

This Thesis Has Been

MICROFILMED

Negative No. T-

75

Form 26

bу

Orley Glen Barrett, B. S.



## SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

approved for Solmon

University of Missouri

## WORK STOCK MANAGEMENT

The object of this investigation is to arrive at some conclusion or determine, if possible, the most satisfactory means or methods of management of the work stock or work animals on the farms in actual operation.

The data for this investigation was obtained by sending circular letters to farmers thruout the state and by feeding records and diaries kept by several farmers on farms in actual operation and actual practice. The circular letters (Plate 1-2) were sent to about 1800 farmers who were good fair representatives of the general farmer of the state. Of the 1800 letters sent out about 500 returned and of these 296 were selected for use here. The ones selected were the ones most complete, most legible and filled out in clear, concise manner. The feeding records and diaries include figures obtained, in cooperation with the Farm Management Department of the University of Missouri, by several farmers on a fairly large number of animals, and these figures give us absolute facts in this regard, whereas the former are more or less correct, varying with the degree of accuracy of the farmers estimates.

In summarizing this data the whole number of cases was divided into four groups. The first includes all cases where

## UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI—COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE FARM MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

IN CO-OPERATION WITH U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF FARM MANAGEMENT

Columbia, Mo., Feb. 20th, 1913

Dear Sir:--

We are making a detailed study of the different methods of work stock management in an effort to determine what are the most successful systems in practice on our farms to-day, and knowing of your interest in and your desire to aid any movement which has for its object the bringing before the farmers of our state the practices of the most successful men, we are asking that you kindly fill in the following blanks and return to us in the enclosed envelope, which requires NO postage. This information will be considered confidential. Your name will in no way be associated with it when the results appear in print.

Thanking you for any help you may be able to give us, I remain.

Very truly yours,

O. R. JOHNSON,

Farm Management Department.

My nam	e is						······
Postoffic	e			(	County	······	I live
m	iles from tow	n. My farm i	s *bottom land	d—up lan	d-rough-lev	el-rolling. I own	acres.
I rent	<b>a</b> cres.	I operate a	total of	acres	The land I	own will bring \$	per
acre on	the market.	I have about	\$	wort	h of buildings,	fences, etc., on my	farm. I can
cultivate		acres of the la	nd I operate.	I have	acre	es that I keep in g	grass. On the
average	acr	es of my past	ture would su	pport a	mature steer a	all season. I *have	-have not-
practiced	d rotating cro	ops fory	ears. My rot	ation is			
Му сгор	acreages, yi	elds and sales	last season we	ere (give	all field crops	of importance).	» <u>;</u>
CROP	CORN	OATS	WHEAT				
Acres	1			,			
Yield per A							
Total							* _ * - * - *
Sales	\$	<b>\$</b> -	\$	\$	*	*	*
A li	st of adlimage l	nonse and mul	e stock follows	S42			

	NUMBER	AVERAGE WEIGHT	VALUE
Mares over 2; and under 7			
Mares over 7 years			6 6 m s s
Geldings over 2 and under 7			
Geldings over 7		* ,	
Mules over 2 and under 7			T.
Mules over 7			т.

<sup>\*</sup>Cross out all but the word that fits your condition.

The mares given above are mostly ofbreed, or grade. The geldings are
ofbreed (draft, coach, etc.). I havehorses under two years. They
are worth about \$per head. I keep aboutmules under two years. They are worth
about \$per head. I keep aboutdairy cattle, worth \$(total value).
Abouthead of beef cattle, worth \$(total value). Abouthead of
hogs worth \$(total value). Abouthead of sheep, worth \$(total
value)stallions, worth \$(total value)of jacks andjennets,
worth about \$total value). I keepbrood mares exclusively for breeding.
of my mares kept for work raise colts. I raise from these mares aboutcolts per year.
I raisefall colts andspring coltsof these are horse colts andare
mule colts. I like (spring or fall) colts best because
I raise aboutper cent colts per year (the number raised compared to number of mares bred).
I sell on the average aboutcolts under two years of age per year. I find it easier to sell young
-*mule-horse-colts than-*mule-horse-colts. The mule colts are usuallymonths old when
I sell them and horse colts months. I receive about \$ for the mule and \$
for the horse colts. I pay on the average \$service fee for mule colts and \$for
horse colts. I sellyoung horses andmules over two years usually at \$
for horses and \$for mules. The broken young horses usually bring \$more than
the unbroken ones at the same age and broken mules \$more than the unbroken ones at the
same age. I usually sell mature horses atyears and mules atyears. I usually get \$
for the horses and \$for the mules. I buy young horses atyears, costing \$
per head and young mules atyears, costing \$per head. I buy mature horses at
years, costing \$per head. I buy mature mules atyears, costing \$per
head. I *do—do not—keep all my work stock the year around. I sellhead in(month)

