UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Department of Agriculture
and the

United States Department of Agriculture
Soil Conservation Service

-- 0 --

Fourth
Annual Report
of the
Farm Management Service
for
Soil Conservation Demonstrat:

Farmers in Soil Conservation Demonstration Areas for the year 1938

-- 0 --

Name:					
ivanii o	·	_	 	 	 _

Mimeographed Report No. 105
Division of Agricultural Economics
University Farm
St. Paul, Minnesota
March, 1939

Fourth Annual Report of the Farm Management Service for Farmers in Soil Conservation Demonstration Areas

Prepared by W. P. Ranney, T. R. Nodland and G. A. Pond

INDEX

	Page
Introduction	1
Summary of Farm Inventories	6 & 7
Summary of Amount of Livestock	7
Summary of Farm Earnings (Cash Statement)	. 8
Summary of Farm Earnings (Enterprise Statement)	9
Analysis of the Reasons for Differences in Operator's Earnings.	10
Effect of Well-Balanced Efficiency on Operator's Earnings	13
Measures of Farm Organization and Management Efficiency	14
Thermometer Chart	15
Distribution of Acres in Farm	16
Crop Yields	17
Feed Costs per Horse and Other Power Expense Items	17
Factors of Cost and Return in Dairy Production	18
Feed Costs and Returns for Other Cattle	19
Feed Costs and Returns for Sheep	19
Feed Costs and Returns for Hogs	50
Feed Costs and Returns for Poultry	20
Distribution of Farm Produce Used in House	21
Distribution of Household and Personal Expenses	21
Summary of Farm Earnings by Areas (Cash Statement)	22
Distribution of Acres in Farm, and Crop Yields, by Areas	
Measures of Farm Organization and Management by Areas	
Amount of Livestock by Areas	24
Summary of Farm Earnings, 1935 - 1938	25
Summary of Miscellaneous Items, 1935 - 1938	26

Introduction

Through a joint agreement between the Division of Agricultural Economics of the University of Minnesota and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, a complete farm record service has been made available to farmers in the Soil Conservation Demonstration Areas of Minnesota. Farmers in the Gilmore Creek Area at Winona, the Beaver Creek Area at Caledonia, and the Deer-Bear Creek Area at Spring Valley, who were cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service and operating their farms under a complete erosion control program, had the opportunity to keep records. This is the fourth year that records were kept in the Gilmore Creek and Deer-Bear Creek Areas; and the third year in the Beaver Creek Area.

The work of supervising these records was taken care of by James C. Jensen of Spring Valley, Minnesota, Austin B. Sanford of Caledonia, Minnesota, and C. Herman Welch, Jr., of St. Paul, Minnesota, members of the staff of the Soil Conservation Service. The summary and analysis were under the direction of G. A. Pond, W. P. Ranney and T. R. Nodland of the Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of Minnesota. The record books were furnished by the Division of Agricultural Extension, University of Minnesota, which is also cooperating in this study.

Note: Completion of this project was made possible by workers supplied on Federal Students' Work Project, 1938-39, Project No. 78-70; and Project No. 6320, Sub-Project No. 420, Minnesota Works Progress Administration. Sponsor: University of Minnesota.

Full cooperation has been given during the past year by members of the Divisions of Operations and Economic Research, Soil Conservation Service, and the Division of Agricultural Extension, University of Minnesota, as well as county agricultural agents in the locality.

Records Kept

The records kept by the cooperators included inventories at the beginning and end of the year, cash receipts and expenses, a report of feed to the various classes of livestock, and a record of farm produce used by the family. Supplementary information was also secured during the year regarding crop and livestock production practices.

The cooperators were assisted and supervised in keeping their records by the fieldmen from the Soil Conservation Service, who visited each farm several times during the year. In addition to securing the supplementary information, the fieldmen's duties included numerous services, viz., helping the farmer place uniform values on real estate and equipment, checking the cash and feed records, answering any questions that might arise as to how the entries should be made in the account book, and helping with farm management problems which came up due to changes brought about by the introduction of a complete erosion control program.

At the end of the year, the books were taken to the central office at the University Farm where they were checked for completeness and accuracy. Then the field-man of the Soil Conservation Service visited each cooperator and asked for corrections and secured any data which had been omitted.

Thirty-four books contained complete household statements which were summarized and tabulated on page 21. This portion of the summary was an extra service given in addition to the regular farm accounts and it was entirely up to the cooperator as to whether he kept that portion of the record or not.

Topography, Soils, Climate

The Gilmore Creek Area, in which 7 records were completed, is located at the southwestern edge of the city of Winona, in Winona county. The valley and side coulees are very narrow with steep sides. The ridges are narrow, varying from a few rods to usually less than one fourth of a mile in width. The upland soils fall mainly into two types, Clinton silt loam, a forest soil developed on loess, and Dubuque silt loam, a forest soil developed on residual limestone. The valley soils consist mostly of Jackson silt loam and Chariton silt loam. A considerable portion of the steep valley slopes is classified as rough, stony land. Serious sheet and gully erosion has taken place over the area. The annual rainfall of this area is approximately 34 inches and is distributed throughout the year satisfactorily for crop production; approximately 64 per cent occurs during the frost-free period. The winters are cold, and followed by short but warm summers; the annual mean temperature is 46 degrees. Droughts may endure for short periods; or unusual precipitation, with heavy water and soil losses may occur; but these unusual periods are not frequent.

The Beaver Creek Area in which 23 of the records were kept is located in Houston county in the southeastern portion of the state. The area may be divided into two parts, the gently unfulating to moderately rolling prairie region of the upper one-third of the watershed, and the undulating to hilly region of the lower two-thirds of the area.

pl Care respect, where research was he had been and no solid to the contract of the contract o

In the upper portion of the area the greatest agricultural development has taken place, since the land is more level, less cut up by ravines, and has a lower degree of erosion all of which permit more land in cultivation and much larger fields. The soil in this section is predominantly a deep prairie soil (Tama Silt Loam) which is high in organic matter, but needs lime for the best production of alfalfa or sweet clover.

The lower two-thirds of the area is composed of a main valley with accompanying tributary valleys surrounded by high steep ridges. The bottom of the valley is excellent corn land but due to annual overflow is not adaptable to other crops. A broad terrace on either side affords excellent soil for cultivated fields, many of which extend part way up the lower slopes of the adjoining ridges. Due to the steep character of the ridge slopes about 25 per cent of the area is on land too steep for crops or pasture so is predominantly in woods. On the ridge tops we again find fields with soil very similar to that of the soils on the lower slopes of the ridges. This is a forest soil (Fayette Silt Loam), low in nitrogen, shows a marked response to barnyard manure or legumes in rotation and needs lime for the best growth of alfalfa or sweet clover. Sheet erosion has taken a severe toll and many of the old fields have less than three inches of topsoil remaining.

