Table 12. Contract Provisions for Variation in Quantity and Quality for Feeder Cattle

(Based on 89 contracts reported)

	Farms		Farms
Lesser quantity: Contractor would have accepted cattle delivered	58 8 1 1 13 12 5	Lower quality: Contractor would have accepted cattle delivered Producer would have made cash payment to fulfill contract No payment would have been received for inferior cattle Contract would have been invalidated Contract included a natural disaster clause Producer would have received payment based on quality actually delivered Cattle would have been sold on open market Cattle would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open	27 - 12 5 2 13 2
Greater quantity: No payment would have been received for excess produced. Excess would have been sold on open market Producer would have received a reduced payment for excess Excess would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open market. Producer would have received an incentive or premium payment. No provision to cover greater quantity	7 24 - 36 2 16	market. No provision to cover lower quality	14 15 7 51 6 1 4 17 9

Table 13. Other Contract Characteristics for Feeder Cattle

(Based on 89 contracts reported)

		Feeder cattle produced under contract in 1977							
	Total	1 to 49 cattle	50 to 99 cattle	100 to 199 cattle	200 to 499 cattle	500 to 999 cattle	1,000 cattle and over		
Other contractors were available for negotiation	65	2	6	12	22	15	8		
Producer had knowledge of key provisions of other contracts	51	1	4	10	16	12	8		
Negotiations were undertaken with more than one contractor	44	2	2	10	13	10	7		
Contract was specified in writing	72	4	7	15	23	15	8		
Contract covered more than one production period	6	4	_	1	1		_		
Contract specified a specific number of cattle	67	4	6	14	21	15	7		
Product was pooled with others prior to final payment	- 1						•		
determination	9	3	1	3	1	-	1		
Product was under a State or Federal market order	3	1	1		1	-	<u>-</u> i		
Contractor was a cooperative	7	2	1	2	-	1	1		
Producer was a member of this cooperative	6	2	ī	2	_	_	ï		
Contract was associated with a joint venture between two or							_		
more cooperatives or a cooperative and another firm	3	-	-	_	1	-	2		
Producer's operation was a part of this joint venture	1		_	_	_	-	1		
A bargaining association was involved in negotiating the	_						-		
contract	9	2	1	2	1	2	1		
Producer was a member of this bargaining association	9	2	1	2	ī	2	1		
Contractor provided supply, demand and/or price outlook		-	-	_	-	_	-		
information	21	3	3	5	4	5	1		
Producer considered this as main source of market		•	_	-	•	-	-		
information	5	2	1	-	1	-	1		
Producer was generally satisfied with production terms of	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-	-		-		-		
	76	7	6	14	26	15	8		
contract Producer was generally satisfied with marketing terms of	, , ,	•	· ·	**		~-	Ĭ		
	75	7	5	12	27	16	8		
Producer plans to continue utilization of contracts	65	,	6	13	19	13	8		
	69	6	7	15	21	16	6		
Cattle would have been produced without a contract	0,9	4	,	13	21	10	٠		
Total reporting size of operation	86	8	8	17	27	18	8		

Table 14. Extent of Contract Usage for Feeder Cattle

(Based on 89 contracts reported. Producer's opinion of cattle produced under contract)

	1977				1972				1967			
	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III
Total reporting Percent of cattle in area contracted:	70	12	29	29	61	11	25	25	58	9	24	25
None	-	_	-	-	3	1	2	-	5	2	2	1
Under 25 percent	25	9	12	4	21	7	12	2	21	6	14	1
25 to 49 percent	6	2	3	1	10	2	4	4	6	1	1	4
50 to 74 percent	13	1	8	4	8	1	4	3	10	-	5	5
75 percent and over	26	-	6	20	19	-	3	16	16	-	2	14