and replace them in(month). I use my work stock in summer for					
and geldings; and \$	to keep mules. Grading for efficienc	y and counting the average mature			
gelding at 100, brood ma	res would gradepoints; mulespoint	s and young work stockpoints.			
REMARKS:					
		2			
*					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			

the farmer operates less than 120 acres. Group II includes all those between 120 and 226 acres. Group III includes those between 220 and 320 and group IV comprises all those of 320 acres and over. In the following the various cases will be spoken of as Group I, II etc.

There are several facts that bear more or less directly or indirectly on this problem and some of the most important ones will be considered and given in the following tables.

S	ize of farm an	d distance f	rom town.	operation is the state of the s	
	Size	of farm.	Distance	from town.	
Walter Spinish and American Sp	No.of farms		No. of farms	Av. dis.	potawo - 1984 April - 1 April
Group I	24	104.83	25	3.29	
Group II	91	153.60	101	4.87	
Group III	62	244.38	64	4.59	
Group IV	94	657.13	102	4.53	

The above table shows that the smaller farms are nearest to town and this, one would imagine to be the case, but there seems to be no relation of size of farm to distance from town after we get above the smallest group, or 120 acres.

It is interesting to note the relative number of small farms reporting in comparation to the number of largest ones. This fact, it seems, goes to show that the farmers on the larger areas are the most up-to-date and have a better idea of social and agricultural improvements as shown by his willingness to cooperate in this one particular investigation.

Amount o	perated	and percent t	illed	
	Amount	operated	Percent	tilled
	No. re	ported Av.	No. rept	'd Av.
	26	86.37	23 22	75.73
	102	161.5	94	71.16
I	65	259,11	62	69.12
7	103	670.57	101	60.79
	I	Amount No. re 26 102	Amount operated  No. reported Av.  26 86.37  102 161.5  I 65 259.11	No. reported Av. No. rept 26 86.37 22 102 161.5 94 I 65 259.11 62

The above table shows the relative size of farms in the various groups and shows the relative amount of land per. farm that is actually tilled or worked each year. The figures show that the smaller farms have a greater percent of their area tilled than the larger ones but this difference is not as large as one might immagine.

The high average for the size of farms in group IV is due to the fact that there were a faw extremely large ones. One farm had an area of 10000 acres operated

	Percent	practicing	rotation	and hength	of time practiced.
3		practicing rotation.		Av. years practiced.	
		No. rept	d. Av. %	No.rep'td	Av.years
Group I		23	100	22	7.22
Group II	I	88	79.54	63	9.09
Group I	II	60	90	54	10,71
Group I	٧	97	91.75	78	12.46

The above table goes to show us, again, that it is the larger farmer that is the most progressive and is the one that is making a greater effort to adapt himself to the advance methods of farming. It will be seen that, aside from group I where there were comparitively few cases reported and in all cases they reported as having practiced rotation and the percent, therefore, was 100, the percent gradually increased with increase in size of farm and there is a gradual and also a perceptible increase in the average number of years they have practiced rotation from the smaller farms, which report an average of 7.22 years to 12.46 years on the larger farms.

Mattheway - To supposite the		A	verage ;	yield pe	r acre.		**************************************	NEW TO THE PARTY WAS ARREST TO STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE	
4		Corn		Oats		Wheat		Hay	
month (5) for the contract of			yield.	report-		No. report- ing	yield		
Group	I	23	44.8	12	30.08	13	16.2	8	.94
Group	II	95	40.55	63	42.41	54	14.4	26	1.11
${\tt Group}$	III	63	41.92	44	37.41	42	16.4	22	1.08
Guoup	IA	97	43.93	73	39.05	<b>7</b> 0	17.16	34	1.71

The above table is very interesting, in that it serves substantiate to prove Prof. G. F. Warren's results, and it also disproves the common and erroneous idea that the crop yields are larger on the smaller farms and that the yields decrease with the increase

<sup>\*</sup>Cornell Bulletin No. 295. pp 425.

in size of farm. We see in the case of corn there is the greatest yield per. acre in Group I, then a gradual increase in Group IIII and IV till the latter is nearly as great as in Group I. In the case of oats there seems to be no direct relation but we see a noticeably low yield in Group I and for the rest the yield seems to be quite uniform. Aside from the slight variation in Group I the wheat yield actually increases with the increase in area, and the same holds true of hay except the very slight decrease of Group III over II.