The Deer-Bear Creek Area, in which 25 records were completed, is located in Fillmore and Mower counties and is drained by the middle branch of the Root River. The topography varies from very gently rolling to almost level land, in the upper part of the area, to very steep, hilly and rough land in the lower end. In many cases the upper end of the area lacks sufficient undulation of surface to allow proper drainage, in contrast to the lower, where creeks have cut deeply into the underlying limestone. The entire area has been glaciated almost equally between soils composed of drift material and of loessial mantle overdrift. Carrington, and Lindley, silt loam soils with glacial drift derivation and Tama, Clinton, silt loams with loess derivation are among the more important soil types of the area. Erosion varies from slight amounts of sheet erosion in the upper reaches of the drainage areas to severe sheet and gully erosion in the middle and lower parts of the area. The mean annual temperature for the area is 45 degrees Fahrenheit, with a range of -37 to 108 degrees, occurring in January and July, respectively. The average growing season is around 150 days with an annual precipitation of 32 to 33 inches well distributed throughout the growing season.

Type of Farming

Agriculture in the three areas covered by this report centers primarily around the dairy enterprise with smaller proportions of hogs, poultry and sheep included. In the Deer-Bear Creek and Beaver Creek Areas a few farmers have both dairy cattle and beef cattle enterprises. Dairy products were sold principally as cream altho a few farmers had an outlet for whole milk. In those cases where cream was sold, the skimmilk was fed to calves, hogs, and poultry.

The principal crops grown are oats, barley, hay, and corn. The proportion of total farm land devoted to crop production and rotation pasture land varies from 40 per cent on some of the rougher farms in the Gilmore Creek Area to more than 80 per cent on some of the Deer-Bear Creek farms, with an average of 53 per cent for all farms studied. Approximately 20 per cent of the areas is devoted to permanent pasture, with twice as much woodland in the Gilmore Creek Area as in the Deer-Bear Creek Area, and an average of 10 per cent of all the farms being handled as protected timber areas.

Purpose of the Project

The farm management unit of the Operations Division of the Soil Conservation Service has three main objectives; first, enabling the cooperator to know the returns he is getting for his labor and management, second, to secure information which when compared with similar data secured on other farms will enable the cooperator to increase his efficiency and organize his farm on a more profitable basis and third, to rebalance the farm business in light of economic conditions after the establishment of the erosion control program.

Since success under our present economic order is measured in terms of dollars and cents, and since the profit motive is the governing factor in our modern agriculture, it is important that both the cooperator and the soil conservationist know what returns the farmer is obtaining for his capital, management, and labor. In other words, the farmer's income is the yardstick by which we measure the success of his enterprise and if the soil conservation program is to succeed it must increase or at least maintain the farmer's income. This information may be obtained through farm account books and furnish a common basis from which the conservationist and the farmer may build a better erosion control program for that farm.

In any community we find certain farms above the average yet almost adjoining it will be a farm far below the community standard. Sometimes physical conditions will make it impossible to change the situation, but frequently it is a question of inefficiency and poor management.

Through the records kept for the farm management service, each cooperator furnishes data dealing with the operation of his farm or affecting its income. By comparing this data with that obtained on the most profitable farms the operator can often find many ways of operating his farm more efficiently.

Forms cannot be operated efficiently if the soil has been allowed to become so badly eroded as to reduce crop yields. In order to prevent this, very decided changes have been made in the field plans of the individual farm and in the crop rotations. These changes are bound to upset the fine balance formerly existing on a well-managed farm. Readjustment of labor and livestock is bound to follow and the sooner these readjustments are made the easier it will be. By means of farm account books both the concerator and the fieldman can see just how the income is being affected and take steps to improve the situation. At the same time, the fieldman is able to get the information which he can apply on other farms in the locality and know that he has concrete evidence to back his statements.

Fortunately most practices which make for efficient farm management are also important measures in good erosion control. In this section of the country livestock farming is in practically every case the most profitable type of operation, but it requires efficient handling if the full benefits are to be received, good quality pasture throughout the grazing season, high quality roughages for the feeding season, and above all a balanced ration. Good erosion control requires fencing out of very steep hillsides to woods, to prevent silting and gullying of fertile land lower down the slope. Other land that is not so steep but too rough to cultivate makes excellent permanent hayfields and pasture. Of our various permanent hay crops alfalfa is one of the best and without question it is the best roughage we have for dairy cattle. Well-balanced rotations make for higher crop yields and at the same time are important factors in good erosion control. In other words, good farm management and good erosion control in this area call for efficient livestock farming, good land utilization and all done with a minimum of labor.

Analysis of the Farm Business

On pages eight and nine are presented financial summaries of the year's business, showing the average results for the 55 farms on which the work was completed for the twelve months' period, January 1, 1938 to December 31, 1938, the average results for the highest one-fifth of the farms in respect to Operator's Labor Earnings, and the average for the lowest one-fifth. 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 page 10 and the remaining pages 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 three of the soil conservation areas.

Capital Investment in Farm Business

The data on pages six and seven show that the average size of the farm in this report was 202 acres. The average farm inventory was \$15,220. This does not include the value of the house in which the operator lived. In 1938, 45 per cent of the average farm inventory consisted of land; 21 per cent of permanent improvements; 7 per cent of feeds and supplies; 10 per cent of machinery and equipment; and 17 per cent of livestock, of which about one-third or an average of \$762 was the average inventory value of milk cows.

Returns to Operators for Their Labor and Management (See page 8)

The average cash receipts per farm were \$3,352. In addition, farm produce to the value of \$315 was consumed by the farm family and there was an average inventory increase of \$50 per farm. The total average receipts per farm were the sum of these three items, \$3,717. The average total expense per farm, \$1,833, includes \$1,755 cash expense and an estimated allowance of \$78 for board of hired labor. The difference between the total income and total expense figure is \$1,884. 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, \$761, for the services of capital, there remains \$1,123 for the services of the farmer and his family. The average value of family labor used, if computed at hired man's wages, was \$244. The average operator's labor earnings are the family earnings less their allowance of \$244, or \$879. This is the return to 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.

The average total value of farm produce used in the house, \$315, represents an important item in the farmer's income. This produce is figured at farm prices; if it was purchased at retail price, 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 21 shows the average amounts and values for each item included in the total of farm produce used in the house.

	Summary of Farm	Inver	ntories	(Beginning	of Year)	
Items	*: *: 1		Your farm	Average of 55 farms	ll most pr ofi table farms	ll least profitable farms
Size of farm (a Size of busines	cres) s (days of prod.wor	k) (1))	202 628	218 859	202 588
Land Farm improved Machinery and General machiner Tractor Truck and Auto (farm Gas engine	d equipment (total) achinery and equipm trailer	ent		2	3,249	315 3 46 7 144 3 14
Miscellaneou Feeds and se Horses (tota Horses Colts Productive 1 Cows Other cat Hogs Sheep Poultry	eds 1) ivestock (total)			2,020 6	3 1,499 5 546 21 442 74 104	1 56 1,924 807 5 547 0 271 5 151

(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 data presented in Minnesota Technical Bulletin 44, "A Study of Dairy Farm Organization in Southeastern Minnesota", are listed as follows:

4**;	No	of days	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		No, of days
Item		prod.worl	k:Item	Per .	of prod. work
Cows	Cow	16.6	:Corn for grain	Acre	2.1
Other cattle	Animal unit*	7.6	: (husked)		
Sheep '	Animal unit*	2.7	:Corn for grain	Acre	2.8
Poultry	100 hens	20.1	: (husk. & shred.)	
Hogs	100 lbs. hogs	.55	:Corn for silage	Acre	2.6
	produced		: Corn. hogged	Acre	1.25
Alfalfa	Acre .	1.5	:Corn for fodder	Acre	1.8
Tame & wild hay	Acre	.6	:Sweet corn	Acre	3.0
Small grain & flax	Acre	1.0	:Potatoes .	Acre	6.4
Small grain hogged	Acre	• 4	:Sugar beets	Acre	4.0
Canning peas	Acre	2.5	1		

^{*}Animal Unit represents one cow, one bull, two head of young cattle, seven head of sheep, fourteen lambs, five hogs, ten pigs, 100 hens, or 1400 pounds of turkeys.

