








part 9

CATTLE, HOGS, SHEEP, GOATS

VOLUME V
SPECIAL REPORTS



1969 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE



Issued October 1973



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick B. Dent, Secretary
Sidney L. Jones, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs

Social and Economic Statistics Administration
Edward D. Failor, Administrator

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Vincent P. Barabba, Director



BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Vincent P. Barabba, Director
Robert L. Hagan, Deputy Director
James W. Turbitt, Associate Director

AGRICULTURE DIVISION

J. Thomas Breen, Chief

REPORTS OF THE 1969 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Individual County Reports

Eight-page reports have been issued for each county and State.

Volume I. Area Reports

A separate report has been published for each State, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory, and the Virgin Islands. The report consists of two sections. Section 1 contains State summary data, county summary of selected data, and miscellaneous items by counties; Section 2 contains the detailed county reports.

Volume II. General Report

Statistics by subject are presented in separate chapters with totals for the United States, regions, geographic divisions, and States. The nine chapters are being issued as individual reports as follows:

- Chapter 1 General Information; Procedures for Collection, Processing, Classification*
- Chapter 2 Farms: Number, Use of Land, Size of Farm*
- Chapter 3 Farm Management, Farm Operators*
- Chapter 4 Equipment, Labor, Expenditures, Chemicals*
- Chapter 5 Livestock, Poultry, Livestock and Poultry Products*
- Chapter 6 Crops, Nursery and Greenhouse Products, Forest Products*
- Chapter 7 Value of Products, Economic Class, Contracts*
- Chapter 8 Type of Farm*
- Chapter 9 Irrigation and Drainage on Farms*

Volume III. Agricultural Services

This new report contains data relating to agricultural services for the United States by State and county.

Volume IV. Irrigation

Data will be included on drainage basins, land irrigated, crop production on irrigated land, water conveyed, users, and types of organizations.

Volume V. Special Reports

Reports may contain data obtained from supplemental surveys, such as type of farm, horticulture, and farm finance; in addition to information obtained in the census.

- Parts 1 to 9. Type-of-Farm Operations.*—One for each of nine major type-of-farm classifications.
- Part 10. Horticultural Specialties.*
- Part 11. Farm Finance.*
- Part 12. Ranking Agricultural Counties.*
- Part 13. Forms and Procedures.*
- Part 14. Procedural History.*
- Part 15. Graphic Summary.*
- Part 16. Coverage Evaluation.*

Volume VI. Drainage of Agricultural Lands

This report will include agricultural drainage statistics collected from individual farms and from publicly organized drainage projects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS—Many persons contributed to the 1969 Census of Agriculture. First and foremost are the millions of farm operators, members of their families, and employees who furnished the information.

The Department of Agriculture cooperated at all levels: Local employees in the county offices of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Extension Service, and the Soil Conservation Service aided in the publicity and provided assistance to the farm operators who requested help in filling out the census forms correctly; personnel of the Economic Research Service and the Statistical Reporting Service were especially helpful in the determination of what data should be collected, the tabulations that were needed, and in the analytical review of the tabulations.

Members of the Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics and representatives from public and private agencies and firms gave generously of their time and effort in establishing the data requirements and priorities for collection and publication of the information.

The press, radio, and television media, especially those relating to agribusiness activities, were most helpful in promoting awareness of the 1969 census among farm and ranch operators and enlisting their cooperation.

Charles Merzel, International Statistical Programs Division, and **Ralph Graham** and **Jack Margolis**, Agriculture Division, were responsible for the systems and processing procedures, including clerical procedures and computer programming. **John Adkins**, **Reginald Masano**, and **Richard Buhrman**, Agriculture Division, and **John E. Lance** (resigned) made significant contributions to the computer programming.

A large part of the clerical operations were performed in the Data Preparation Division, Jeffersonville, Ind., **Hobert A. Yerkey**, Chief, under the supervision of **Rex Pullin**, **Don Adams**, and **Rebecca Nesbitt**. **John A. Blackledge**, **William Harlan**, and **John Wornack**, Agriculture Division, were responsible for the subject matter review in Jeffersonville.

Computer processing was performed in the Computer Services Division under the supervision of **James R. Pepal**, Chief.

J. Thomas Miller, consultant to the Chief, Agriculture Division, assisted in developing the table format and reviewed much of the text for this volume.

Orvin L. Wilhite, Assistant Division Chief, and **Thomas D. Monroe**, Chief of the Livestock Branch, assisted by **Avon B. Floyd**, participated in the overall planning and supervised the preparation of the data collection form, specifications for editing and tabulation, review of tabulations, and preparation of tables for this report on cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats. The specifications for precomputer and computer edit were prepared by **James A. Liefer** who also planned and reviewed the tables. **John A. Branch** wrote the text specifically related to the cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats survey. **Reginald Masano** prepared the formatting program. The computer edit program was written by **Charles King** and **William Eng**; **William Eng** wrote the tabulation program.

The program was under the primary direction of **J. Thomas Breen**, Chief, Agriculture Division.

SUGGESTED CITATION

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Agriculture, 1969
Volume V. Special Reports
Part 9. Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Goats

U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1973

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CARD NO. 72-601370
For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price \$8.50 Stock Number 0324-00234

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
Introduction	
The Farm Enterprise Surveys	
Authority, Area Covered, and Method	vii
History and Precedent	vii
Background and Purpose	vii
Scope of the Survey	viii
Development of Data Collection Forms, Content, and Format	viii
Method of Data Collection	viii
Processing Procedures for Individual Report Forms	ix
Tabulation Policy and Limitations	ix
Presentation of Data	ix
Relationship of Data to Other Agriculture Census Data	x
Census Confidentiality	x
Abbreviations and Symbols	x
Definitions and Explanations	x
Unpublished Data	xi
Sample Selection	xi
Farm Enterprises by Type of Farm	xii
Agricultural Labor Related to Specialized Operations	xiv
Exhibit 1. Sampling Rate by Total Value of Products Sold by Type of Farm	x
Exhibit 2. Enterprises in the Sample by Value of All Farm Products Sold	xiii
Text Table 1. Number of Enterprises in the Sample, by Type of Farm	xiii
2. Number of Enterprises, by Type of Farm: 1969	xiv
3. Relationship of Forms Tabulated to Forms in the Sample and to Farms by Type: 1969	xiv
Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Goats	
General Background	xv
Scope of the Livestock Survey	xv
Availability of Data	xvi
Presentation of Livestock Data	xvi
Imputation	xvi
Selected Reporting Items	xvii
Reporting Problems	xvii
Ownership and Purchases of Cattle and Hogs	xviii