There is not, in all cases, an increase in yields with the increase in area but the general tendency is that way and this fact seems of great importance to the farmer, for it does not coincide with the popular opinion, that we should "Intersify" our farm operations and work smaller areas. A goodly number of the farmers reporting this data have come to realize the importance of the above facts and are increasing their area operated by renting land from neighboring farmers. The general practice also seems to be for the farmers already on the larger farms to rent outside land more than the farmers of smaller areas although the data does not show this absolutely.

The above facts and data are given because they are of considerable impotance to our final conclusions in this work tho they, themselves, possibly are not, primarily, work stock problems.

The points of greatest importance in this investigation are those bearing directly on the problem and the question of work stock as to number, quality, value etc, are here to be considered.

	Average 1	number, weigh	ht and val	ue of mare	s between 2-7 years
5		No rept'd.	Av. no. per. farm	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. head.(in \$)
Group I	T	23	1.7	1154	177.63
Group II	1	84	2.38	1156	170.81
Group II	I	51	2.61	1190	183.34
Group IV		89	3.61	1272	180.33

This table shows a gradual increase in weight of the animals on the larger farms and also a tendency toward an increase in value.

	Average	number, wei	ght and va	lue of mar	es over 7 years.
6		No. rept'd.	Av. no. per. farm.	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. head.
Group II		17	1.76	1253	133.33
Group II		84	2.19	1189	147.59
Group II	I	51	2.41	1213	150.08
Group IV		78	2.56	1223	155.29

The same facts are seen here as in the preceeding table; namely, that the greater the size of farm the heavier the mares and the greater the value of them.

	Av. weight,	number and	value of	geldings	between 2-7 years
7		ept'd per	r p	er.	Av. value per. head. (in \$)
Group I	1	1 1.	45 1	.085	142.85
Group II	5	9 1.	95 1	.157	149.11
Group II	1 4	3 1.	86 1	180	149.07
Group IV	7	2.	<b>9</b> 9 1	1180	147.01

	Average number we:	ight and va	lue of gel	dings over 7 years.
8	No. rept'd	Av. no. per. farm	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. haed. (In \$)
Group I	8	1.11	1050	117.77
Group II	49	1.71	1159	127.56
Group III	27	1.77	1168	120,11
Group IV	55	2.28	1148	132.78

These figures tend to show that on the larger farm larger animals are to be found. In both of the preceeding tables the geldings of group I are perceptibly smaller and considerably cheaper than in any of the other groups. The average number of this class of animals per. farm is comparatively small as well as the number reporting compared to the total number of farmers included in each group. All conclusions drawn from the preceeding tables as regards mares is corroborated by this data on geldings.

Average number, weight and value of mules between 2-7 years						
9	No. reported	Av. no. per. farm.	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. head. (in \$)		
Group I	11	2.04	995	161.95		
Group II	41	2.65	1039	176.42		
Group III	47	3.44	1095	179 <b>.3</b> 5		
Group IV	77	7.29	1139	185.85		

	Average number, weight and value of mules over 7 years.						
/0		No. reported	Av. no. per. farm.	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. head. (in \$)		
Group	I	3	1.33	1150	127.50		
Group	II	13	1.15	1100	138.09		
Group	III	16	2.19	1148	142.57		
Group	ΙV	30	3.10	1174	151.23		

The two preceeding tables again show, to a marked degree the tendency toward heavier and better work animals. In every case there is an increase except in the weight of the anomals in group II and III of the second table and this fact is easily explained by the fact that there were only four mules reported in group I and this is not enough to give us a fair average.