Supplement of January Saralogs

Summary of Farm Inventories (End of Year) Your

Items	Your farm	Average of 55 farms	ll most profitable farms	ll least profitable farms
•			. :	
Average farm inventory (without house Land Farm improvements Machinery and equipment (total) General machinery and equipment Tractor Truck and trailer Auto (farm share))	1	3,240 2,119 03 1,314 37 444 73 164 38 141	\$17,267 9,230 3,111 1,631 1,094 334 145
Gas engine (farm share) Electrical equipment (farm shar	e)		12 9 26 47	
Miscellaneous supplies Feeds and seeds Horses (total) Horses Colts Productive livestock (total) Cows Other cattle Hogs Sheep		2,057 7 6	1,466 514 71 373 99 141	19 1,028 450 397 53 1,798 806 495 229
Poultry			97 100	150
			97 100	150
	Amount of Your farm		97 100	ll least profitable farms
Summary of Items No. of horses No. of colts No. of cows	Your	Livestock Average of 55	97 100	ll least profitable
Summary of	Your	Livestock Average of 55 farms 4.0 1.0 14.2	97 100 ll most profitable farms 4.2 1.2 18.0	ll least profitable farms 4.2 .6 15.5
Summary of Items No. of horses No. of colts No. of cows No. of cows per worker Head of other cattle Litters of pigs raised Pounds of hogs produced Head of sheep (2 lambs equal 1 head)	Your	Livestock Average of 55 farms 4.0 1.0 14.2 8.0 19.9 8.7 12808 30.2	97 100 11 most profitable farms 4.2 1.2 18.0 8.4 23.3 11.5 20980 32.2	ll least profitable farms 4.2 .6 15.5 8.0 20.5 7.1 7916 20.4
Summary of Items No. of horses No. of colts No. of cows No. of cows per worker Head of other cattle Litters of pigs raised Pounds of hogs produced Head of sheep (2 lambs equal 1 head) No. of hens	Your farm	Livestock Average of 55 farms 4.0 1.0 14.2 8.0 19.9 8.7 12808 30.2 100	11 most profitable farms 4.2 1.2 18.0 8.4 23.3 11.5 20980 32.2 110	ll least profitable farms 4.2

Summary of Farm Earnings

You	_	ll most	11 least
tems		profitable	profitable
	farms	farms	farms
ASH EXPENSES			1
Tractor (new & exp.) \$	\$206	\$320	\$151
Truck (new & exp.)		131	15
Auto (new & exp.) (farm share)	76	37	102
Gas engine (new & exp.) (farm share)	6	7	6
Electricity (new & exp.) (farm share)	- 8 : .	8	. 6
Machinery and equipment (new)		185	112
Machinery and equipment (exp.)	36	52	35
Buildings, fences, tiling (new)		72	22
Buildings, fences, tiling (exp.)	40	78	. 16
Hired labor		274	184
Feed for livestock		537	126
Other expense for livestock	63	76 .	53
Horses bought	 33 · .	9	23
Cows bought	49	148	. 0
Other cattle bought	84	213	39
Hogs bought		69	. 14
Sheep bought	43	23	. 8
Poultry bought		21	24
Crop (seed, twine, spray)	145	185	137
Taxes and insurance		282	218
General farm	12:	12	15
			*
(1) Total cash expense	1,755	2,739	1,306
(2) Decrease in farm inventory	·	_	314
(3) Board for hired labor		115	82
(4) Total expense (sum of (1),(2),&(3)	1,833	2,854	1,702
		*	•
ASH RECEIPTS			
Horses	54	62	15
Cows	181	268	154
Dairy products	800	1,292	667
Other cattle	492	685	326
Hogs	890	1,468	592
Sheep	128	134	79
Poultry	58	81	3 7
Eggs.	162	178	320
Small grain	51	124	50
Corn	7	25	0
Hay	21_	35	22
Root crops	5	1	18
Other crops	16	. 22	11
Miscellaneous	142	264	60
Income from work off the farm	177	390	38
Agricultural Conservation payments		216	192
(5) Total cash receipts	3,352	5,245	· 2,581
(6) Increase in farm inventory	5,352	5,245 421	ಏ, ೨೦⊥
(7) Farm produce used in house	315	403	266
(8) Total receipts (sum of (5) & (6)			266
Total expenses (4)	3,717	6,069	2,847
	1,833	2,854	1,702
(9) Ret. to cap. & fam. labor (8) - (4)	1,884	3,215	1,145
(10) Interest on farm inventory	761	· 856 ·	871
(11) Family labor earnings (9) - (10) (12) Unpaid family labor	1,123 244	2,359 362	274 302
		3h/	

Items	Your farm	Average of 55 farms	ll most profitable farms	ll least profitable *\arms
TYPENSES AND NET DECDEASES	er er			. /.
Total power Hired Tractor Truck Auto (farm share) Gas engine (farm share) Elec. plant or current (farm share) Horses General machinery and equipment Buildings, fencing, tiling Productive livestock misc. expense Crop Real estate taxes Personal property tax Insurance		\$422 80 98 21 69 8 9 137 117 120 22 100 182 25 29	\$419 98 110 20 64 12 103 152 160 23 137 216 31 35	\$441 48 113 23 87 6 10 154 112 96 25 106 167 21 30
General farm Hired labor & board, & unpaid fam. Interest on farm inventory	labor	12 518 761	12 751 856	15 568 871
(1) Total		2,308	2,792	2,452
All productive livestock Cows Other cattle Hogs Sheep Poultry Crops, feed, vegetables and fuel Agricultural Conservation payments Miscellaneous Income from work off the farm	5	2,826 999 525 953 109 240 8 168 8	4,379 1,532 813 1,591 168 275 - 207 216 11 390	2,238 819 420 583 377 - 52 192 8
<pre>(2) Total</pre>)	3,187 2,308 879	4,789 2,792 1,997	2,424 2,452 - 28

⁽A) Cash receipts and expenses are adjusted for changes in inventory for each enterprise and for each item of expense in order to show total receipts and net increases, and total expenses and net decreases. The operator's labor earnings are the same as those on page 8.

ing the second of the second

Analysis of the Reasons for Differences in Operator's Earnings

The financial statement on the preceding pages shows that there is a wide range in earnings. The average operator's labor earnings for the eleven most profitable farms was \$1,997, and for the eleven least profitable farms \$ - 28. The difference between the averages for these two groups was \$2,025. 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 55 farms indicate that there are several very definite factors that enable some farmers to make substantial earnings on these farms that are subject to rather serious erosion, 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.

Lbs. butterfat	per cow	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
		14.14.7	
Below 175	150	16	\$597
175 - 224	199	22	944
225 and above	249	17	1,059

High production per cow tends to lower 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 Returns Above Feed for Other Productive Livestock to Farm Earnings.