TABLES

	<i>page</i>
STATE DATA	
Table 1. Cattle and Calves on Place	2
2. Cattle and Calves on Place Owned by Operator or Firm	4
3. Cattle and Calves on Place Owned by Landlord	6
4. Cattle and Calves on Place Owned by Others	8
5. Ownership of All Cattle and Calves on Place	10
6. Cattle and Calves Sold	12
7. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Sold for Slaughter	14
8. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Sold for Further Feeding	16
9. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Sold for Breeding	18
10. Cattle and Calves Sold for Dairy and Unknown Purposes	20
11. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Purchased	22
12. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Purchased by Source of Purchase	24
13. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Purchased for Breeding by Source of Purchase	26
14. Beef Cattle and Calves Fed for Others on a Custom Basis	28
15. Hogs and Pigs on Place	30
16. Hogs and Pigs on Place Owned by Operator or Firm	32
17. Hogs and Pigs on Place Owned by Landlord	34
18. Hogs and Pigs on Place Owned by Others	36
19. Ownership of All Hogs and Pigs on Place	38
20. Hogs and Pigs Sold	40
21. Hogs and Pigs Sold—Breeding Stock, Market Hogs	42
22. Hogs and Pigs Sold—Marketing and Production Contracts	44
23. Hogs and Pigs Sold—Breeding Stock, Feeder Pigs—Marketing and Production Contracts	46
24. Hogs and Pigs Sold—Market Hogs—Marketing and Production Contracts	47
25. Hogs and Pigs Purchased	49
26. Hogs and Pigs Purchased by Source of Purchase	51
27. Hogs and Pigs Purchased for Breeding by Source of Purchase	53
28. Hogs and Pigs Fed for Others on a Custom Basis	55
29. Sheep and Lambs—Inventory and Sales	57
30. Sheep and Lambs Sold for Breeding, Slaughter, Further Feeding	59
31. Sheep and Lambs Purchased	61
32. Sheep and Lambs Purchased by Source of Purchase	63
33. Sheep and Lambs Purchased for Breeding by Source of Purchase	65
34. Sheep and Lambs Fed for Others on a Custom Basis	67
35. Goats and Kids—Inventory, Sales, Mohair Clipped	68
36. Selected Capital Outlays and Production Expenses	70
37. Animal Health Costs—Beef Cattle	72
38. Animal Health Costs for Hogs	74
39. Animal Health Costs for Sheep and Goats	76
40. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	78
41. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Cattle in Feedlots Only	80
42. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Cattle Other Than in Feedlots	82
43. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Hogs and Pigs	84
44. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Sheep and Goats	86
45. Commercially Mixed Feed Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	88
46. Ingredient Feeds—Oilseed Meals Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	90
47. Ingredient Feeds—Urea, Molasses, Alfalfa Meal and Pellets Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	92
48. Ingredient Feeds—Animal Protein, Minerals, Other Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	94
49. Feed Grains—Corn, Sorghum, Oats Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	96
50. Feed Grains—Barley, Other—Forage Feed Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	98
51. Forage Feed—Hay Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Sheep, or Goats	100
52. Silage Feed Fed on Farms Reporting Cattle, Sheep, or Goats	102
53. Livestock Feed Purchased	104
54. Method of Mixing Feed for Beef Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, and Goats	106
55. Disposal of Beef Cattle Waste	108
56. Disposal of Hog Waste	110
57. Disposal of Sheep or Goat Waste	112
58. Bulk Grain Storage Bins for Feed for Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	114
59. Silos for Feed for Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, or Goats	116

TABLES—Continued

	<i>page</i>
STATE DATA—Continued	
Table 60. Machinery and Equipment—Silo Unloaders, Feed Grinder Mixers, Feed Grinders	118
61. Selected Machinery and Equipment—Feed Mixers, Mechanical Feeders, Dipping Vats	120
62. Combinations of Livestock Enterprises on Farms Reporting Cattle, Hogs, or Sheep Sold	122
63. Acreage and Cropland Harvested on Farms Reporting Livestock	124
64. Farm Operators Reporting Work on Farm	126
65. Farm Operators Reporting That 1/2 or More of the Days Worked on This Place Were Related to This Enterprise	128
66. Number of Other Unpaid Workers by Days Worked During Year	130
67. Number of Other Unpaid Workers for Which 1/2 or More of the Days Worked on This Place Were Related to This Enterprise	132
68. Regular Hired Workers—Farms, Workers, and Cash Wages by Days Worked During Year	134
69. Seasonal and Contract Workers—Farms and Cash Wages by Days Worked During Year	136
70. Farms Reporting, by Number of Man-Days of Hired Labor Worked During the Year	138
71. Farms Reporting Man-Days of Hired Labor, by Quarter in Which Most Man-Days Were Worked	140
72. Cash Wages Paid for Hired Labor and Farms Reporting Portion of Cash Wages Paid for Work Related to This Enterprise—Total, None, Less Than 1/4	142
73. Farms Reporting Portion of Cash Wages Paid for Work Related to This Enterprise—1/4 or 1/2, 1/2 or 3/4, 3/4 or More	144
 COUNTY DATA (<i>County table numbers are keyed to identical tables for the States</i>)	
1. Cattle and Calves on Place	148
6. Cattle and Calves Sold	202
8. Beef Purpose Cattle and Calves Sold for Further Feeding	256
15. Hogs and Pigs on Place	309
20. Hogs and Pigs Sold	361
41. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Cattle in Feedlots Only	413
42. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Cattle Other Than in Feedlots	463
43. Feed and Feed Supplements Fed to Hogs and Pigs	516
55. Disposal of Beef Cattle Waste	566
56. Disposal of Hog Waste	619

APPENDIX

Report Form 69-A18—Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Goats	A1
Reminder Card A84.1(L)A	A8
Reminder Card A84.1(L)B	A8

Introduction

THE FARM ENTERPRISE SURVEYS

The first part of this text provides information that applies to the nine specialized type-of-farm enterprises included in the survey. The second, provides information specifically related to the enterprise for which data are presented in this book.

Authority, Area Covered, and Method

The 1971 Survey of Specialized Agriculture was conducted as part of the 1969 Census of Agriculture authorized by the Congress of the United States in "Title 13, United States Code—Census," Sections 142(a) and 193. The survey was conducted primarily by mail, and covers all States except Alaska.

History and Precedent

The 1971 Survey of Specialized Agriculture is the first that is devoted almost entirely to providing data at the State and county level, in addition to that obtained on the general census of agriculture report form. It is, however, the natural outgrowth of prior agriculture census-taking activities in the sense that it reflects the Bureau's continuing effort to make available information fully descriptive of current developments in our Nation's agriculture. In association with the 1950 and more recent censuses of agriculture, special supplemental surveys have been utilized to provide, on a sample basis, selected items of information not included in the general reports. In general, these were items for which United States and regional totals were needed, but for which State and county totals could not be justified.

Following World War II, industrial and technological advances in animal breeding and nutrition, in machinery, and in the use of chemicals for fertilization and for weed and insect control together with a number of other factors, accelerated the movement of agricultural management toward specialization. Special tabulations and analyses of data for several major types of farm for the United States and the geographic regions in which each had substantial significance were presented in volume III, part 9, chapters 1 to 9 of the published reports for the 1954 Census of Agriculture.

During the planning of the 1969 census program, it was recognized that specialization had attained a position that could not be adequately described by statistics limited to the national and regional levels. Accordingly, within the limits of the appropriated funds, adjustments were made to provide for specialized type-of-farm enterprise surveys that would provide

supplemental data for States and for counties with significant amounts of the specified activities.

Background and Purpose

During the planning stage of each agriculture census, opportunity is provided to the various Federal and other government agencies, universities, news media, manufacturers, processors, marketers, farm organizations, and members of the general public to make known the items related to agricultural organization and production for which data are needed. The data demands made in preparation for the five most recent censuses of agriculture have included an increasing number of economic oriented items. More and more of these items are specialized in nature, and not appropriate for inclusion in a general report form directed to all farm operators.

The trend of these data demands has paralleled the movement of agriculture from generalized to specialized operations. The desire to lower the cost per unit of production has led to the development of tractors with more and more power and with an increasing variety of attachments; of specialized, often self-propelled tilling and harvesting machines; of chemicals for weed and insect control; of improved breeds of livestock and higher-yielding varieties of seeds. These developments have made it feasible for farm operators to handle more and more land. Indeed, the purchase cost of these larger, more specialized machines, and of the improved livestock and seeds, have made it economically mandatory for farm operators to handle more land, and to become more specialized in their agricultural operations. Because it has become increasingly advantageous, many farm operators have specialized in only one product, while others have reduced the number of products but have specialized in several products in order to make fuller use of labor and equipment throughout the year. Thus, the general farms that produce a variety of crops, poultry, livestock and their products have decreased in number and in variety of products, while specialization has increasingly become more representative of North American agriculture.

The purpose of the 1971 Survey of Specialized Agriculture was to collect relevant data specifically related to each of nine specialized types of agricultural production. A separate data collection form was used for each specialization so that the information collected could be restricted to items directly involved in the type of agricultural operation being conducted. Farms that in 1969 reported sales of at least \$10,000 for each of two or more specialized operations were asked to complete the two or more related data collection forms. The results of the

survey are presented in nine separately published reports, as follows:

Volume V,

- Part 1. Grains, Soybeans, Dry Beans and Dry Peas
2. Tobacco
3. Cotton
4. Sugar Crops, Potatoes, Other Specified Crops
5. Vegetables, Including Tomatoes and Melons
6. Fruits, Nuts, and Berries
7. Poultry
8. Dairy
9. Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Goats

The agricultural products assigned to each of these fields of specialization are generally the same as for the corresponding type-of-farm classifications for which agricultural census data have been presented since 1959. A more detailed listing of the products comprising each type of specialization is given in the discussion of **sample selection**.