	Average nu	mber, weig	ht and val	ue of all	horses.
11		No. report ing	Av. no. per. farm.	Av. wt. per. head.	Av. value per. head. (in \$)
Group I	*	26	3.61	1138	146.91
Group II		102	5.57	1167	154.33
Group III	I	65	5.91	1202	158.83
Group IV		102	8.66	1215	158.31

	Average number, weight and value of all mules.					
12		No.	Av. no.	Av. wt.	Av value	
		report- ing	per. farm	per. head.	per. head. (in \$)	
Group I		12	2.25	1009	156.85	
Group II	[	47	2.91	1051.	170.66	
Group II	II	49	4.02	1103	182.34	
Group IV	7	79	8.28	1138	187.76	

	Average	number of all	work stock	per. farm and % mules.
13		No. report ing.	Av. no. per. farm.	Percent mules.
Group	I	26	4.65	22.31
Group	II	102	6.93	19.43
Group	III	65	8.94	33.91
Group	IA	103	14.91	42.58

It is noticeable that in all cases the work stock increases in weight and value as the size of farm increases and there is also a marked increase in the percent of mules kept on the larger farms as shown by table 13. The reason for this, without a doubt, is because of the fact that there is greater occasion for hired help on the farm of largest area and it is generally admitted that the mule will stand rougher treatment and less care than will the horse.

The foregoing tables not only show a marked increase in weight and value of all animals as the farm area increases but also a perceptible difference in values of horses of all the different groups and mules of the respective groups. In tables 11 and 12, group IV there is a difference of \$29.45 in favor of mules.

Percent of all work stock that are mares 2-7, percent over 7 and percent geldings.

14	Percent mares 2-7 yr.	Percent mares Over 7	Percent geldings.	Percent mules.	٠.
Group I	32,23	24.79	20.66	22.31	
Group II	27.77	25.B9	27664	19.43	
Group III	22.89	21.17	22.03	33.91	
Group IV	20.90	12,37	23.46	42.58	

The table giving the percent of all work stock that

are mules is repeated here for sake of clearness. A point, as shown in table 14, that is worthy of attention is the fact that as the percent of mules increase with increase in area the percent of mares, both under 7 and over 7, decreases, from 32.23 to 20.90 in case of mares 2-7 and from 24.79 to 12.37 in case of mares over 7. The percent of geldings seems to remain fairly constant or at least there is no perceptible change.

	Average r	number and	value of	horses under 2 years.
15		No. report- ing.	Av. no. per. farm.	Av. value per. head. (in \$)
Group I		10	1.8	104.16
Group II		54	2,39	94.95
Group II	I	37	2.46	103.91
Group IV	•	65	3.52	106,49
		THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.	-	

	Average numb	er and value	of all mul	es under 2	years.
		port- per.	per.	alue (in \$)	
Group I	9	2	100.0	0	
Group II	33	<b>5.</b> 54	104.1	9	
Group III	28	3 4,32	114.5	2	
Group IV	45	8,64	123.6	2	

Tables 15 and 16 show a tendency toward an increase in value of all horses under 2 years and a marked increase in the case of mules under 2 years with the increase in area, as has been the case in all the work stock at all ages.

Number of mares kept exclusively for breeding and

number kept for work that raise colts.

17		Exclusively for breeding.		and eding.
	No. report- ing.	Av. no per. farm.	No. report- ing.	Av. no per. farm.
Group I	3	1.33	14	2.14
Group II	24	2.37	69	2.80
Group III	15	2.46	45	3.04
Group IV	35	3.83	66	3.71

The above table shows that the number of mares kept exclusively for breeding and the number kept that raise colts is larger. comparatively, on the smaller farms than on the larger. In every group, in both cases there is, there is, on the average, more than one mare per. Occare of land, except in gruop IV and here there is about one mare to every two acres.

Number of colts raised and percent. (Percent being based on number of mares bred)

18	No. report- ing.	Av. no. raised per.farm.	Percent raised.
Group I	12	1.87	66.17
Group II	<b>7</b> 8	2.24	70.00
Group III	45	2,45	63.50
Group IV	82	2,95	68.11

The average percent of colts from all groups is 66.46, or practically two thirds of all mares bred, raise colts. In the above table, again, there is to be seen a marked decrease in the number of colts raised as the farm area increases.

	Average n	umber of ho	orse and m	ale colts :	raised.	
19		No. reporting horse colts.	Av. no. per. farm.	No. reporting mule colts.	Av. no per. farm.	Percent mule colts.
Group I	,	7	1.43	9	1.44	56.52
Group II	:	50	1.71	48	1.55	46.56
Group II	I.	36	1.49	28	1.64	46.23
Group IV	T	62	2.15	52	1.92	42.58

Table 19 shows that there is a marked decrease in all colts (per unit area) as the farm area increases and also that there is an increase in the percent of horse colts raised as the area increases.