Returns above feed of prod. livestock		No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
Below \$25	\$15	13	\$371
\$25 - 54	39	28	829
\$55 and above	78	14 ·	1,449

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. Feed is the major item of cost in livestock production. High returns from livestock above the value of feed usually accompany greater profits from the livestock. This means another addition to the farm earnings.

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

Productive livest	ock units per 100 A.	No. of	Average
Group .	Average	Farms	Earnings
	A r n r		W 1
Below 16.0	13.9	13	\$694
16.0 to 23.9	20.0	32	820
24.0 and above	28.6	10	1,308

.

On some farms the returns from livestock are so low that they do not cover feed and other costs. Such livestock is unprofitable, especially if there is more than enough to utilize what would otherwise be waste feed.

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 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 were of			
the average for a	11 the 55 f	arms	No. of	Average
Group	Average	·	Farms	Earnings
·	9	,	· · ·	
Below 85	77		9	\$559
85 - 114	99		.36	862
115 and above	124	٧	10	1,228_

High production per acre, up to certain limits, tends to lower the cost per bushel of grain or per ton of hay. 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. As a rule, plowing under legumes and manure and control of erosion tend to increase crop yields on these farms.

Table 5. Relation of Choice of Crops to Farm Earnings.

Per cent of tillable high return crops*	le land in	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms**	Earnings
			2000
Below 38	30.4	13	\$728
38 - 48	42.5	27	776
49 and above	54.8	9	858

Statement .

As a rule, on these farms, such crops as alfalfa, sweet clover, red clover, corn, barley, winter wheat, and flax bring a higher net return per acre than other crops usually grown. Additions can be made to earnings by putting a greater percentage of the tillable land into these higher return crops.

^{*}Crops are marked on page 16 as (A), (B), (C) or (D).

All of the acres in (A) crops, one-half of acres in (B) crops, and onefourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable
land in high return crops.

^{**}Farms with less than 15 per cent of the total productive work units expended on crops were not included.

Soil erosion and fertility maintenance are vital problems on the farms included in this study. Biennial and perennial legumes, especially alfalfa and sweet clover, form a sod that helps to check erosion, conserve humus and soil fertility. If properly inoculated they tend to increase the nitrogen content of the soil. Legume hays and pastures are also valuable for feed, for they lessen the necessity to purchase high-priced protein feeds. Alfalfa is undoubtedly the most profitable crop available for these farms.

Table 6. Relation of Size of Business (days of prod. work) to Farm Earnings.

Days of productive work Group	Average	No. of Farms	1	Average Earnings
Below 500	380	20	,	\$533
500 to 799	647	26	0	889
800 and above	1,126	9		1,616

Average farm earnings tend to increase with an increase in size of business where size of business is measured by days of productive work. However, for those farmers who are operating their farms at a loss, the larger the volume of business the larger will be 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, providing that in so doing he does not lower materially the efficiency in some one or more important branches of his business. Those farmers who have large businesses usually have more flexibility of their organization than does the man with a small business, and can utilize more efficiently and to better advantage available labor, power, machinery, and buildings.

Table 7. Relation of Amount of Work Accomplished per Worker to Farm Earnings.

Days of productive	e work pe	r worker	No. of		Average	
Group	Av	erage	Farms		Earnings	
Below 300 300 - 399 400 and above	i , e Fe	254 341 453	19 22 14	** %	\$659 843 1,233	

More days of productive work accomplished per worker reduce the labor charge per unit of business. Higher labor accomplishment can be secured in several ways. In the first place the business must be large enough so that there will be at least sufficient work available for the family labor. The farm should be so organized that the labor requirements are well distributed throughout the year. Handling pastures in an efficient manner, in such a way that as large a proportion as possible of the year's feed for livestock may be obtained from them, helps to reduce labor requirements. Proper planning of the farm work, economical use of labor saving machinery, etc., help to increase the work accomplished per worker.

Table 8. Relation of Power, Machinery and Building Expense to Farm Earnings.*

Expense per day of	productive work	No. of	Average
Group	Average	Farms	Earnings
	3 2 2		
\$1.60 and above	\$1.72	6	\$470
.90 to 1.59	1.14	33	756
Below .90	.66	16	1,286

^{*}Includes building, fencing, and all machinery expense, horse feed, and miscellaneous horse expense.

The expense factor shows a higher relation with earnings when prices are very low than when they are high. Some farms are under-equipped. On a few farms, excessive expenses constitute the main factor causing earnings to be very low. Some of the cash expenses can be kept down by careful management. Oftentimes necessary repairs and improvements can be made by using the available farm labor rather than by hiring extra help. Repairs and overhauling should be done before spring work begins insofar as possible; or on rainy days or in other spare time during the summer. Reducing the number of horses to the minimum required for efficient operation of the farm, helps reduce the power expense. In some cases farmers can offset some or all of the power and machinery expense by using their equipment for outside work.

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 on the other hand those few who can manage to attain high efficiency in all parts of their organization receive returns well above the average. This is well illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9. Relation of Operator's Labor Earnings to the Number of Factors in Which the Farmer Is Above the Average

No. of factors in which farm excels	No. of	Your Farm	The length of the shaded lines are in proportion to the average operator's labor carnings	Average Operator's Earnings
Seven or eight	4		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	\$1,932
Five or six	15		xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	1,233
Three or four	23	8	XXXXXXXXXXXX	756
One or two	13		XXXXXX	363

The array in Table 9 indicates that it will be worth-while for each cooperator to study carefully his ranking on pages 14 and 15, and learn his standing in respect to each of the above factors and the elements of strength and weakness in his farm business.

and the authority of the contract of

Measures of Farm Organization and	Managen	ent Effi	ciency	
Measures used in chart	Your farm	Average of 55	<pre>ll most profit-</pre>	ll least profit-
on page 15.	* s	farms	able	able
		! .	farms	farms
Operator's Labor Earnings	\$	\$879	\$1,997	\$ - 28
		7		a a
(1) Pounds of butterfat per cow	·	200	216	175.
(2) Return over feed (pr.lvst.other than cows)*	\$	\$43	\$57	\$26
(3) Productive livestock units per 100 acres**	~£ +	20.1	22.6	19.7
(4) Crop yields***		. 100	108	95
(5) % of tillable land in high return crops****	<u> </u>	40.3	39.9	42.6
(6) Size of businessdays of productive work		628	859	588
(7) Days of productive work per worker		340	397	. 296
(8) Power and eq. exp. per day of prod. work	\$	\$1.06	\$.84	\$1.13
Measures and items related to some of the above				r 27 *
measures:		3 .		£ **
(10)	\$	\$9.64	\$13.06	\$4.44
Return over feed per 100 lbs. hogs prod.		3.04	3.76:	1.14
Return over feed per hen	-	1.21	1.03	1.04
Return over feed per head sheep		1.71	2.71	.41
(6) Days of productive work on crops	*	151	186	150
Days of productive work on prod. livestock		418	542	426
Days of other productive work		59	131	12
		1		
(7) Total number of workers		1.8	2.2	1,9
Number of family workers		1.4	1.6	1.5
Number of hired workers		• 4	•6	• 4
(8) Power expense per day of productive work	\$. \$ -68	\$.47	\$.79
Mach. & equip. exp. per day of prod. work			·18	
Bldg. & fencing exp. per day of prod. work			.19	.15
- 04			<u>, </u>	• •

^{*}Given as returns over feed cost per animal unit of productive livestock other than cows.