Scope of the Survey

The farm operators included in the 1971 Survey of Specialized Agriculture were a stratified sample selected from those who operated farms in 1969 with sales of at least \$2,500. The sample rate varied by economic class and type of farm to provide estimates for quantitative items with an acceptable level of accuracy for publication at the county level for those counties with significant activity and at the same time to minimize the respondent burden.

These surveys were neither intended nor designed to provide universe totals for the items included in the survey at the county, State, or national level. In general, no attempt was made to contact successors to those operators in the sample who had ceased agricultural operations in 1969 or later. Neither was any attempt made to contact newly established operators. Further, for those sample farms still operating in 1971, no attempt was made to obtain data for any additional specialized operations that had not been conducted in 1969, or if conducted, that were not large enough to be included in the survey. Partially offsetting the effects of these omissions, however, those who had enlarged their specialized operations since 1969 were asked to include the entire 1971 specialized operation in their reports.

These surveys were designed to provide information about the extent to which various production and other practices and facilities, including specialized equipment, are reported on farms having the specialized enterprises, and to provide data for those counties where the enterprise has some significance. This information is intended to serve as the basis for further analysis and estimates with regard to related data from other sources.

Development of Data Collection Forms, Content, and Format

Development of the specialized report forms began in the latter part of 1968. The principal items included in the report forms

were suggested in the meetings of the Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics in April and October 1968 and in written suggestions received from various governmental agencies and private organizations during 1968 and 1969. These suggestions were augmented and refined by staff research and consultation with the suggesting agencies and organizations. Particularly noteworthy was the assistance provided by the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In May 1969, draft versions of three of the specialized report forms (Grains, Soybeans, Dry Beans, Dry Peas; Cotton; and Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, Goats) were field tested in a limited number of interviews conducted by professional staff members who also obtained the respondent's reactions to the purpose and content of the survey.

Based on an evaluation of these interviews and further research, data collection forms were developed for 11 type-of-farm enterprises for further testing. These forms were mailed on August 28, 1969, to nearly 1,300 addressees who had had agricultural operations in 1964 sufficient to qualify them as operators of specialized agricultural enterprises. One mail followup was sent to nonrespondents in early October. Letters accompanying both mailings stated the purpose of the test and asked for the addressee's assistance on a voluntary basis.

Approximately 400 report forms were returned to the Bureau in various stages of completion. These returns were analyzed for completeness and apparent accuracy of response. Of particular interest were items for which response was not complete or was apparently inconsistent with other data. Also considered was the format of the various sections of the report form. Did the respondent follow the flow of the items to be answered? Did he understand what information was wanted? Was he able to supply the information requested?

On the basis of the analysis, the final versions of the data collection forms were prepared. Two of the 11 types of enterprises (those for "General" and "Miscellaneous" farms) were dropped from the survey as not being identifiable as "specializations" for which the data about management and operation practices, inventory, and equipment would yield sufficient characterization. Other changes included revisions in format, the deletion of some items for which there was evidence of poor response capability, and the standardization of some sections common to two or more enterprises.

Method of Data Collection

The survey was conducted primarily on a mailout/mailback basis. A farm included in the sample received a separate report form for each of the specialized enterprises for which it qualified. The forms were mailed early in January 1972. A "Thank you" reminder card (see appendix) was sent to each addressee on January 12th, and up to six followup letters were mailed to nonrespondents at intervals between February 1 and June 30. As of April 9, all nonrespondent operators who had reported sales of \$100,000 or more in 1969 were assigned for direct interview by personal visit or telephone. For economic efficiency of field operations, personal visits were restricted to those counties with eight nonrespondents or more. The nonrespondents in all other counties were interviewed by telephone.

Those nonrespondents with sales of less than \$100,000 were handled in a second effort, during July and August 1972. Interviews by personal visit were restricted to counties with 12 nonrespondents or more. In the remaining counties, nonrespondents received additional request letters, supplemented to some extent by telephone interviewing. The general effort to obtain reports from nonrespondents was stopped at the end of August. Of the 412,000 forms mailed out in the surveys, returns were received for 390,000, of which 340,000 were considered in scope and appropriate for inclusion in the survey tabulations. During the processing operations, telephone calls were used to resolve the internal consistency or incompleteness of the reports for large operations.

Processing Procedures for Individual Report Forms

As the forms were received from the respondents they were checked in. Periodically the address register was updated and a reminder letter was sent to nonrespondents. If more than one specialized form had been required for the same farm, they were held together until completion of the pre-key clerical edit process.

The basic edit policy for the survey was to accumulate and present the publishable data the forms contained without attempting the followup required to obtain data for every section of every form, or, except in a few instances, to impute for missing data.

Implementation of this policy called for a pre-key clerical edit sufficient only to make the data keyable, and to assure consistency between two or more specialized forms for the same farm. The computer edit programs identified and resolved or displayed incomplete items, inconsistencies and data outside limit parameters. In general, no attempt was made to impute for completely missing items of data. However, if one part of a question was answered but some other part was not, the missing item was imputed.

For example, if the number of animals sold was reported but the value was missing, then the value was imputed; if acres were reported without yield, or yield without acres, then the missing component was imputed. Insertion of missing data based on information for an adjacent farm or for other items reported for the same farm was held to a minimum. Nationwide parameters were used for testing the ratios of production to acres, production to sales, etc. Thus, the major review and correction of the individual reports followed computer rejection of questionable data. Corrections were keyed to tape, merged into the record tape and re-edited to assure that the records were acceptable for tabulation.

The edit process included three computer passes. The first of these presented the problems, the second and third, following merging of keyed corrections, monitored the acceptability of the corrected records, as compared with the edit rules.

Tabulation Policy and Limitations

The type-of-farm enterprise survey was designed as a follow-on survey to the 1969 agriculture census. It was financed out of the savings resulting from the use of mail procedures for data

collection, modification of the evaluation program, and improvements in the programing and processing of the regular census. Limited financial and staff resources dictated a modest tabulation and publication program. The tabulations presented in this report consist, for the most part, of basic summations of individual data items. Selected data are presented separately for farms that reported some specified condition, such as milk cows on hand, or turkeys sold.

The percentages and ratios presented or that may be derived from the data are believed to be representative of the farms conducting that type of enterprise within the geographic area.

The base data are those that were reported by the farms that responded to the survey, multiplied by their assigned sample weights. Thus, published totals are not estimates for all such enterprises in the given county or State but only for those that were represented in the sample drawn and that responded to the item tabulated. No attempt was made to identify and include in the survey enterprises organized since 1969 or grown large enough since 1969 to qualify. In general, no attempt was made to impute for completely missing items of data on partially completed report forms.

Presentation of Data

The standard pattern of the tabulations provides three lines of data for each area (State or county) for which data are shown, as follows:

Principal enterprise—That enterprise (product or groups of products for which sales in 1969 amounted to \$10,000 or more) which in 1969 represented 50 percent or more of the total value of sales for the farm. This enterprise is the same as the type of farm code for the place for 1969. **EXCEPTION:** For 14,538 farms in the \$10,000 to \$19,999 TVP group the principal specialized operation had less than \$10,000 of sales. The in-scope report forms for these operations that were returned by the respondents have been included in the tabulations on the **PRINCIPAL** line, since the report forms were sorted by total value of products sold by the farm, rather than by the value of sales of the product or group of products comprising the specialized operation.

Secondary enterprise—An enterprise (product or group of products for which sales in 1969 amounted to \$10,000 or more) on a place with a principal enterprise. If three or more enterprises were conducted on the same place, all except the enterprise that agreed with the type-of-farm code were secondary.

Under \$10,000—For places with less than \$10,000 total value of products, the specialized operation that agreed with the 1969 type of farm.

