$1056	\$111
	202	225	201
\$	\$ 21	\$ 31	\$ 12
	13.3	13.1	13.5
ngaaanaa gu da seena ahkama	100	109	92
	34.8	37.7	31.9
\$	\$ 2.90	\$ 2.66	\$ 3.14
k	494	507	481
	<u>on and Man</u> Your farm \$ \$ \$ \$ k	on and Management EI Your Average farm of 20 farms \$584 \$584 \$202 \$ \$21 13.3 100 34.8 \$ \$ 2.90 k	on and Management Efficiency Your Average 10 most farm of 20 profitable farms farms farms \$ \$584 \$1056 202 225 \$ \$ 21 \$ 31 13.3 13.1 100 109 34.8 37.7 \$ \$ 2.90 \$ 2.66 k 494 507

... + 1966: ... ~ ---. . - --

The above seven factors are those that show a high relation with earnings, and are used on the opposite page, in finding the weak links in the farm business. Below are additional factors that help to explain some of the seven factors shown above.

Per cent of fall freshening		43	50	36
Eggs per hen		111	119	105
Pigs per litter		6.0	7.1	5.0
Per cent lamb crop		101	127	66
Price rec. per lb. of B.F. sold as Mfg. cream - cents Price rec. per 1b. of B.F. sold as milk or retail cream - cents	• •••••	29.3 51.6	28.9 55.0	29 .7 49.2
Price rec. per cwt. of hogs sold*	\$	\$ 6.61	\$ 7.02	\$ 5.85
Price rec. per doz. eggs sold - cents		17.0	16.9	17.0
Price rec. per lb. of wool sold - cents		21.7	22.6	20.3
Power exp. per day of productive work Machinery exp. per day of prod. work Bldg. exp. per day or productive work**	\$	\$.77 • 	\$.79 ; .37 .29	\$.75 .33 .42
Total power, mach., & bldg. exp. per day of productive work Miscellaneous exp. per day of prod. work		1.48	1.45	1.50
No. of tractors		10	4	6
No. of family workers		1.9	1.7	2.2
No. of hired workers		.3	.4	.2
Total Number of workers		2.2	2.1	2.4

* Part of the variation in hog prices is due to variations in the age and weight of hogs sold. Some sold only market hogs whereas others sold weanling pigs.

-12-

Find Your Weak Links

Using your figures from page 12, locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for the 20 farms included in the summary are located between the two lines across the center of the page.

	Oper. labor earn.	Lbs. B.F. per cow	Ret.over feed; prod. livestock	Prod. livestock units per 100 acres	Crop yields	Per cent high return crops	Expenses per day of prod. work	Days of productive work
High	\$2993	307	\$1 13	32.6	154	63.3	\$1.59	1177
	1184	287	41	20.8	130	49.8	1.90	744
	1064	270	37	19.3	124	46.8	2.10	694
	944	253	33	17.8	118	43.8	2.30	644
	824	236	29	16.3	112	40.8	2.50	594
	704	219	25	14.8	106	37.8	2.70	544
Aver	. 584	202	21	13.3	100	34.8	2.90	494
	434	185	17	12.1	94	31.8	3.10	434
	284	168	13	10.9	88	28.8	3.30	374
	134	151	9	9.7	82	25.8	3.50	314
	-16	134	5	8.5	76	22.8	3.70	254
	-166	117	l	7.3	70	19.8	3,90	194 ·
Low	-399	88	-10	2.4	43	8.0	6.94	106