^{**}Excluding acreage in protected woodlots.

^{***}Given as a percentage of the average.

^{****}Crops are marked on page 16 as (A), (B), (C), (D). All of the acres in (A) crops, one-half of acres in (B) crops, and one-fourth of acres in (C) crops are used in calculating per cent of tillable land in high return crops.

Using your figures from page 14, locate your standing with respect to the various measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for 55 farms included in this summary are located between the two dotted lines across the center of this page.

0-0-	The	Do #	D 1	0	<i>A</i> 2			
Oper. labor	Lbs. b.f.	Returns over fee	Pr.l.s. d units	Crop yields	% of tillabl	Days e of	Days pr.work	Power & eq. exp.
earn-	per	per u.pr		groras	land in			per day
ings	COM	lvst.oth	er 100 A.	,	high re		worker	pr. work
: 10	•	than cow	S		turn cr	rops		
		· F i	F 1	FT	FT			FI
\$2600-	280	\$85	32.0	140-	60.0	1050	550	\$.30
E	; -	Ē	E	=	E	-	E	E.
2400	270	80	.30.5	135	57.5	1000	525	.40
. =	=	=	=		E	E	E	E
2200	260	75	29.0	130-	55.0	950	500	.50
2000	250	70	20 =	104		200	100	co =
2000	250	10 = -	27.5	125	52.5	900	475	.60
1800	240	65	26.0	120	50.0	850	450	.70
· , E	, <u>E</u>		[-	Ę I.		=	E	E
1600 -	230	60	24.5	115	47.5	800	425	.80
, E		,	<u>-</u>	=			El	=
1400	550	55	23.0	110	45.0	750	400	•90 E
1200	210	50	21.5	105	42.5	700	375	1.00
E	<u></u>		F		F. I	700 E.L.	. 3/3	-1.06
1000	200	45	20.0	100	40.3 40.0	650	350	1.10
879	• -	43	E	El	= 1	628	340	177 T
879	190	40	18.5	95=-	37.5	600	325	1:50
600	1.80	35	17.0	90	35.0	550	300	1.30
	1.00	J	17.0	30	33.0	330	. 300	1.50
400	170	30	15.5	85	32.5	500 =	275	1.40
	, =	-	-	Ē	F	=	_	
200	160	25	14.0	80	30.0	450	250	1.50
	150	20	70 [-		02 -	100 E	- E	, .c. E
	130	, ,	12.5	75 <u> </u>	27.5	400	225	1.60
-200	140	15	11.0	70-	25.0	350	200 =	1.70
· E. I	\=			E		Ē	E	E
-400	130	10	9.5	65	22.5	300	175	1.80
		. =				-	=	on mieste
()		()		$\left(\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	()	()	()	
,)								_

Crop	0001011	of Acres	Your	Aver.	ll most	ll least
(A) (B) (C) (D) refer to		farms	farm	of	profit-	profit-
ranking used in calculating		growing	- (55	able	able
of tillable land in High		this		farms	farms	farms
Return Crops (see page 11).	. *	crop				
		00, 70,000			• •	
Vinter wheat	(B)	. 21	<u> </u>	3.8	2.5	7.1
opring wheat	(C)	12		1,0	. 8	1.3
ats	(D)	31		10.8	9.4	13,3
Barley	(B)	29		10.9	17.4	13.5
Rye	(D)	2		.3	.0	1,5
lax	(B)	2		. 4	.0	•0
Wheat and oats	(C)	13		7.3	8.8	4.9
Dats and barley	(C)	22		10.3	12.9	3.2
Soybeans	(C)	6		. 6	1.9	3
Miscellaneous	(D)	: 2		.3	0	1.4
Total grain		·		45.7	53.7	46.5
Corn, grain	(B)	52 .		18.8	28.0	14.3
Corn, silage	(c)	45		7.9	8.0 .	9.0
Corn, fodder	(D)	15		1.8	3.0	1.0
Potatoes	(A)	50		. 5	.1	1.8
Truck crops	. (A)	9.		.3	<u>.3</u>	.1
Total cultivated crops		, v		29.3	39.4	26.2
		; 	٠.			7.0.5
Alfalfa	(A)	50		17.1	20.2	16.5
Misc. legumes and mixtures	(c)	40		13.1	15.5	11.4
Cimothy hay	(D)	15		2.9	5.6	3.4
Annual hay (millet, Sudan grass,	(D)	8		E	• 4	.7
sm. grain, etc.) Legume seed	(B)	5 .		.5 .7	1.1	1.6
Fimothy seed	(D)	5		1.1	.7	.0
Wild hay (non-tillable land)	(1)	4		5)	.6	.9
				75.0	- · ·	
Total hay	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			35.9	44.1	34.5
Total crop acreage				110.9	137.2	107.2
10tar crop acreage				110.9	107.2	. 107.2
Alfalfa pasture	(A)	13	;	1.5	.3	3,0
Sweet clover pasture	(B)	10	,	1.6	C.	2.4
Miscellaneous legume pasture	(c)	. 25		7.7	5.9	6.6
Other tillable pasture	(D)	17		5.9	6.8	8.1
Non-tillable pasture	/	52.		45.4	49.0	43.0
Total pasture				62.1	62.0	63.1
Total besome						00.1
Fillable land not cropped	(D)	22		2.1	1.8	1.4
Timber (not pastured)	(1)	47		19.2	9.6	22.4
Roads and waste		-# (3.1	1.9	3.9
Farmstead		3		4.9	5.9	4.2
t at mo ocat				±•∂,		
Total acres in farm				202.3	218.4	202.2
% of land tillable				63.2	69.6	62.2
/				~~~		_~ -

			Crops per Your	Average	ll most	ll least
Crop			farm	of 55	profitable	profitabl
		·		farms	farms	farms
Winter wheat, bu.				11.7	10.7	14.0
Spring wheat, bu.				13.9	16.0	10.2
Dats, bu.				31.6	36.9	24.7
Barley, bu.	i			26.6	25.8	20.0
Paro bu	2			0.4		9.4
Rye, bu. Flax, bu.	š.			9.4 6.5	-	9,4
Theat and oats, bu.				32 . 5	35.9	38.2
Dats and barley, bu.				33.0	39 . 7	41.3
Soybeans, bu.	3			19.4	14.2	26.9
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						······································
Corn, grain, bu.				49.5	48.8	49.6
Corn, silage, tons				8.9	9.3	7.7
Corn, fodder, tons	N.			3.0	2.7	2.3
Potatoes, bu.				80.0	35.0	69.4
						6.7
Alfalfa hay, tons				2.4	2.6	2.3
Soybean hay, tons	(#) +			1.4	1.3	1.4
Sweet clover, tons] •1 ·	. 5	- 1.8
Clover and timothy, tons				3.0	2.0	
Timothy hay, tons	•			1.2	1.3	1.3

eed per horse,** bu.: Grain Tame hay and alfalfa	· -		farms .	farms	farms
Grain Tame hay and alfalfa	* *				
Wild hay and fodder	7		 1,559 3,754 448	1,480 2,895 434	1,567 3,377 702
eed costs per horse: Grain Roughage Pasture TOTAL	. 4 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$	\$ \$12.06 13.12 3.36 \$28.44	\$11.13 10.83 14.05 \$26.01	\$12.62 11.90 2.48 \$27.00
umber of work horses	· •	W	 4.1 1.0	4.2 1.2	4.2 .6
otal acres in farm rop acres per horse			 202.3 28.6	218.4 37.9	202.2 25.8
ractor and horse exp. pe arm power exp. per day			\$2.14***	\$1.60 .84	\$2.26 1.13

^{*}One farm had no horses.