The data are weighted estimates, based on the information furnished by the respondents to the survey. Sampling rates are shown in exhibit 1. Data are presented for all States and for all counties in which more than a limited number of farms were engaged in the enterprise. No data are shown separately by county if less than 10 reports for the enterprise were tabulated. For some enterprises the minimum number of tabulated reports for publication at the county level was set at some higher

Exhibit 1. Sampling Rate by Total Value of Products Sold by Type of Farm

	Type of farm and expansion factor									
	Cash-grain	Tobacco	Cotton	Field crop	Vegetable	Fruit and nut	Poultry	Dairy	Other live-stock ¹	General and misc. ²
\$100,000 and over	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
\$40,000 to \$99,999	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
\$20,000 to \$39,999	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	8	2
\$10,000 to \$19,999	8	4	4	2	2	2	4	8	16	(3)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	16	8	8	4	4	4	8	16	32	(3)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	32	16	16	8	8	8	16	32	64	(3)

NOTE: These rates are based on 1969 Census of Agriculture distribution.

¹ Includes livestock ranches for 17 Western States, Louisiana, Florida, and Hawaii.

² Expansion factors assigned to secondary enterprises on these types of farm.

³ Not in survey.

number. The minimum number of tabulated reports for which separate county data are shown for the type-of-farm enterprise presented in this report is given in the part of this text that deals specifically with the enterprise.

Data for all counties with less than the minimum number of reports have been combined and are presented for "All other counties." Those who desire to examine ratios, comparisons between items, etc., for *enterprises* of a given type may do so by first combining the data presented for "principal" and "secondary" enterprises.

Similarly, those who wish to compare 1971 data with data by type of farm previously published from the 1969 Census of Agriculture should combine the data presented for "principal enterprises" and for places whose major agricultural operation had sales of "Under \$10,000."

Relationship of Data to Other Agriculture Census Data

The 1971 data presented for the various specialized agricultural enterprises are, for the most part, an extension of the 1969 data previously published by type of farm in volume I and in chapter 8, volume II of the published reports of the 1969 Census of Agriculture.

Acres of land in the farm by ownership, acres of cropland harvested, farm labor information, and total sales and expenses were the only items common to every specialized enterprise report form. In addition, the report form for each specialized enterprise contained inventory, production, and sales items appropriate to the type of agricultural products comprising the enterprise. These basic items provide a rough measure of the coverage of the 1971 specialized enterprise, as compared with 1969 census data for the corresponding type of farm. They also provide some basis for evaluation, analysis, and interpretation of the specialized information obtained and presented.

Census Confidentiality

The data in this report have been reviewed to prevent the disclosure of individual operations, while presenting as many items of data as feasible. The probability of recognizing data

about an individual operation is a function of the size of the operation and the number of farms reporting the item. For State totals, only an extremely large quantity reported would be recognized as possibly pertaining to the operations of an individual farm. For a county also, the number would need to be so large as to be grossly atypical of such operations within the county. Further, it is highly unlikely that anyone would know whether another's enterprise was "principal" or "secondary" in a county with 10 occurrences or more of the enterprise. Thus, the general policy was developed that a report for a secondary enterprise that exceeded 10 percent of the amount reported for the principal enterprises would be suppressed since it might be possible for others to associate the number with the specific farm that reported it. At least two numbers were deleted in the same line of any table that consisted of a total and detail to avoid the possibility of the user obtaining the missing number by subtraction.

This policy was adopted, in lieu of deleting all numbers for which less than three farms were tabulated because it permitted a very large reduction in the number of cells of data to be suppressed (and therefore a large reduction in the time and cost of the operation) with little likelihood of revealing the individual operations of any farm.

Abbreviations and Symbols

The following abbreviations and symbols are used throughout the published tables:

Z—Less than half of one unit reported

D—Data withheld to avoid disclosure of information for individual enterprises.

Definitions and Explanations

Except for the introduction of the term "Enterprise" (defined in the paragraph on **presentation of data**) the definitions and explanations are the same as for the other parts of the 1969 census, and are as fully comparable as possible with reports of earlier censuses. The more important definitions and explanations, including any variations from earlier censuses, are provided on pages 6 through 12 of chapter 1, volume II of the

published reports of the 1969 Census of Agriculture. The reproduction of the specialized enterprise data collection form in the appendix provides the content of the survey and the frame of reference for each data item.

Unpublished Data

The individual enterprise records from which these published tabulations were prepared are being retained for a period of about 5 years in computer processable form. Thus, it will be possible for the Census Bureau to prepare special tabulations for which a demand arises. Such tabulations could be tailored to the specific needs of the requester and would be done at the requester's expense. The cost would include programing, tabulation, review for consistency with published data, and suppression of data that would disclose individual operations. Inquiries should be directed to the Chief, Agriculture Division, Bureau of the Census, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Washington, D.C. 20233.

Sample Selection

For the purpose of the farm enterprise surveys an enterprise occurs within a farm if the value of products sold for the product or product group included in the enterprise description is \$10,000 or greater.

The universe for the 1971 Farm Enterprise Surveys was the 1969 Census of Agriculture data file excluding farms with total value of products less than \$2,500, abnormal (primarily institutional) farms, and all farms located in Alaska.

For selection of the samples, the universe was stratified by value-of-sales class within type of farm, within State. The basic samples were selected by type of farm with all enterprises included in the sample farm (except "General" and "Miscellaneous") also included in enterprise sample. Farms classified as general or miscellaneous types were sent the applicable report forms only for their secondary enterprises, if any. The products or groups of products assigned to each enterprise (or enterprise-like) classification are the same as those for corresponding type-of-farm classifications, except that sales of dairy cattle and calves were included in the livestock-farm type classification in 1969 and in the dairy-farm enterprise classification for 1971.

The procedure used in selecting the sample for the type of farm enterprise survey was—

1. For each type of farm, select an indicated number of farms within each total value of products sold (TVP) stratum. Sampling rates by type of farm and TVP stratum are given in exhibit 1. The resulting numbers of enterprises in the samples are given in exhibit 2.
2. Once a farm is selected for the sample, determine the enterprises (product or group of products with sales of \$10,000 or more) and provide a report form for each. By definition, only those farms with total value of products of \$10,000 or greater could include an enterprise; however, it was possible for some farms with total value of products between \$10,000 and \$20,000 to have no enterprise. (Note: These farms, however, were tabulated

in the line for PRINCIPAL enterprises since the sorting was based on the total value of products sold by the farm.)

3. If a sample farm has no enterprise, provide a report form matching its type of farm. However, exclude general and miscellaneous farms, regardless of size, when they do not include at least one in-scope enterprise.

The effect of this procedure is—

1. Estimates are provided for all nine of the enterprises in scope for the surveys.
2. Estimates for enterprise-like statistics are provided for farms with 1969 total value of products of \$2,500 or greater but which include no enterprises. These estimates are by type of farm and are not combined with the estimates for enterprises.
3. Except for the qualifying farms containing no enterprise, there are no estimates for farm characteristics which are not included in an enterprise. For example, if a sample farm with \$39,000 total value of products sold has a \$20,000 grains enterprise and an \$11,000 tobacco enterprise and cotton sales of \$8,000, cotton operations characteristics from that farm are not included in the estimates.
4. No estimates are provided from farms having TVP less than \$2,500.

Simple unbiased estimates are provided for totals. They are based on reports received, with no adjustment for nonresponse, or for enterprises established since 1969. Sampling errors have not been presented. The purpose of the reports is to present characteristics for only those enterprises and farms reporting and not to provide estimates for the universe. Time and other resources were not available to follow up nonrespondents as intensively as was desired and for given enterprises it was believed unsafe to assume a distribution for characteristics. Greatest effort was made in following up nonrespondent farms with expansion factors of 1 and 2. Thus, the sampling error for enterprises such as sugar, potatoes, and other field crops; vegetables, including tomatoes and melons; and fruits and nuts should be close to negligible for characteristics reported by all farms containing the enterprise.