There were 117 farmers that gave their preference as to horse or mule colts and of these only 4 were in favor of the horse colts, nevertheless, there are a greater percent of horse colts raised than mule colts. The reason for their preferring mule colts is the fact that they are more salable at immature age and also bring a better price at any age as shown by tables 11 and 12 but where the farmer is breeding for his own use in many cases he prefers the horse to the mule.

Out of 213 farmers, reporting their preference as to fall or spring colts, only 6 were in favor of the fall colts. There are various ideas, both for and against the raising of. fall colts. It would seem that here in the Gorn Belt where the greatest rush for the work stock is during the spring and early summer months that the fall colt, especially when horse colts are raised, would be best and would allow, practically, a maximum amount of work from the mares during the busy season and also allow full time with the colt after it was born until it was old enough to wean and at weaning time the following spring there would be a plenty of good pasture for the colt, which is advantageous. In case of mule colts, since it is the common custom in this locality to raise spring colts, there is no question but the spring colt can find a more ready sale at weaning time than would the fall colt. Some good points are given by the farmers who are following this line of work. One farmer says that"The fall colt is always judged as a spring colt six months older" Another says "Warmer weather to make growth while young". Another says, "Spring colts are not as hard on their mothers"

Still another says, "Spring colts grow out better with less expense and care". Another says "Spring colts can be sold at any age but fall colts have to be kept till they are mature". Another believes. "Mares are in better condition to suckle" and still another says. "Spring colts don't diminish their mothers so in flesh" The above are some of the more logical reasons in favor of spring colts and following are some in favor of fall foals. One farmer says, "The fall colts come when work is light and weaned when pasture is ready in the spring". Another says "Fall colts can go right on grass at weaning time and do much better than on dry feeds". Another says. "I believe for our conditions fall colts would be better only it \* seems more natural to have the colts come in the spring" and another says "If I had a warm barn I would have my mares foal in the fall by all means." There are arguments both for and against but it would seem that in many cases the farmer raises spring colts because of the precident which has been established, which is not based on profits derived from the practice.

verage service	fee paid for	horse and	jack.	
No. report ing.			Av. amt. paid for jack.	
15	13,23	16	10.37	
69	12.88	60	10.05	
39	13.07	3 <b>7</b>	10.30	
65	13.05	58	10.38	
	No. report ing. 15 69 39	No. Av. amt. report- paid for horse.  15 13.23 69 12.88 39 13.07	No. Av. amt. No. reporting. horse. ing.  15 13.23 16 69 12.88 60 39 13.07 37	report- paid for report- paid for ing. jack.  15 13.23 16 10.37  69 12.88 60 10.05  39 13.07 37 10.30

-	Average ag	e and valu	e of horse	colts sold.
21			av. age sold. (in mo.)	Av.value at selling.
Group I		2	8	62.50
Group II	I	13	9.92	80.67
Group II	II	9	8.22	75.55
Group IV	٧	9	7	65.73

Above table shows the average age of selling horse colts ranges from 7 to 10 months at an average price of \$62,50 to about \$80.00 or in general, from 60 to 70 dollars at weaning time

Annales de Granden de applicación politica (Albahanga annales en contra	Average a	ge and valu	e of mule	colts at selling.
22.		No. report- ing.	Av.age sold. (in mo.)	Av.value at selling.
Group I		9	6.33	81.66
Group II		36	6.7	87.80
Group II	I	18	7	91,47
Group IV		23	7.26	91.91

Table 22 shows that, in general, mule colts are sold from 1 to 2 months younger and bring nearly \$20.00 per head more. This fact justifies the farmer to quite an extent in raising mules instead of horses and in such case it may be advantageous to raise spring colts instead of fall colts.

	Difference	in value	of broken	and unbrol	ken stock.
23			Dif. in horses.		Dif. in mules.
Group I		8	23.75	8	19.12
Group II		34	23.00	32	21.30
Group II	I.	24	25,41	24	18.85
Group IV	7	37	25.94	<b>3</b> 0	22.75

The figures in this table prove another point in favor of mules, namely; that they are less trouble to break or at least they are less expensive to break, the difference being about \$2 to \$6 in favor of the mule.