^{**}Two colts equal one horse.

^{***}Average of 55 farms.

Factors of Cost and Return in Dairy Production Your. Average 11 farms ll farms Items farm of 55 highest lowest farms in B.F. in B.F. per cow per cow Pounds of butterfat per cow 200 256 141 Feeds per cow, lbs.: 235 239 Corn 203 835 322 Small grain 550 Com. feeds - under 25% protein 5 46 86 Com. feeds - over 25% protein 76 49 1 629 1,309 Tame hay 979 2,093 Alfalfa 2,829 3,457 Wild hay 50 32 16 Corn fodder 317 694 129 4,087 5,854 7,929 Silage 1.232 615 Total concentrates 4,175 4,812 3,547 Total dry roughage Total digestible nutrients 3,721 4,690 2,949 Total digest.nutrients per 1b. B.F.* 18.2 21.3 18.8 % protein in ration 14.4 14.0 14.4 % cows fresh- Sep. to Dec., incl. 43.0 63.3 41.5 Feed cost per cow: \$7.12 \$5.14 Concentrates \$10.71 Roughages 21.36 25.51 17.08 Pasture 5.74 5.67 5.88 TOTAL FEED COSTS \$34.22 \$41.89 \$28.10 Value of produce per cow: Butterfat sales \$53.53 \$78.68 \$35.36 Dairy produce used in the house 4.94 5.05 4.35 12.33 Milk to other livestock 11.56 18.46 1.77 Appreciation or depreciation . 54 -2.47TOTAL VALUE OF PRODUCT \$71.45 \$59.94 \$92.71 RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER COW \$37.23 \$50.82 \$31.84 Price received per 1b. B.F. sold: As manufacturing cream \$.30 \$.30 \$.30 As market milk and cream and .37 cheese milk .30 .37 .16 Feed cost per 1b. B.F. .17 .20 Number of cows** 14.2 16.3 15.9

^{*}Not including nutrients secured from pasture.

^{**}All cows which have at some time in the past freshened are included in the dairy herd, and affect the average number of cows used in computing this table. There is some variation in the number of months of dry period per cow; however, this variation is small for the majority of the farms.

Items	Your farm	Average of all farms	Cattle and She Farms highest in returns above feed per head	Farms lowest in returns above feed per head
Other cattle: number of farms	X	55	11	11
Feeds used per head, lbs.: Concentrates Hay and fodder Silage Whole milk Skim milk Feed cost per head: Concentrates Roughages Milk Pasture TOTAL	\$	242 1,569 1,752 461 1,161 \$2.00 7.31 7.39 2.21 \$18.91	488 1,522 1,875 878 1,042 \$4:17 7.27 12.58 1.54 \$25.56	202 1,863 1,569 367 1,741 \$1.77 8.47 7.05 2.61 \$19.90
RETURNS PER HEAD	\$	\$28.55	\$49.43	\$16.70
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEAD	\$	\$9.64	\$23.87	\$-3.20
% death loss Lbs. of butterfat per cow Number of head of young cattle		6 200 19.9	6 216 16.5	11 197 22.4
Sheep: number of farms		22 =	5	5
Feeds used per head,* lbs.: Concentrates Tame hay Alfalfa Corn fodder and wild hay Silage Feed cost per head: Concentrates Roughages Pasture TOTAL	\$	27 52 210 61 72 \$.21 1.17 .87 \$ 2.25	19 40 183 32 0 \$.14 .91 .90 \$ 1.95	11 65 169 77 69 \$.10 1.06 .69 \$ 1.85
Value of production per head: Wool Mutton TOTAL	\$ ·	\$1.01 2.95 \$ 3.96	\$.88 5.31 <u>\$ 6.19</u>	51.37 27 \$ 1.10
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEAI	s <u>\$</u>	\$ 1.71	\$ 4.24	\$75
Price per lb. wool sold Value per lamb sold	\$	\$.20 5.61	\$.19 6.50	\$ •21 4•46
% lamb crop % death loss No. of head of sheep		95 14 75.4	99 7 24.4	71 21 58.5

^{*}Two lambs under six months of age are considered as one head.

Feed costs and Returns for Hogs and Poultry Your Average Farms Farms farm of all highest in lowest in Items farms returns returns above feed above feed 52 10 10 Hogs: number of farms Lbs. of feed per 100 lbs. hogs produced: Corn 265 213 377 173 229 87 Small grain 10 . Commercial grain feeds . 9. 14 Total grain and commercial feeds 447 620 310 Tankage 2 1 . 1 . Skim milk, buttermilk and whey 923 468 345

. •	-	-		
Cost of feed per 100 lbs. hogs production and commercial feeds Tankage, skim milk, buttermilk & v Pasture Total Feed Cost per 100 lbs. Hogs Production	\$ whey	\$3.54 .64 .19 \$4.37	\$2.40 .47 .16 <u>\$3.03</u>	\$4.96 1.23 .21 \$6.40
RETURNS PER 100 LBS. HOGS PRODUCED	\$	\$7.41	\$7.60	\$6.97
RET. ABOVE FEED COST PER 100# HOGS PI	ROD. \$	\$3.04	\$4.57	\$.57
Price received per 100# hogs sold	\$	\$7.55	\$7.51	\$7.50
Total no. of litters Total no. of pigs weaned per litter % of two-litter system Pounds of hogs produced		9.4 6.7 33.1 13,545	9.0 6.4 26.6 14,340	9.5 6.4 22.4 10,008
Poultry: number of farms	-	52	10	10
Lbs. of feed per hen: Concentrates Skim milk		115 65	156 94	125 52
Cost of feed per hen: Concentrates Skim milk TOTAL	\$	\$1.14 .08 \$1.22	\$1.50 .12 <u>\$1.62</u>	\$1.19 .06 \$1.25
Value of product per hen: Eggs sold and used in house Poultry sold and used in house plu appreciation or less depreciation TOTAL		\$1.73 .70 \$2.43	\$2.32 1.75 <u>\$4.07</u>	\$.93 .42 <u>\$1.35</u>
RETURNS ABOVE FEED COST PER HEN .	\$	\$1.21	\$2.45	\$.10
Price received per dozen eggs sold (of Eggs laid per hen No. of hens % of hens that are pullets (at end of % death loss of hens		17.6 118 106 59 16	17.2 161 : 65 68 11	17.7 63 62 63 20
Vices and as Se	e consider	in one to a	dines who t	ist of the