Estimates are provided for specialized enterprises corresponding to nine type-of-farm classifications, as follows:

Grains, Soybeans, Dry Beans, Dry Peas (vol. V, part 1)

Barley for grain	Mustard seed
Buckwheat for grain	Oats for grain
Corn for grain	Proso millet
Cow peas for dry peas	Rice
Dry field and seed beans	Rye for grain
Dry field and seed peas	Safflower
Emmer and spelt	Sorghum for grain (includes milo)
Flaxseed	Soybeans for beans
Mixed grains for grain	Wheat for grain

Tobacco (vol. V, part 2)

Tobacco

Cotton (vol. V, part 3)
Cotton

Sugar Crops, Potatoes, and Other Specified Crops (vol. V, part 4)

Broomcorn	Popcorn
Castor beans	Sesame seed
Dill for oil	Sugar beets for seed
Flax for fiber	Sugar beets for sugar
Guar	Sugarcane for seed
Hops	Sugarcane for sirup
Irish potatoes	Sugarcane for sugar
Lentils	Sunflower seed
Mint for oil	Sweet corn for seed
Mung beans	Sweetpotatoes
Peanuts for nuts	

Vegetables, Including Tomatoes and Melons (vol. V, part 5)

Asparagus	Lettuce and romaine
Beets	Radishes
Cabbage	Snapbeans, bush and pole
Cantaloups, persians, and muskmelons	Squash and pumpkins
Carrots	Sweet corn
Cucumbers and pickles	Sweet peppers
Dry onions	Tomatoes
Green lima beans	Watermelons
Green peas	Other vegetables

Fruits, Nuts, and Berries (vol. V, part 6)

Citrus fruits:	Berries:
Grapefruit	Blackberries and dewberries
Oranges	Blueberries
Lemons	Cranberries
All other citrus	Raspberries
Noncitrus tree fruits:	Strawberries
Apples	All other berries
Cherries	Tree nuts:
Peaches	Walnuts, English or Persian
Pears	Almonds
Plums and prunes	Pecans, improved
All other noncitrus fruits	Pecans, wild and seedling
Grapes, American type	Other fruit and nut trees
Grapes, European type:	
Raisin varieties	
Table varieties	
Wine varieties	

Poultry, (vol. V., part 7)
Poultry and eggs

Dairy (vol. V., part 8)

Milk
Dairy cows and heifers
Dairy bulls

Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, and Goats (vol. V, part 9)

Beef cattle and calves
Hogs and pigs
Sheep and lambs
Goats, kids, mohair

Type-of-farm operations not represented by corresponding specialized enterprise survey report forms are—

General:

Field seed crops, hay, grass, and silage. A farm was also classified as general if it had cash income from three or more sources and did not meet the criteria for any other type.

Miscellaneous:¹

Greenhouse and nursery products, mushrooms, sod, forest products, mules, horses, colts, ponies, fur-bearing animals, bees, honey, goat milk, and farms with no value of farm products sold. Also all institutional farms and Indian reservations.

Farm Enterprises by Type of Farm

Table 1 shows the enterprises for each census type of farm in the sample. For example, the horizontal line for cash-grain farms shows the various specialized enterprise report forms that cash-grain farms received. The first number (12,028) represents cash-grain farms with less than \$10,000 sales of cash grains. Such farms received the enterprise form that corresponded with their type-of-farm classification. The second number (44,551) represents cash-grain farms with \$10,000 or more sales of cash grains. The third number shows that 66 of the 44,551 farms whose principal enterprise was cash grain also had a secondary tobacco enterprise (\$10,000 or more of tobacco sales). Additional secondary enterprises on the selected sample farms whose principal enterprise was cash grain were cotton, 2,060; other field crops, 741; vegetables, 315; fruit and nut, 88; poultry, 45; dairy, 517; and other livestock, 8,184. The total number of report forms (all nine specializations) sent to farms whose principal type of operation was cash grain was 68,595.

The vertical columns of table 1 show the number of farms by type that received a specific specialized report form. For example, the tobacco column shows 18,852 total tobacco enterprise forms mailed, of which 66 went to cash-grain-type farms, 8,496 to tobacco-type farms, 12 to cotton type of farm, etc. The last entry in this column (7,636) is tobacco-type farms with less than \$10,000 sales of tobacco; therefore they received a tobacco enterprise report form.

To determine the number of farms classified as a specific type of farm, it is necessary to add the "farms under \$10,000" group to the group classified for that type. For example, to determine the number of farms classified as tobacco type, add the "farms under \$10,000" group (7,636) to the tobacco type of farm group (8,496) which equals 16,132. These 16,132 tobacco-type farms received 16,132 tobacco enterprise report forms and 1,495 report forms for other enterprises.

Table 2 shows the universe from which mailing cases were selected. Farm counts derived from table 2 for type-of-farm classifications can be related directly to counts available from the 1969 Census of Agriculture.

Table 3 provides data indicating the extent of coverage shown in the tabulations of the farm enterprise surveys. The unweighted

¹ A census of greenhouse products, nursery products, mushrooms and sod was taken for the year 1970. (Volume V, part 10).

Exhibit 2. Enterprises in the Sample by Value of All Farm Products Sold

	Type of farm enterprise								
	Cash-grain	Tobacco	Cotton	Other field crops	Vegetables	Fruit and nut	Poultry	Dairy	Other livestock
Total	95,700	18,852	18,389	27,141	15,020	29,234	38,920	61,202	107,887
Principal enterprise	48,495	10,172	9,198	17,168	9,311	22,296	36,472	49,985	73,154
Secondary enterprise	39,121	2,720	7,225	7,897	4,103	2,082	1,696	7,701	27,265
Other	8,084	5,960	1,966	2,076	1,606	4,856	752	3,516	7,468
\$10,000 or more	83,672	11,216	15,384	23,693	12,879	23,903	37,917	55,421	97,438
Principal enterprise	44,551	8,496	8,159	15,796	8,776	21,821	36,221	47,720	70,173
Secondary enterprise	39,121	2,720	7,225	7,897	4,103	2,082	1,696	7,701	27,265
Under \$10,000	12,028	7,636	3,005	3,448	2,141	5,331	1,003	5,781	10,449
Principal enterprise	3,944	1,676	1,039	1,372	535	475	251	2,265	2,981
Other	8,084	5,960	1,966	2,076	1,606	4,856	752	3,516	7,468
\$100,000 or more									
Principal	4,120	245	1,128	2,201	2,138	2,788	8,525	4,974	20,939
Secondary	12,344	585	2,929	3,005	1,885	1,093	571	1,286	5,472
\$40,000 to 99,999									
Principal	14,529	1,856	3,315	4,955	2,564	5,638	18,388	14,809	30,880
Secondary	20,357	1,548	3,275	3,787	1,770	771	887	4,101	14,423
\$20,000 to 39,999									
Principal	17,877	3,746	2,846	6,753	2,903	8,528	7,707	20,345	13,088
Secondary	6,420	587	1,021	1,105	448	218	238	2,314	7,370
\$10,000 to 19,999									
Principal (>\$10,000)	8,025	2,649	870	1,887	1,171	4,867	1,601	7,592	5,266
Principal (<\$10,000)	3,944	1,676	1,039	1,372	535	475	251	2,265	2,981
\$5,000 to 9,999									
Under \$10,000	5,616	3,797	1,076	1,455	1,055	3,194	535	2,893	4,764
\$2,500 to 4,999									
Under \$10,000	2,468	2,163	890	621	551	1,662	217	623	2,704

Note: These counts are based on 1969 Census of Agriculture distributions.

number of forms tabulated are shown with the unweighted number of forms mailed for each type. Data were not imputed for nonresponse nor for forms received which were incomplete or no longer in scope.

Expanded figures are shown for principal and secondary enterprises and for the reports for farms with less than \$10,000 value of products sold (1969) by type of enterprise and farm.

The expanded figures for specialized reports by type of farm are shown with the number of farms by type from the 1969 Census of Agriculture.