-13-

Dis	tribution of	<u>Acres ir</u>	Farm		
	No. of farms	Your	Average	10 most	10 least
	growing	farm	of 20	profitable	profitable
Crop	this crop		farms	farms	farms
Wheat	7		1.0	.8	1.2
Oats	17		14.8	15.6	14.0
Barley	11	tin and all the second second	6.9	5.0	8.8
Rve	2		1.4	.8	2.0
Flax	ĩ		.2	.4	.0
Oats and wheat	3		.7	.3	1.1
Oats and barley	3	-	4.8	4.7	5.0
Total grain			29.8	27.6	32.1
				0	c
Corn, grain	3	traing tag and the state of the	•7	.9	.5
Corn, fodder	7		4.0	4.0	3.9
Corn, silage	6	Applement Photos Concerns	3.7	2.6	4.8
Sunflower silage	1	agi, ganaga, ganan a	.4	.0	.8
Potatoes	17		5.9	8.6	3.3
Truck crops	5		1.2	1.8	•6
Total cultivated crops			15.9	17.9	13.9
Alfalfa	7		10.4	10.2	10.6
Sweet clover	2	California and a second se	.9	.9	.8
Clover	ã		2.9	5.8	•0
Clover and timothy	9		9.1	9.2	9.0
Other leave mixtures	5		4.1	.1	8.0
Timothy	6		5.6	9.2	2.0
Miscellaneous hav	7		3.9	2.7	5.1
Wild hav (non-tillable land)	3		1.1	1.8	.5
Clover seed	5		2.1	3.9	.2
Total hav and seed			40 1	47.8	36.2
Total cron acreage			85.8	89.3	82.2
			00.0		02.0
Sweet clover pasture	2		1.7	1.6	1.7
Miscellaneous legume pasture	5		3.3	3.9	2.6
Other tillable pasture	2	an a	1.3	.4	2.2
Non-tillable pasture	19		65.4	63.1	67.9
Total pasture			71.7	69.0	74.4
Tillable land not cropped	6		4.1	1.2	7.0
Timber and brush (not pasture	e d) 10		24.6	31.1	18.1
Roads and waste		·	8.0	6.6	9.5
Farmstead			3.6	3.4	3.8
Total parag in form	.		1000 0	200 6	195.0
Don cont of lond till-hl-		* <u>184.000</u>	TA1.9	600.6 50.0	190.U
Ler cent of rand fillable		Anne a desce applie de alterna de la comp	D1.7	20.2	کرون ک

	TIELD OF OLOP			20.2
_	Your farm	Average of 20	10 most profitable	lU least profitable
Crop		farms	farms	farms
Wheat, bu.		22.7	26.3	17.9
Oats, bu.		40.2	47.1	32.4
Barley, bu.		32.0	31.6	32.4
Rve. bu.	The subject of the subject in the subject is the subject in the subject is the su	10.3	13.0	7.5
Flax. bu.		5.7	5.7	
Oats and wheat, bu.		32.8	48.0	25.2
Oats and barley, bu.	an a	44.7	48.0	38.0
Corn, grain, bu.		21.7	30.0	17.5
Corn, fodder, tons	And the second sec	1.5	1.5	1.6
Corn, silage, tons	A second and the second	5.9	6.6	5.6
Sunflower silage, tons		3.3	-	3.3
Potatoes, bu.		112.4	113.4	111.0
Cabbage, tons		5.1	5.1	
Rutabagas, tons	and the second	8.5	6.3	15,0
	1990 - 1997 Martin I 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 1994 - 19			
Allalla, tons		1.4	1.3	1.4
Sweet clover, tons	*	1.2	1.3	1.0
Clover, tons		.6	.6	
Clover and timothy, tons	•	1.0	1.0	T.T
Oat hay, tons		1.0	.9	1.2
Timothy, tons	Land Section of the s	1.2	1.2	1.2
Wild hay (non-tillable) tons	and the second	1.7	1.4	1.9
	- <mark>20 galan da</mark>			
Clover seed, 1bs.		165.9	165.9	
Alfalfa seed	10000-000-000-00-00	375.5	600.0	151.0
Alfolfo for here tora	99999999999999999999999999999999999999	~	A	
ALIALIA IOF Hay, VOIIS	tion graps a Decision of a residence of	• č	•4	1.1
and seed, 10S.		20.2	01 .4	7.1
	and the second	and the second	and the second secon	and the second

-15-

Livestock	Summar	<u>Y</u>		
	Your farm	Average of 20 farms	lO most profitable farms	lO least profitable farms
		Tarmo	- CLIND	- 54
The of cours		11 0	11.5	12.0
NO. OI COWS		5 7	51	E.6
No. of cows per worker		0.0	0 9	8.2
Head of other cattle		9.1 7 5	3.3 7 1	· 1 &
Litters of pigs raised			1040 5	096 5
Pounds of pork produced		1367.0	1(4(.U	300.0 DE 7
Head of sheep		25.4	20.4	20.0 C5 N
No. of hens		47.6	31.5	63.7
Total no. of prod. livestock animal units		21.9	22.0	21.8
% of total prod. livestock units that are				
COWS		52.7	46.1	59.3
5 of total prod. livestock units that are			20.0	<u> </u>
other cattle		20.8	28.0	22.0
% of total prod. livestock units that are		- 1	~ 0	7.0
hogs		3.1	3.2	3.0
% of total prod. livestock units that are				10.0
sheep		14.1	18.1	10.0
% of total prod. livestock units that are				
hens		4.3	3.8	4.9
Farms Withou	ut Trac	tors		
L (3.10)	Your	Average	5 most	5 least
	farm	of 10°	profitable	profitable
	10111	farms	farms	farms
		•		7 54
No. of horses		2.3*	3.2	1.5*
No. of colts		.3	• 3	.2
Forme With	mnooto	270	ананананананананананананананананананан	
Fains 7101	Your	Average	5 most	5 least
	form	$\int f] 0$	profitable	urofitable
	Tarm	farms	farms	farms
No. of horses		3.5*	3.0*	3.9
No. of colts		.7	.4	.9

* One of these farms had no horses.