		Quar	ntities		Value			To word mix
	Your	Average	11 most	ll least	Your	Aver.	11 most	11 least
	farm	5 5	profit-	profit-	farm	55	profit-	profit-
		farms	able	able		farms	able	able
Whole milk		1020 qts.	1,297	778	 	\$28.87	\$36.85	\$22.71
Skim milk		61 qts.	100	47	'	.17		.13
Cream		365 pts.	450	285		31.83	41.18	24.55
Farm-made butter		12 lbs.	14	2		3.78	4.54	.51
Eggs		154 doz.	184	144 ′		27.53	32.99	25.38
Poultry		30 head	45	42		13.48	20.78	17.53
Cattle	780	299 lbs.	523	202		17.26	31.18	11.05
Hogs		570 lbs.	744	651		43.20	54.90	48.50
Sheep		9 lbs.	0	18		.42	.00	.82
Potatoes		27 bu.	34	31		12.64	15.50	15.54
Vegetables & fruit		-	_	-		82.67	117.73	.52.73
Farm fuel		14 cds.	12	11		52.69	47.82	46.66
Total					\$	5314.54	\$403.75	\$266.11
Average value of fa	arm dw	elling	 		\$	\$1.808	\$2152	\$1780
Interest and depre		_	welling			1.45	158	. 136

Distribution of Household and Personal Expenses for Those Farms which Kept Complete Accounts of These Expenses 7 least Your Average 7 most profitable farm 34 farms profitable Number of persons,) Family 3.6 5.0 3.2 adult equivalent) Other* .2 .4 Food \$185.76 \$270.56 \$182.79 48.20 Operating and supplies 45.60 63.04 8.58 53.95 Furnishing and equipment 25.38 Clothing and materials 115.50 74.05 75.53 24.51 Health 28.31 41.42 Development and recreation 52.68 75.36 75.70 38.52 27.94 28.91 Personal 80.47 Life insurance and savings 69.15 64.42 32.83 Personal share of auto expense 68.69 48,28 Housing 7.00 2.58 1.70 \$567.35 Total Household & Personal Cash Exp.\$ \$560.90 \$789.16 \$236.46 \$356.37 Food furnished by the farm \$250.37 Fuel furnished by the farm 53.48 52.86 46.89 123.89: Interest and deprec. on farm dwelling 128.94 143.43 39.13 45.80 35.15 Interest and deprec. on misc, lteris** \$1,009.74 Total Household & Personal Empenses \$____ \$1,032.82

on extend

The savet has a state with the

Children Yould Ville (1)

^{*}Hired help or others boarded.

^{**}Personal share of auto, gas engine, electric plant, and household goods.

Summary of Farm Earnings

Summary of			
		Creek Beaver Creek	Gilmore Creek
Items	Area	Area	Area
Number of farms	25	23	?
CASH EXPENSES			
Tractor (new & exp.)	\$220	\$217	\$118
Truck (new & exp.)	48	40	15
Auto (new & exp.) (farm share)	105	45	72
Gas engine (new & exp.) (farm share)	6	5	11
Electricity (new & exp.) (farm share)	6	13	. 1
Machinery and equipment (new)	157	111	50
Machinery and equipment (exp.)	43	31	25
Buildings, fences, tiling (new)	66	42	58
Buildings, fences, tiling (exp.)	29	61	9
Hired labor	269	156	61
Feed for livestock	343	203	96
Other expense for livestock	99	36	23
Horses bought	64	. 6	14
Cows bought	42	70 :	0.
Other cattle bought	141	41	21
Hogs bought	36	33	16
Sheep bought	95	, 0	. Q
Poultry bought	19	. 14	30
Crop (seed, twine, spray)	189	115	82
Taxes and insurance	254	234	177
General farm	16	. 8	14
* .			
(1) Total cash expense	2247	1481	893
(2) Decrease in farm inventory	1-		156
(3) Board for hired labor	116	. 58	12
(4) Total expense (sum of (1),(2),& (3)	2363	. 1539	1061
OLON PROPERTY.			
CASH RECEIPTS	P 10		0.5
Horses	70	45	23
Cows	189	192	119
Dairy products	732	883	768
Other cattle	690	370	185
Hogs	109.3	879	202
Sheep	262	22	0
Poultry	68-	54.	34
Eggs	209	. 96	213
Small grain	83	8 ,	83
Corn	13	4	0
Hay	33	11	9
Root crops	1	2	33
Other crops	22	7	18
Miscellaneous	205	107	30
Income from work off the farm	214	185	16
Agricultural Conservation payments	205	147	109
(5) Total cash receipts	4089	3012	1842
(6) Increase in farm inventory	2	164	=
(7) Farm produce used in house	316	330	260
(8) Total receipts (sum of (5) & (6)	4407	3506	2102
Total expenses (4)	2363	1539	1061
(9) Ret. to cap. & fam. labor (8) minus (4		1967	1041
(10) Interest on farm inventory	888	653	660
(11) Family labor earnings (9) minus (10		1314	381
(12) Unpaid family labor		248	327
(12) Uliparu ramiriy rabur	218	640	06/

	Distrib	ution of	Acres		Crop Yie	lds
	Deer-Bear	Beaver	Gilmore	: Deer-Bear	Beaver	Gilmore
y	Creek	Creek		: Creek	Creek	Creek
	Area	Area		: Area	Area	Area
	11104	111 Ca	221 00	. 11104		222 000
Winter wheat	5.2 A.	1.1 A.	7.8 A.	9.0 bu.	8-8 bu	. 18.6 bu.
Spring wheat	1.6	.5		12.9 "	15.8 "	12,9 "
Oats	13.1	7.6		32.4 "	33.1 "	26.6 "
Barley	17.0				32.8 "	21.1 "
Rye		3.8	11.6	: 25.2 "		
	•0	•0	2.4	:	-	9.4 "
Flax	. 8	.0	.0	: 6.5 "		- .
Oats and wheat	13.3	3.0		: 35.2 "	23.6 "	Sing 31-
Oats and barley	7.5	16.2	1.9	: 35.1 "	31.2 "	41.6 "
Soybeans	1.3	•0	.0	: 19.4 "	7	75476
Miscellaneous '	.6	.0	.0	: -	a 7	
Total grain	60.4	32.2	37.8	:		
Comparain	21.6	20 7	4.1	: 46.5 bu.	57 6 h	. 44.8 bu.
Corn, grain		20.3				ns 9.1tons
Corn, silage	10.7	5.0	100	: 7.9 tons		ons 9.1 tons
Corn, fodder	3.8	.3		: 3.1 "	2.5 "	
Potatoes	.2	.1		:101.9 bu.	57.9 bu	. 70.7 bu.
Truck crops	.5	.0	.0	: -		
Total cultivated crops	36.8	25.7	14.2	:		
*** ***	1 - 1		1			
Alfalfa	19.9	14.0	17.2	: 2.1 tons	2.7 to	ns 2.4tons
Misc. legumes & mixtures	17.3	9.1	11.1	; -	. –	
Timothy -	4.2	1.6	2.5	: 1.2 "	1.1 ".	1.2 "
Annual hay	.9	.1	.1	: 1.4 "	8 11	1.0 "
Legume seed	1.6	.0	.0	: 86.7 lbs.	-	
Timothy seed	2.5	.0		:171.9 "	_	
Wild hay (non-tillable)	.3	•5	1.4	: -	1.3 "	.9 11
Total hay and seed						to be "
	46.7	25.3	32.3	<u>:</u>		
Total crop acreage	143.9	83.2	84.3		· 	
Alfalfa pasture	3.0	.2	.4	:		
Sweet clover pasture	2.7	.3	1.8	:		
Misc. legume pasture	15.7	1.3	.2	•		
Other tillable pasture	12.9	0	• 5	;		
Non-tillable pasture	43.5	46.8	47.2	. ,		
Total pasture	77.8					
TOURT PROUNTE	1.00.,	48.6	50.1	•		
Tillable land not cropped	2.9	1.7	.8	:		
Timber & brush (not pastured		24.2	27.1	:		
Roads and waste	5.5	.8	2.4	:		
Farmstead	6.0	4.1	3.8	:		
Total acres in farm	248.5	162.6	168.5	:		
	*			:		
Per cent of land tillable	74.3	54.5	52.0	:		