Comparisons with data shown in table 1 and exhibit 2 provide some interesting relationships of the expanded reports tabulated with the unweighted number of forms mailed. For example, the weighted number of principal tobacco enterprises tabulated,

Table 1. Number of Enterprises in the Sample, by Type of Farm

	Farms under \$10,000 ¹	Enterprises									Total
		Cash-grain	Tobacco	Cotton	Other field crops	Vegetables	Fruit and nut	Poultry	Dairy	Other livestock	
Total.....	(X)	95,700	18,852	18,389	27,141	15,020	29,234	38,920	61,202	107,887	412,345
Type of farm:											
Cash-grain.....	12,028	44,551	66	2,060	741	315	88	45	517	8,184	68,595
Tobacco.....	7,636	659	8,496	56	159	29	3	13	49	527	17,627
Cotton.....	3,005	3,599	12	8,159	157	135	59	4	9	586	15,725
Other field crops.....	3,448	2,992	93	280	15,796	668	88	18	146	1,489	25,018
Vegetables.....	2,141	1,087	23	246	704	8,776	532	14	70	249	13,842
Fruit and nut.....	5,331	254	9	158	105	476	21,821	33	74	381	28,642
Poultry.....	1,003	876	329	95	99	142	184	36,221	851	2,375	42,175
Dairy.....	5,781	2,079	205	211	207	153	116	47,720	3,739	60,442	
Other livestock.....	10,449	17,350	386	604	1,402	255	194	472	2,663	70,173	103,948
General and miscellaneous.....	0	10,225	1,597	3,515	4,323	1,930	818	866	3,322	9,735	36,331
Farms under \$10,000 ¹	(X)	12,028	7,636	3,005	3,448	2,141	5,331	1,003	5,781	10,449	(X)

¹Not considered an enterprise because sales for the principal product group were under \$10,000. (See exhibit 2.) These places received only the specialized report form corresponding to their type of farm.

Table 2. Number of Enterprises, by Type of Farm: 1969

(Universe from which farms in the sample were selected)

	Farms under \$10,000	Enterprises								Total	
		Cash-grain	Tobacco	Cotton	Other field crops	Vegetables	Fruit and nut	Poultry	Dairy		Other livestock
Total.....	(X)	433,948	95,998	50,865	41,680	24,525	56,101	59,990	276,723	691,087	1,869,280
Type of farm:											
Cash-grain.....	200,485	168,840	146	4,088	1,577	555	120	100	1,319	19,086	396,316
Tobacco.....	71,651	758	20,277	56	176	31	3	15	74	684	93,725
Cotton.....	27,007	4,243	13	13,585	162	142	65	5	9	659	45,890
Other field crops.....	13,488	2,992	93	280	17,720	668	88	18	146	1,489	36,982
Vegetables.....	9,755	1,087	23	246	704	9,926	532	14	70	249	22,606
Fruit and nut.....	27,001	254	9	158	105	476	26,718	33	74	381	55,209
Poultry.....	8,765	914	336	98	101	145	190	48,739	894	2,478	62,660
Dairy.....	84,118	4,434	434	256	340	243	155	480	176,280	9,055	277,795
Other livestock.....	372,238	36,573	916	920	2,152	381	309	812	9,072	271,705	695,078
General and miscellaneous.....	138,363	13,368	2,100	4,171	5,155	2,203	920	1,009	4,667	13,063	187,019
Farms under \$10,000.....	(X)	200,485	71,651	27,007	13,488	9,755	27,001	8,765	84,118	372,238	(X)

¹Total includes general and miscellaneous.

Table 3. Relationship of Forms Tabulated to Forms in the Sample and to Farms by Type: 1969

	Cash-grain	Tobacco	Cotton	Field crop	Vegetable	Fruit and nut	Poultry	Dairy	Other livestock	Total
Specialized reports mailed.....	95,700	18,852	18,389	27,141	15,020	29,234	38,920	61,202	107,887	412,345
Specialized reports tabulated.....	81,491	14,256	14,816	20,145	10,874	23,352	30,776	50,291	90,546	336,547
Specialized reports tabulated, expanded.....	351,906	69,347	37,188	29,921	17,379	45,710	45,345	222,293	561,397	1,380,486
Principal enterprises.....	172,643	21,124	14,663	16,084	8,441	23,425	39,045	164,218	271,216	730,859
Secondary enterprises.....	55,618	2,959	8,253	7,799	3,330	2,014	1,779	10,170	39,584	131,506
Under \$10,000.....	123,645	45,264	14,272	6,038	5,608	20,271	4,521	47,905	250,597	518,121
Farms by type, 1969.....	369,312	89,903	40,534	31,190	19,660	53,754	57,545	260,956	647,884	1,570,738
Specialized reports by type of farm (principal plus under \$10,000).....	295,172	66,424	28,935	22,118	11,245	43,548	43,566	212,123	521,813	1,244,944
Percent of 1969 farms by type.....	79.9	73.9	71.4	70.9	57.2	81.0	75.7	81.3	80.5	79.3

21,136, represents the useable returns received from the 10,172 forms mailed (8,496 principal enterprise, \$10,000 or more, table 1; and 1,676, less than \$10,000, exhibit 2). The 45,288 tabulated tobacco reports for farms with less than \$10,000 in sales of all farm products represent the useable returns received from the 5,960 forms mailed (exhibit 2). The figure of 3,007 for secondary tobacco enterprises tabulated represent the useable returns received from the 2,720 secondary tobacco enterprises on farms of all other types that were drawn in the sample and to which tobacco forms were mailed (table 1).

Agricultural Labor Related to Specialized Operations

The items pertaining to labor were identical for all nine of the specialized surveys. These inquiries were divided into three separate parts. These three parts are as follows: (1) Operator and unpaid workers, (2) paid workers, and (3) man-days worked by paid workers. (See the reproduced data-collection form in the appendix.)

Data on the number of days the operator worked and the portion of expenditures for hired labor related to the given enterprise are shown only for the reports that provided both the number of days worked and the portion of labor expenditures related to the given enterprise. Incomplete responses were not imputed or otherwise corrected and were not included in the tabulations. Separate data by days worked are shown for those operators who reported that one-half of their work or more was related to the given enterprise.

The same limitation on presentation of the data was used for the number of unpaid workers and the number of days they worked. The reporting of these other unpaid workers was more incomplete than for the operator due to the necessity of listing each unpaid worker. Many operators apparently did not

consider their wives or children as farm workers if they did only infrequent work on the farm. There was no attempt made to impute or otherwise correct the reports for unpaid labor.

In presenting data for hired workers the following definitions were used:

Regular workers represent those workers who performed agricultural work on a farm 150 days or more during the year.

Part-time workers (seasonal) represent those workers who performed agricultural work on a farm less than 150 days during the year. Such workers may have worked as little as part of one day or as much as full time for not more than 149 days on a particular farm.

Contract workers represent those workers who performed agricultural work on a farm, but who were paid by a crewleader, contractor, buyer, processor, cooperative, customwork operator, or other such person having an oral or written agreement with the farm operator.

Man-day is considered to be any day on which a person was employed one hour or more.

The data relating to regular hired workers include the number of farms reporting, number of workers, and cash wages for the farms reporting workers working 250 days or more and farms reporting workers working 150 to 249 days. Additional data are also presented for farms reporting 3/4 or more of the cash wages paid for regular farm workers being used on the given enterprise. Only those reports showing number of workers, cash wages, and the proportion of cash wages paid for work on the given enterprise are included in the data shown.

CATTLE, HOGS, SHEEP, GOATS

General Background

Since World War II, the livestock industry has been changing significantly at a very rapid pace. There have been substantial technological and sociological changes in the production of cattle and hogs, and to a lesser extent in the production of sheep and goats.

The specialized 1971 Agriculture Survey of Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, and Goats was conducted to obtain more in-depth and intensive information than was feasible to collect on the regular census report. Because little information was available nationwide at the county level on in-depth characteristics of livestock operations, information was collected pertaining to the ownership of beef cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats, number sold by purpose, number purchased by source, number fed on a custom basis, various production expenses, animal health costs, waste disposal methods, feed usage by kind, feed storage facilities, and labor. Items of information not previously available are compared to traditional census items such as inventory or sales for the same farms in many of the publication tables. These relationships should provide some measure of distribution of the characteristics of cattle, hog, sheep, and goat operations throughout the United States, including their impact on the quality of our environment.