	Average	age and value	ue of matu:	re horses sold.
24		No. reporting	Av. age . at sale.	Av. value at sale.
Group	I	8.	6.62(yr)	151.25(\$)
Group	II	48	6.33	151.98
${\tt Group}$	III	26	6.34	148.15
Group	IA	<b>5</b> 0	5.98	166.94
STATE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN				

	Average	age and valu	ue of matu	re mules sold.
25		No. reporting	Av. age . at sale.	av. value at sale
Group I		9	5.33(yr)	172,55
Group II	ĽĮ.	31	5.4	183.83
Group II	II	24	5.04	188.26
Group IV	7	50	5.26	200.08

The two preceeding tables (numbers 24 and 25) show a general tendency, of the farmers that make a practice of selling any mature work stock, to sell at an average age of about 6 to  $6\frac{1}{2}$  years for horses and 5 to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  years for mules. It is a noticeable fact that as the farm area increases, there, as an average, better prices obtained for the animals and the average age at which they are sold is less in the groups containing the larger farms. The fact that the farmers on the smaller farms receive less for their animals, is not due to the age, given as their average, being too high and these animals beginning to depreciate; but rather because this average includes some animals of ages ranging too high to bring the maximum price therefore the average age of the group tends to run high and necessarily the values will be less.

	Average a	ge and valu	e of horse	es purchased.
26		No. reporting	Av. age (in yr.)	Av. value (in \$ )
Group I		6	3,01	149.16
Group II		22	2.45	137.27
Group II	I	23	2.54	114,48
Group IV		32	2.39	116.89

Av	erage age and va	lue of mule	s purchased.	
27	No. reporting.	Av. age (in yr.)	Av. value. (in \$)	
Group I	3	1	78,33	
Group II	23	2.37	145.09	
Group III	31	2.	128.19	
Group IV	54	1.78	134.76	

Tables 26 and 27 go to show that the farmers on the larger farms buy the animals, that they have to buy, younger and at less cost. In the case of horses there is a marked decrease in age and in value and likewise in the case of mules (except in group I where only three farmers reported and these reported buying only three mules in which case they were all yearlings) as the farm area increases.

It is also noticeable that the mules, as a whole, are younger than the horses and still they pay larger prices for them.

the general practice seems to be for the farmers to keep their work stock the year round, still there are a few who report selling their mules in the fall and buying young ones in the spring. One farmer says "I find that I can buy good young mules in the spring, do my summers work with them and sell them in the fall for about \$20 to \$30 per. head more than I gave for them and in this way I get my work done, a nice little profit and don't have to feed them thru the winter". This is a point well worth consideration tho it is easily seen that it could not be made a universal practice, and is only adapted to the few.

		Aver	age	percent	of	the	time	the	work	stock	are	kept	
busy	in	the w	inte	r time.									

28	No. reporting.	Av. percent.
Group I	16	47
Group II	79	40
Group III	51	38
Group IV	<b>7</b> 9	44

Figures obtained by the Farm Management Department of the University of Missouri show that the average number of hours the horses put in on the average farms for the six winter months is 2.2 hours per. day. If 10 hours per. day is to be considered full time then the figures above, which are farmers estimates, are about twice as high as shown by accurate data. It has also been shown that the average for the year is only 3.9 hours per. day. This figure is much smaller than the farmer would estimate and because of this fact it is deserving of attention. Each farmer should answer for himself, how he is to keep his work stock productively busy during the winter months. This was partially accomplished, by some of the farmers reporting, by part or all of the following ways. (1) General farm work as hauling manure feeding, bedding, hauling wood, etc, etc. (2) Marketing. (3) Hauling building material. (4) Outside teaming. (5) Logging. (6) Fall and winter plowing. (7) Gathering corn. (8) Filling ditches. (9) Grading. (10) Clearing and breaking new ground. (11) Orchard work. (12) Hauling gravel and cinders for improvements. (13) Discing

(14) Cutting up stalks. (15) Cutting brush and cleaning. (16) Hauling manure from town. (17) Driving mail carrier. and (18) Driving an auctioneer. The above may serve as suggestions and help to solve the problem of employment for the work stock and the hired help, as well, during the winter season.

C	ost of keeping brood a	mares.	
29	No. reporting.	Av. cost (per. head.)	
Group I	14	53.01	
Group II	60	39.57	
Group III	34	40.82	
Group IV	65	40.03	

	Cost of keeping	other mares and gelding	5.
30	No. repor	Av. cost. ting. (per. hea	a)
Group I	15	56,89	
Group II	51	39.11	
Group II	1 27	40,01	
Group IV	63	45,03	

	Average (	ost of keeping mules	
31		No. reporting.	Av. cost. (per. head)
Group	I	8	53.83
Group	II	38	36.13
$\mathtt{Group}$	III	27	38.92
Group	IV	57	40.83

The above table shows that group I contains the farms that are to a considerable greater expense or at least that is their estimation of the case. The average cost of keeping the various classes of work stock in group I is about \$55. and the cost in the other groups for the same classes is less than \$40.00 Groups II, III and IV are very comparable tho the cost is slightly greater in group IV than in the other two groups.