Distribution of Fa	Distribution of Farm Produce Used in House Chantities			
	Your	Avera	re Your	Average
	farm	20 fai	rms farm	20 farms
	I QA III			
Skimmilk	а.	ts. 164 (nts. \$	\$.52
Whole wilk	q	t_{s} , 1207 (nts.	42.90
Croom	Y	$\frac{10}{10}$	400. <u></u>	36.05
Form-mode button		$b_{2} = -63$	1 he	18.33
Farm-made butter	r	140		24 40
Dec >	u	02. 1400		9 49
			1eau	
	ł	DS. 474	LOS	10.40
	L	bs. 339	LDS	18,35
Sneep	1	bs. 30.	Lb3.	1.83
Potatoes	b	u. 31 1	bu	15.06
Vegetables and fruit		-		32.76
Farm fuel	C	ds. 21 d	cās	38.66
Total			\$	\$254.78
			Your	Average
			iarm	20 farms
Average value of farm dwelling			\$	\$1487
interest and depreciation on farm dwel	ling			106
Distribution of Household and Personal	Expense These F	es for Thos	se Farms Which	Kept Complete
Accounts of	Your	Average	7 most	7 least
	farm	15 farms	profitable	profitable
Number of persons.) Family		3.9	3.5	4.3
adult equivalent) Other*	-	.4	6	.2
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		• •	••	•~
Food	¢	\$231 43	\$196 80	\$273 89
Operating and supplies	Ψ	φ201.40 マヘ ワワ	φ1 30.00	90,000 20 QQ
Furnishing and equipment		42 22	59 19	22.50
Clothing and material -		46.66	03,10	24.00
Voolth		85.16	81.30	84.00
Development with a start to		30.89	49.44	15.78
Development and recreation		55.62	40.87	73.19
Personal		44.89	20.68	69.98
Life insurance and savings		60.54	82,19	30.62
Personal share of auto expense	<u></u>	50.18	45.11	58.11
Housing		4.10	2.47	4.80
Total Household and Personal Cash Exp.	\$	\$633.75	\$614.54	\$657 . 95
Food furnished by the farm	ŝ	\$225.16	\$269.43	\$194.84
Fuel furnished by the farm	Ψ	38 13	44 72	35.29
Interest and depres on form dwolling		00.10		10% 41
Interest and depress on mine it welling		99.69 DD 05		100.71
inverest and deprec. on misc. items**	<u> </u>	<u>c8.05</u>	60.07	29.13
Total Household and Personal Exp.	\$	\$1026.3 8	\$1057.89	\$1021.22

ł

* Hired help or others boarded. ** Personal share of auto, gas engine, and electric plant, and household goods.

Comparisons	of Various	Items with	<u>1 Previous</u>	Year	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1931	1932	1933	1934	
Number of farms	55	44	30	20	
Farm inventory (not including house)	\$10,6 64	\$8,110	\$7,867	\$8,900	
Acres in farm	199	184	182	198	
Crop acres per farm	97	78	79	86	
Per cent of land tillable	49	42	45	52	
Per cent of tillable land in high retu	rn				
crops*	5 0	56	48	35	
	c 1		7 0	2.0	
NO. OI WORK HORSES	3.4	ద.ర	3.0	£.J	
NO. OI COLTS	•3	.3	•4	•0	
No. OI COWS	11.6	10.4	10.5	11.8	
No. of head of other cattle	11.2	9.9	10.1	9.1	
No. of litters of pigs raised	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	
Pounds of pork produced	2961.0	2147.0	1738.0	1367.0	
Head of sheep	12.5	9,6	16.0	25.4	
No. of hens	62.0	57.0	48.0	47.6	
Productive livestock units per 100 acr	es 12.3	11.4	13.3	13.3	
Los. of B.F. per cow	238.	233.	225.	202.	
No. of pigs per litter	7.	6.3	7.3	6.0	
No. of eggs laid per hen	121.	120.	119.	111.	
Price rec'd. per 1b. B.F. sold (mfg.					
cream)	\$.26	\$.19	\$.23	\$.29	
Price rec'd. per cwt. hogs sold	5.17	3,29	4.87	6.61	
Price recid. per lb. wool sold	.12	.08	.27	.21	
Price rec'd. per doz. eggs sold	.16	.15	.15	.17	
Potumna chore food cost non onight wei	+ - 5				
meturns above feed cost per animal uni		¢11 00	67.4 OO	ഹോററ	
productive investock	φ19.00	\$11.00		φα⊥•00 1 40	
rover and equip. exp. per day of prod.	WORK 1.40	1.10	1.10	1.40	
Misc. exp. per day of prod. work	1.41	1.09	1.24	1.40	
Yield per acre, wheat, bu.	19.5	17.1	17.1	22.7	
" " " oats, bu.	41.3	33,5	33.7	40.2	
" " barley, bu.	24.7	23.0	20.3	32.0	
" " " oats & barley, bu.	37.7	33.2	33.2	44.7	
" " " flax. bu.	10.8	6.8	7.5	5.7	
" " " corn. bu.	24.4	22.9	26.9	21.7	
" " corn silage, tons	6.7	5.3	4.9	5.9	
" " clover & timothy tons	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.0	
" " notatoes hu	155 5	133.2	115.4	112.4	
" " rutabagas, tons	200.0 Q 9	13.5	13.8	8.5	
	U # A2		~~~~~	~	