Cattle production—The number of cattle herds has decreased, but the number of cattle marketed has increased greatly. According to the 1969 Census of Agriculture, the decade of the 1960's witnessed rapid growth in cattle feeding in the southwestern plains States. Investment decisions involving millions of dollars were made as feedlots were constructed and slaughtering facilities moved into the area. The southwestern plains emerged as an important feeding area during the decade that the cattle-feeding industry experienced a substantial increase. Noteworthy among these changes are the increase in beef production, the relative increase of fed cattle produced to total production of cattle, and shifts in the production areas and movement of feeder cattle. Historically, the corn belt has been the center of cattle feeding, but in recent years, the industry has expanded more in the western and southwestern regions. Accompanying this growth have been changes in several dimensions of feeding operations. Large commercial feedlots have come into existence and farmer feeding operations have expanded. Custom feeding has been important in the growth of the livestock industry, especially in the West. Farmer feeding has remained centered in the central part of the United States. The demand for beef and beef products has been strong and has made the growth of the industry possible. Changes in technology, equipment, management, and nutrition have assisted in the growth and provided means for changes to occur. The livestock industry as a whole experienced a period of relative prosperity, benefiting from unprecedented increases in demand for fed beef and from significant advances in feeding technology and management skills.

Hog production—The hog business is going through a revolution at the present time. Competition is forcing hog producers to cut production costs, to increase their volume of operations, and to

pay more attention to the production of high-quality animals. The general trend is toward increased specialization, multiple or successive farrowings, and the use of complete rations.

Sheep production—The downward trend in the number of sheep operations has been going on for some time. Most of the decrease stems from the greater variation in lamb prices than in cattle and hog prices. Also sheep ranches face other problems such as hiring good herders. The frontier is gone, and the public domain and other open range on which these ranchers depend for their existence has contracted. The production of manmade fibers has increased and has eroded the ranchers' wool market.

Goat production—Like sheep production, the number of farms having goats on hand has been declining also. Since approximately 80 percent of the goats reported were angora goats, this decline in the number of farms with goats and the number of goats on hand is directly associated with the decrease in price per pound of mohair, and the demand for mohair garments.

Scope of the Livestock Survey

The sample farms were selected at a rate designed to permit publication of survey tables for all States and for those counties in which there were substantial livestock operations. The minimum number of records for individual county data to be shown separately for this report is 20. The 107.8 thousand farms to which livestock survey forms were mailed included 82.2 thousand livestock-type farms and 27.2 thousand livestock enterprises on other type farms. These 107.8 thousand farms in the sample represent a total of 691.1 thousand livestock operations in 1969. The number of sample farms included in the tabulations shown in this publication is 90.5 thousand. When expanded, these reports represent 561.5 thousand livestock operations, or approximately 81 percent of those in the universe being sampled. The sampling rates, by value of sales, for livestock-type farms are shown in the table below:

	Number of livestock-type farms in 1969 census			Sampling rate
	Livestock farms	Livestock ranches	Total livestock farms and ranches	
\$100,000 or more	17,114	3,919	21,033	1 out of 1
\$40,000 to \$99,999	55,396	6,819	62,215	1 out of 2
\$20,000 to \$39,999	96,397	10,405	106,802	1 out of 8
\$10,000 to \$19,999	119,338	14,443	133,781	1 out of 16
\$5,000 to \$9,999 .	131,059	19,807	150,866	1 out of 32
\$2,500 to \$4,999 .	148,897	24,290	173,187	1 out of 64

Availability of Data

Data are shown at the State level for 73 tables and at the county level for the 10 tables believed to be of most general interest. Space limitations preclude inclusion of data at the county level for all 73 tables; however, the data are available at the county level in the form of unpublished tabulations. Copies of any or all of the 63 unpublished county tables can be provided upon payment of the cost of review for disclosures and consistency and of making reproductions. A cost estimate will be furnished upon request. Direct your inquiry to Chief, Agriculture Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.

Presentation of Livestock Data

The tabulations for the livestock survey are limited, for most items, to those farms that reported the item on their report form, provided the item was acceptable in comparison to related items on the form. Many of the tables have one column or more of data that can be related to the universe reporting: For example, the number of farms reporting any kind of livestock, and the number of farms reporting any health costs (for all livestock). Counts of farms for the total survey that had acceptable reports for various items are shown in the following table. Some indications of the degree of completion or response for these items may be obtained from this table. For example, the response for the animal health costs section appears to be fairly satisfactory with 71 percent of the respondents reporting these items. Feed and feed supplements fed were also fairly well reported, with 76 percent reporting. Only 38 percent of the operators reported both their total days of farm work during the year and the portion of that time they spent on the livestock operations; this is a poor response since a much higher percentage of operators would be expected to do some work on their livestock operations. Also, 39 percent reported hired labor for the livestock operations, compared with 58 percent of the livestock-type farms and ranches in the 1969 census. Only 34 percent reported selected machinery and equipment on their farms.

	Farms re- porting ¹	Percent of farms ¹
CATTLE, HOGS, SHEEP, GOATS		
Total farms in survey	561,489	100.0
Feed and feed supplements fed (all livestock)	424,826	75.7
Cost of purchased feed (all livestock)	200,034	35.6
Methods of mixing feed (all livestock)	107,350	19.1
Animal health costs (all livestock)	397,454	70.8
Bulk grain storage bins	213,347	38.0
Silos	95,072	16.9
Machinery and equipment	191,280	34.1
Hired-labor expenditures	217,937	38.8
Labor on livestock operations:		
Farm operator labor	270,884	48.2
Other unpaid workers	151,219	26.9
Regular workers (150 to 249 days)	24,415	4.3
Regular workers (250 days or more)	27,912	5.0
Part-time workers (less than 25 days)	59,213	10.5
Part-time workers (25 to 149 days)	46,646	8.3

Farms re-
porting¹ Percent
 of
 farms¹

CATTLE

Total cattle and calves of all ages	494,362	100.0
Cows	388,829	78.7
Heifers and heifer calves	376,424	76.1
Steers, steer calves, and bull calves	370,719	75.0
Bulls	335,087	67.8
Cattle and calves for dairy purposes	67,149	13.6
Cattle sales	486,659	98.4
Cattle fattened on grain or concentrates	117,206	23.7
Cattle purchased	215,341	43.6
Health costs for beef cattle	296,798	60.0
Waste disposal for beef cattle	280,583	56.8

HOGS

Total hogs and pigs of all ages	261,343	100.0
Hogs and pigs used or to be used for breeding:		
Sows	191,884	73.4
Gilts	89,951	34.4
Boars	170,166	65.1
Market hogs and pigs	232,531	89.0
Hogs and pigs sold	270,162	103.4
Hogs and pigs purchased	127,622	48.8
Health costs for hogs and pigs	149,800	57.3
Waste disposal for hogs and pigs	174,349	66.7

SHEEP

Total sheep and lambs of all ages	54,458	100.0
Sheep and lambs kept for breeding	49,820	91.5
Sheep and lambs sold	52,614	96.6
Sheep and lambs purchased	17,068	31.3
Health costs for sheep and lambs	20,676	38.0

GOATS

Total goats or kids of all ages	10,484	100.0
Angora goats	3,101	29.6
Goats or kids sold	3,692	35.2
Mohair clipped	2,879	27.5
Health costs for goats	1,405	13.4

¹ Figures shown are estimates based on the reported data expanded by the sample weights assigned to each report.

Imputation

Some items were imputed, provided other conditions were met. For example, if cattle purchases exceeded cattle inventory on places having more than 30 head on hand and no cattle sales were reported, sales were imputed based on the number of cattle purchased and the percentage of the herd that was cows. Sales of hogs were imputed if hog inventory exceeded nine head, the ratio of the inventory of sows to total inventory was greater than 14 percent, and the number of hogs purchased in relation to hog inventory met specific criteria. Sheep sales were imputed, as were sheep and lamb purchases. No imputation of sales was initiated for goats or kids if none was reported sold. Ownership of cattle inventory was imputed as owned by "you or this firm", if there was no indication as to who owned the cattle reported on the form. If ownership of some of the cattle was indicated, but not all, the remaining cattle were imputed into the ownership categories indicated.