Measures of Farm Organization and Management Efficiency

-					Deer-Bear	Beaver	Gilmore
			14 9	•	Creek	Creek	Creek
			18.5	300	Area	Area	Area
		r 1				* * * *	
Operator's	s labor ear	nings			\$938	\$1066	\$55
ounds of	butterfat.	per cow ···			210	1.94	187
Returns or	ver feed (p	rod. · livestock	other than	n cows) ·	\$36	\$55	\$31
Productive	e livestock	units pér 100	·acres ·		18.3	22.5	18.9
Crop yield	ls		F 19 9 3		95	107	96
Per cent o	of tillable	land in high	return cro	ps ,	37.0%	42.3%	45.7%
* 4	•						E 6
Size of bu	ısiness - d	ays of product	ive work		706	590	474
Days of pr	roductive w	ork per worker			359	333	293
ower, mad	chinery and	building expe	nse per da	у			· 3. 4
of produ	active work	-	A		\$1.21	\$.94	\$.93
					1.		
Returns or	ver feed pe	r head other c	attle		\$8.07	\$12.36	\$6.34
Returns of	ver feed pe	r 100 lbs. hog	ș produced		2.64	4.09	. 80
Returns or	ver feed pe	r hen	2		1.35	1.19	.81
Returns or	ver feed pe	r head sheep			1.17	4.16	
и .						,	

the second of th

0 0 00 00 00 00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	: .		40	ran a		DESCRIPTION OF STREET
	Amour	nt of Livesto	ock			
No. of horses		* · ·	•	4.6	3.2	4.7
No. of colts	.å	,		1.2	.8	• 5
•		•				. F. I. H. W.
No. of cows	J.		•	13.1	15.2	15.0
No. of cows per worker	(8)	* *		7.1	8.7	9.2
,	*	* £	v .			a T
Head of other cattle				24.5	16.9	13.0
Litters of pigs raised	100			10.0	9.2	2.1
Pounds of hogs produced	,			14854	13477	3299
	2	* **				and the same
Head of sheep				63.0	3.6	.0
No. of hens				113	73	144
Total number of productive	livestock	animal unit	. 8	42.3	30.7	24.9
4						. 11 - 10
% of total prod. livestock	units that	were cows	ř.	35.1	52.1	60.4
% of total prod. livestock	units that	were other	cattle	29.9	26.7	28.7
% of total prod. livestock	units that	were hogs		14.6	16.7	5,3
% of total prod. livestock	units that	t were, sheep		17.2	1.9	.0
% of total prod. livestock			rv	3.2	2.6	5.6
,						
	· .					

Summary of Earnings by Years (see footnote, page 26) No. of farms CASH EXPENSES Tractor (new & expense) \$117 \$166 \$206 Truck (new & expense) Auto (new & expense) (farm share) Gas engine (new & expense (farm share) .12 Electricity (new & expense) (farm share). Machinery and equipment (new) 132* Machinery and equipment (expense) 136* Buildings, fences, tiling (new) .96 . 152 Buildings, fences, tiling (expense) .39 Hired labor Feed for livestock Other expense for livestock .21 Horses bought Cows bought Other cattle bought 42 . Hogs bought Sheep bought 16 . 19 . Poultry bought 141 . Crop Taxes and insurance 226 ... General farm \$1494 \$2080 (1) Total cash expense \$1.654 \$1755 (2) Decrease in farm inventory (3) Board for hired labor (4) Total expense (sum of (1), (2) & (3) CASH RECEIPTS \$ 25 \$ 39 Horses \$ 18 Cows Dairy products Other cattle Hogs Sheep Poultry Eggs Small grain Corn Hay . Root crops Other crops Miscellaneous Income from work off the farm Agricultural Conservation payments 1.31 \$3627 \$3077 \$3352 (5) Total cash receipts \$2737 (6) Increase in farm inventory(7) Farm produce used in house (8) Total receipts (sum of (5), (6) & (7) Total expenses (4) (9) Returns to capital & family labor (8) minus (4) 1626 (10) Interest on farm inventory (11) Family labor (9) minus (10) (12) Unpaid family labor (13) Operator's labor earnings (11) minus (12)

*Tractor, truck, gas engine and electricity (new & expense) was included with machinery and equipment.

Summary of Miscellaneous Items by Years

Mi	scellaneous items:	1935	1936	1937	1938
	Acres in farm Crop acres in farm % of tillable land in high return crops	193.9 106.2	189.9 100.7 36.7	203.7 108.7 41.7	202.3 110.9 40.3
	Yield per acre, corn (bu.) Yield per acre, barley (bu.) Yield per acre, oats (bu.) Yield per acre, alfalfa (tons)	39.1 20.8 33.2 3.2	30.1 18.1 20.8 1.8	34.8 23.9 37.0 2.0	
Edi	Productive livestock units per 100 A. No. of days of productive work No. of days of productive work per worker Power and equipment expense per day of prod.wo	14.9 506 288 ork \$.76	17.6 550 301 \$1.13	17.9 597 314 \$1.10	20.1 628 340 \$1.06
3. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr. dr	No. of work horses No. of colts No. of cows No. of head of other cattle No. of litters of pigs Pounds of hogs produced No. of head of sheep No. of hens	4.4 .6 12.7 13.8 3.7 * 26.0 102.5	4.2 .9 13.9 17.2 7.6 8404 23.7 78.9	4.3 .8 13.7 21.2 6.8 9950 30.9 93.4	19.9 8.7 12808
	Pounds of butterfat per cow No. of pigs per litter No. of eggs laid per hen Price received per pound of butterfat sold Price received per cwt. hogs sold Price received per dozen eggs sold	190 · 6.3 · 95 • \$.30 · * .21	178 5.6 102 \$.31 9.22 .18		7.55

^{*}Information not available.

Footnote for page 25:

The financial statements differ in that the unpaid family labor rate was \$40 per month for 1935, \$43 in 1936, and \$45 in 1937 and 1938; and the board for hired labor was figured at \$15 per month in 1935, and \$18 per month in 1936, 1937 and 1938. These adjustments to meet changes in the price level should be considered in comparing 1938 results with previous years.

The data for each of the first three years were for the 12 months' period beginning March first of the years indicated and ending February twenty-eighth of the following year. The data for 1938 were for the period January 1, 1938 to December 31, 1938.

Suggestions for Improvements

ernter's labor earnings (11) minus (12). PRS 1007 ESE ernter's labor earnings (11) minus (12). PRS 1007 ESE int, trick, was engine and electricity (new & expanse) was included with