Data obtained by the Farm Management Department of the University of Missouri shows that the cost of keeping horses to be \$69.76 and mules \$66.39, not including interest on investment taxes or incidental expenses such as shoeing, veterinary treatment, clipping, etc, etc. By adding to the above figures, the interest at 6% on the investment of the average horse and mule, as shown in tables 12 and 13, the cost of keep then is \$78.67 for horses and \$77.05 for mules besides the taxes and incidental expenses which would easily bring the total cost well above \$80.00 in both cases.

According to the above we see that the average farmer

ordinarily estimates the cost of keeping his work stock at approximately one half of the actual cost. When the farmers thruout the state and the country come to realize this fact there will be a tendency among them to bring about a closer balance between their work and the amount of work stock kept to perform that work and greater attention will be paid to the efficiency of the work animals.

	Grading	ofyoung work	stock for efficiency.
32		No. reporting.	No. of points.
Group I		6	70
Group II		43	76.14
Group II	ı	27	76.85
Group IV		49	79.59

	Grading	of mares and geldin	gs for efficiency.
33		No. reporting.	No. of points.
Group I		9	84.44
Group II		43	91.09
Group II	I	<b>3</b> 0	87.01
Group IV		55	87.34

	Grading of	f mules for efficience	cy.
34		No. reporting.	No. of points.
Group	I	4	92.5
Group	II	31	100,42
Group	III	28	97.25
Group	IA	44	98.45

The above tables, numbers 32, 33 and 34, show that mares and geldings are generally considered much more efficient than the young and immature work stock and also that mules are exceedingly more efficient than either of the other two classes. The average number of points allowed mules is about 98 whereas with mature horses it is about 87 and young stock about 76 or a difference in all cases of about 11 points.

	Average	number of	acres	operated	per.	head	of	work	stock.
35		Av. no.				acre:		ead.	
Group I		4.65		19	.19				
Group II		6.93		26	.02				
Group II	I	8,94		30	•96				
Group IV		14,91		49	.26				

Table 35 shows that number of acres operated per. head of work stock is more than twice as great in the group of larger farms as it is in the group of smaller farms and nearly twice as great as in the second group. These figures are very comparable with those obtained by Prof. G. F. Warren of Cornell\* In his bulletin he shows that the average number of acres per. horse is 49 on all farms of 200 acres and over, which would include both group III and IV in this work.

Average size of farm, number of work stock, number of acres operated per horse and per cent of the timathey are kept busy.

36	No. report- ing.	Av. size of farm.	Av. no. of work stock.		
All farms	296	353.48	9.21	35.37 4	1.89
Dairy farms	34	282.7	8.84	31.93 4	6.9
Beef cattle farms	75	481.47	12.12	39.72 3	88.56

For the above table, number 36, there were 34 of the farms that were strictly dairy farms and 75 that were strictly beef cattle farms selected and data taken from them to compare with the average of all farms included in the investigation. It is very evident that the dairy farmers keep more work stock, comparatively than those on strictly beef cattle farms of all farms in general but they keep them busy a greater per cent of the time in winter and this means a greater per cent of the time thruout \*Cornell Bulletin No. 295

the year. There is a question, however, if the dairy farmer does not more than ofset this one point by the fact that he keeps more work stock, for an equal area, than the other classes of farmers.

During this era of agricultural progress there are many features of the work that demand our special attention and the problem of work stock management is not a minor one of the many. It is not an uncommon thing to see an article in the current magazine or in the daily news paper but these many times are based more upon fiction than upon facts and do not serve to solve the problems before us. Munsey's magazine for March 1913 contains an article by Herbert N. Casson on "The Horse Cost of Living" in which he says "Exit the horse-enter the truck and tractor". In this article he tells of the enormus cost of keeping the horses of the country one year, and their relative inefficiency and elaborates on the advisability of the tractor and truck but there is considerable of a question if the day has yet come when we shall dispose of our work stock and replace them with the motor truck and tractor. It is an evident fact that in the Corn Belt area where corn is the most important crop produced and as yet the only methods of cultivation, that we have available is the work stock and horse cultivator, we aren'a poor position to do away with the work stock. It is also quite a question if the tractor can be used supplimentary to the horses in this country or state where corn is grown to such an extent and where cultivation is the limiting factor of the number of acres

that the farmer is able to raise.