Selected Reporting Items

Feed—The items asked for feed are shown in the facsimile of the form in the appendix. Feed reported on the form for each category of livestock was compared as a total to the number of that kind of livestock on hand or sold (cattle, hogs, sheep, or goats). If the total feed reported was below a specified limit, all of the individually reported feed items were accepted. Occasionally this procedure resulted in the acceptance of questionable entries for some individual items of feed. If the total amount reported fed exceeded the specified limits, when compared to the livestock (cattle, hogs, sheep, or goats) for the place, all of the feed was deleted from the report in the computer edit. An analytical review was made of the computer deleted items and those which could be corrected were restored. Therefore, the published feed data should be considered in relation to the number of livestock on farms having acceptable feed sections, and not to the total number of livestock.

Methods of mixing feeds—Methods of mixing feeds used for the livestock enterprise were requested on the form. The three questions were designed to determine how much of the feed was mixed (1) on the place by equipment kept on the place, (2) on the place by custom mobile feed mills, and (3) off the place. If the tons reported mixed were reasonable in comparison to the reported amount of feed fed which could have been used in a mixed ration, the reported number of tons of feed mixed was accepted. Entries of feed mixed that were not acceptable were deleted in computer edit, subject to analytical review, and those which could be corrected, were restored.

Livestock purchases (cattle, hogs, and sheep)—In the report-form sections on cattle and calves, hogs and pigs, and sheep and lambs, the numbers of animals purchased were obtained along with the approximate cost of the animals purchased. Also sources of animals purchased were obtained, and those reports not indicating a source for the animals purchased were tabulated into a separate "no report" group. If no entry appeared in the animal purchases sections, then no imputation of animal purchases was initiated. Farms reporting percent of animals purchased from each source (farms or ranches, stockyards, auctions and sales barns, and dealers and others) was edited if the combined percentages did not equal 100 percent or if

percentages were reported and no cattle or value was reported. When these inconsistencies occurred, percentages were edited to equal 100 percent, and percentages reported without the number of cattle or value of cattle were deleted. Animals purchased were tallied by source of purchase (see State tables 12, 13, 26, 27, 32, and 33).

Livestock sales—If entries appeared in the spaces provided for both the number of sales and the value of sales, these numbers were checked against limits to determine whether they were reasonable entries. If only the number of animals sold appeared on the form and no value of sales was reported, a value was imputed. Conversely, if value was reported but no number, the number sold was imputed based on the value. This partial imputation was done to insure consistency and to salvage inconsistent reports.

Reporting Problems

As might be expected in a survey of this type being conducted for the first time on a large scale, there were some problem areas both in the reporting of data by the respondents and in the computer edit. During computer edit and clerical review operations, several tests were made to detect reporting errors, clerical errors, and keypunch-type errors. Although the majority of these errors were identified and corrected, some errors were not detected and therefore not adjusted. The principal problem areas in this survey are as follows:

- 1. Cattle and calves fattened on grain and concentrates**—Many respondents misreported fattened "cattle" and fattened "calves", probably because of the various definitions in different areas of the country and because of misinterpreting what was being asked for in each category. In processing, fat calves for slaughter were moved to fat cattle for slaughter if the average value per head was greater than \$200. Some respondents had animals evidently fattened on grains and concentrates and did not report them as such. Some of these cases were identified in processing and changed to fattened classification.
- 2. Feed and feed supplements**—Feed and feed supplements tended to be a problem because of the variety and complexity of various feedstuffs associated with beef cattle, hogs and pigs, sheep, and goat production. Problems encountered were compounded because the characteristics and composition of feeds that determine rations vary from one area to another. Some ingredient feeds (animal protein, minerals, and other ingredient feeds), were frequently misreported in pounds instead of in whole tons and tenths as required in the survey.
- 3. Total cost of purchased feed**—Probably due to the general unavailability of detailed records by type of feed and the reluctance on the part of respondents to report the total cost of purchased feed fed, only 36 percent of the farms in the survey reported cost of purchased feed. Many respondents reported purchased feeds without reporting the cost. Such quantities are included in the tabulations for total feed but not in the tabulations for feed on farms reporting purchases.

	Number of farms with purchases	Number of farms specifying source of pur- chases	Percent of farms specifying source of pur- chases
Total farms purchasing beef-purpose cattle	215,341	173,911	80.8
Farms purchasing beef-purpose cattle for breeding	92,265	69,481	75.3
Total farms purchasing hogs and pigs ...	127,622	96,118	75.3
Farms purchasing hogs and pigs for breeding	62,329	44,973	72.2
Total farms purchasing sheep and lambs	28,767	24,530	85.3
Farms purchasing sheep and lambs for breeding	11,922	8,767	73.5

Ownership and Purchases of Cattle and Hogs

The ownership of cattle and hogs was divided into three categories—those owned by the operator or firm, those owned by the landlord, and those owned by others.

Sources of cattle and hog purchases were divided into four categories—those purchased from farms and ranches; stockyards; auctions and sales barns; and dealers and others. The pattern of ownership and source of purchases is shown in the following summary tables.

Ownership of Cattle and Calves on Hand

Total farms reporting cattle and calves	¹ 494,362
Farms by ownership:	
Operator or firm	farms.. 488,349
	percent.. 98.8
Landlord	farms.. 18,257
	percent.. 3.7
Other	farms.. 17,929
	percent.. 3.6

¹Sum of farms by ownership exceeds total and percent exceeds 100 because of reporting of multiple ownerships.

On December 31, 1971, 99 percent of the farms had cattle owned by operators or their firms; 3.7 percent had cattle owned by the landlord; and 3.6 percent had cattle owned by others.

Farms Purchasing Beef-Purpose Cattle—Source of Purchases

Total farms reporting beef cattle purchases	¹ 215,341
Source of purchases:	
Farms or ranches	farms.. 75,106
	percent.. 34.9
Stockyards	farms.. 18,099
	percent.. 8.4
Auctions and sales barns	farms.. 83,494
	percent.. 38.8
Dealers and others	farms.. 30,348
	percent.. 14.1
Source unspecified	farms.. 41,430
	percent.. 19.2

¹Sum of farms by source exceeds total and percent exceeds 100 because of reporting of multiple sources.

Livestock farmers purchased their cattle and calves from varied sources in 1971. Direct purchases from farms and ranches was second to purchases at auctions and sales barns. Of the total

farms reporting purchases of cattle and calves, 39 percent of the farms had purchases from auctions and sales barns; 35 percent of the farms had purchases from farms and ranches; 14 percent from dealers and others, and 8 percent reported purchases from stockyards. About 19 percent of the farms reporting purchases did not indicate a source.

Ownership of Hogs and Pigs on Hand

Total farms reporting hogs and pigs	¹ 261,343
Farms by ownership:	
Operator of firm	farms.. 258,422
	percent.. 98.9
Landlord	farms.. 11,380
	percent.. 4.4
Other	farms.. 5,502
	percent.. 2.1

¹Sum of farms by ownership exceeds total and percent exceeds 100 because of reporting of multiple ownerships.

The largest proportion of farms reported hogs and pigs owned by the operator or firm reporting them. A relatively small proportion of farms (4.3 percent) reported landlord ownership, and 2 percent of the farms reported ownership by others.

Farms Purchasing Hogs and Pigs—Source of Purchases

Total farms reporting hog and pig purchases	¹ 127,622
Source of purchases:	
Farms or ranches	farms.. 63,686
	percent.. 49.9
Stockyards	farms.. 3,703
	percent.. 2.9
Auctions and sales barns	farms.. 26,508
	percent.. 20.8
Dealers and others	farms.. 12,297
	percent.. 9.6
Source unspecified	farms.. 31,504
	percent.. 24.7

¹Sum of farms by source exceeds total and percent exceeds 100 because of reporting of multiple sources.

Purchases of hogs and pigs from specific sources varied somewhat during 1971. A major portion (50 percent) of farms reporting purchases of hogs and pigs purchased them from farms and ranches; 21 percent had purchases from auctions and sales barns, 10 percent from dealers and others, and 3 percent from stockyards.