* In 1931 and 1932 all the acreage in hay was given the same weight; in 1933, nonlegume hay was given a weight of one-half; and in 1934 non-legume hays were not included in with the high return crops.

.

.

Comparison of Farm Earnings With Previous Year					
	1931	1932	1933	1934	
Uash Expenses	400	\$75	\$ 70	ф 077	
Tractor (new and exp.)	\$77 70	ຈວວ 05	\$3U 64	300 72	
tute (new and exp.)	30	60	04 707	70 64	
Auto (new and exp.) (farm share)	94	69	73	0 4	
Basengine (new and exp.) (farm share)	11	10	6	(1	
Electricity (new and exp.) (farm share) 8	1	3		
Machinery and equipment (new)	52	23	40	60	
Machinery and equipment (exp.)	36	21	25	28	
Bldgs., fences, tiling (new)	22	18	40	53	
Bldgs., fences, tiling (exp.)	12	15	25	20	
Hired Labor	144	60	86	94	
Feed for livestock	155	110	197	154	
Other expenses for livestock	24	29	26	27	
Horses bought	27	14	15	31	
Cows bought	10	7	7	14	
Other cattle bought	10	8	10	6	
Hogs bought	9	2	З	9	
Sheep bought	16	6	13	9	
Foultry bought	11	9	6	8	
Crop (seed, twine, spray)	122	70	73	116	
Taxes and insurance	173	125	104	111	
General farm	22	12	15	22	
	10 at 11 11	~~~	0.07	007	
(1) Total Cash expense	1071	729	861	993	
(2) Decrease in farm inventory	93	281	-		
(3) Board for hired labor	62	32	39	38	
Cach Receipts Horses	17	3	24	1	
Cows	57	35	56	66	
Dairy products	745	438	575	819	
Other cattle	84	49	48	59	
Fors	112	60	60	100	
Sh com	77	44	53	112	
Poultry	56	19	75	75	
Poor City	76	45	70 57	57	
Smoll amoin	60	20	17	244	
Com	ح0 ۲	20	-±0 1	272	
Upy	1 24	20	70	55	
Poot grong	64 707	53 00	00 015	1 50	
Othor crops	307	י מס ירו	640 105	103 204	
Viner crops	104	TOT	100	204 717	
MISCELLANEOUS	58	167 144	100	() 6 e	
Income from work oil the laim	8 <i>2</i>	T. **	100	0'x	
(5) Total cash receipts	1822	1279	1656	2139	
(6) Increase in farm inventory		la constante de	61	13	
(7) Farm produce used in house	253	211	193	255	
(8) Total receipts - sum of (5).(6)&(7)2075	1490	1910	2407	
Total expenses (4)	1226	1042	900	1031	
(9) Ret. to cap & fam. labor(8)minus(4)	849	448	1010	1376	
(10) Interest on farm inventory	577	405	397	445	
(11) Family labor corning (9)minual10	1) 716	47	61 7	971	
(~~) routry raver carmings (s)ming(10	010	248	269	747	
(12) Unneid fomily lobor	161	6 m G	(d) (1771	
(12) Unpaid family labor	260	270	200	0	
 (12) Unpaid family labor (13) Operator's labor earnings (11) 	260	. 205	740	594	

• *