Agriculture found, in a recent investigation, that the average cost of raising horse colts, up to the age of three years ,was \$104.06. The value of the labor done by the animals up to this time was \$7.52 This leaves a net cost of \$96.54 per horse colt which is 70.9 per cent of the value of the animal at three years of age. The total cost includes, feed, shelter, service fee, value of time lost by mare in foaling, veterinary services, care, breaking to halter and \$5.01 for other expenses.

After a careful study of the problems bearing directly on work stock management there seems to be no question as to the advisability of the farmers keeping mares for all or at least a part of their work stock. These mares should be made to produce colts as regularly as possible and thereby return a profit to their owner other than by the work they perform. These colts should, without a doubt, be mule colts if the owner cares to dispose of them at an early age and if mule colts /it/better to have the mares foal in spring but if the colts are to be kept by the owner until maturity and other conditions favorable it is well to raise fall horse colts.

If mares are to be kept and bred to raise colts they should, without a doubt, be kept as long as they will breed and at the same time prove efficient workers. The other stock should be disposed of at the time when they will "top the market" or at least should be sold before they reach the age when they

rapidly decrease in value. This applies to either geldings or mules. These animals can be purchased as two, three, or four year olds, kept three to five years and worked and then sold at as good, or possibly better, price than was paid for them. Older work stock is not as efficient and the depreciation in value is a point well worth consideration.

## SUMMARY

After a careful study of the foregoing investigation the following points prove themselves worthy of our attention and may be summed up as follows:

- (1) As the size of farm increases there is a noticeable increase in size and value of the work stock. The value of horses and mules ranges from #10.00 to \$30.00 per head higher on the large than than on the small farms.
- (2) The per cent of all work stock that are mules increases as the size of the farm increases. The per cent of geldings remains about the same and the per cent of mares decreases with increase of farm area.
- (3) The value of mules at any age is higher than that of horses at the same age.
- (4) There is a decrease in the number of young work stock (under 2 years old), per unit area, as the farm area increases
- (5) There is a marked decrease in the number of mares kept exclusively for breeding and those kept for work that raise colts (per unit area) as the farm area increases.
- (6) The number of colts raised per farm does not increase at all in proportion to the increase in area. On the smaller farms there is an average of one colt raised per every 72 acres and on the larger farms there is only one for every 310 acres.
- (7) The per cent of colts raised is about 67 in all cases there being no difference in regard to size of farm.

- (8) There are about equal numbers of horse and mule colts raised.
- (9) Practically all farmers prefer spring colts to fall colts but this preference does not seem well founded in many cases.
- (10) The service fee for stude ranges from \$2.75 to \$3.00 more than the fee for jacks.
- (11) The average age of selling horse colts is 8 months and of mules about 6.5 months. The average price respectively is about \$70.00 and \$86.00
- (12) The average cost of breaking differs \$2.00 to \$6.00 in favor of mules over horses.
- (13) The average age of selling mature work stock is about a year younger for mules than for horses and they bring from \$20.00 to \$35.00 per head more than the horses.
- (14) The average age that the animals are purchased, if any, is about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 years old for the horses and  $1\frac{3}{4}$  to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  for mules with the average cost ranging about the same.
- (15) The actual cost of keeping work stock per year is about \$80.00 which is approximately twice as high as the farmer estimates it.
- (16) It is generally considered that the mule is much more efficient than the horse.
- (17) The average number moderated by one horse is 19.19 in group I, as compared to 49.26 acres in group I $\blacktriangledown$  or in other words one horse can operate  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as much on the large farm as on the small one.

- (18) As the size of farm increases and the amount that one horse operates increases the crop yields DO NOT decrease but show a tendency to increase with increase in area.
- (19) The dairy farms are smaller and keep, comparatively, more work stock than other types of farms but they keep their work stock busy a greater per centage of the time.
- (20) The beef cattle farms are larger and keep less work stock, on the average, than the farms in general but they do not keep their work stock busy as great a per centage of the time as does the average farmer.
- (21) There is a wide margin of profit between the cost of raising and the selling price of three year old horses and without a doubt that margin is greater for mules than for horses.