

Statement of Permission to Copy

In presenting this professional paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this professional paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying of publication of this professional paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

David L. Sandor

Date

Aug 24, 1973

A STUDY OF PERQUISITES PROVIDED TO MONTANA'S
FULL TIME FARM AND RANCH EMPLOYEES

by

DAVID JOSEPH SANDON

A professional paper submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Education

Approved:

Max L. Anderson
Head, Major Department

Max L. Anderson
Chairman, Examining Committee

J. Goering
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to those persons whose assistance has contributed to this study.

To his major advisor and graduate committee chairman, Dr. Max L. Amberson, for his personal interest, advice, and assistance in both the writer's graduate program and in the conduct of this study.

To Dr. Douglas Bishop for his personal interest and assistance in the development of this study and for serving on the graduate committee.

To Dr. Martin S. Stauber and Dr. Dana H. Myrick for the assistance in developing the writer's graduate program and for their time spent serving on the writer's graduate committee.

To Dr. Ervin P. Smith for his assistance in data programming.

To his wife, Dina, for her many sacrifices, patience, assistance, and encouragement, and to his son, Kirk, for his patience and sacrifices throughout the writer's graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
VITA	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Need for the Study	2
Outside of Agriculture	2
Inside Agriculture	3
Objectives	4
Assumption	5
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	5
Identifying the Population	6
Development of the Study	6
Development of the Questionnaire	7
II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
Businesses Outside of Agriculture	9
Businesses in Agriculture	11
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA	15
Size and Form of Ownership of the Sample Population	17

	<u>Page</u>
Housing: Conveniences and Furnishings	
Included with Housing	20
Incentive Programs	25
Vacation and Leave of Absence	31
Meals and Their Value	34
Insurance	36
Transportation	36
Retirement	42
Length of Employment	45
Relationship and Anticipated Length of Continued Employment	47
Value of Total Benefit Package	47
IV. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
Conclusions	51
Implications	52
Recommendations	53
APPENDIX	55
Initial Cover Letter	56
Follow-up Cover Letter	57
Questionnaire	58
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	62

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Sample Distribution by Size in Acres and Type of Operation	18
2. Sample Description by Type of Operation and Size in Acres	19
3. Housing Benefits Provided	21
4. Value of Housing	22
5. Furnishings and Conveniences	23
6. Incentive Programs Provided	26
7. Size of Incentive	27
8. Vacation	32
9. Leave of Absence	33
10. Meals	35
11. Insurance	37
12. Use of Farm Vehicles by Employees	39
13. Supplies Provided for Employees' Personal Automobiles	41
14. Retirement Benefits	43
15. Value of Benefits not Specifically Mentioned in the Questionnaire	44
16. Length of Employment of Current Employees	46
17. Family Relationship and Anticipated Length of Continued Employment	48
18. Importance of Perquisites Provided	49

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in an attempt to gather data which have previously been unavailable. Information on perquisites, fringe benefits, provided by farmers and ranchers in Montana has not been published except in very general terms. It was hoped that agri-producers in Montana could use this information to assist them in finding and keeping competent full-time help.

On March 19, 1973, a questionnaire and cover letter were sent to 180 agri-producers, who responded to the Agricultural Production Manpower Survey conducted in 1972, indicating that they hired full-time labor. Ninety-four responses, 52.2%, had been received by April 23, 1973. Non-respondents were sent another questionnaire and a different cover letter on April 23, 1973. On May 14, the last day that responses were accepted, 151 questionnaires, 83.9%, had been received. Responses to the initial questionnaire were kept separate from responses to the follow-up questionnaire.

All data, those from the respondents and from the follow-up, were subjected to the Chi square test to see if there was any difference in the response of the two groups. Of the 100 variables tested, it was found that the answers from respondents and follow-up were significantly different on 13 variables at the .05 level. Responses to those 13 variables were handled separately in the tables. Responses to the 87 variables, which were not significantly different, were presented in the aggregate.

When the responses were coded in preparation for card punching, it was found that 29 responses, 16.1%, were from people who did not currently hire full-time labor. These responses were discarded. The 122 responses which remained, 67.8%, were coded, the information was put on punch cards and the data were analyzed by the Sigma 7 computer at Montana State University. Information obtained from the survey was presented in tabular and narrative form.

Major findings:

1. Housing, vacations and leave of absence were provided by more than 90% of the respondents.
2. Incentive programs of one type or another were provided by 75% of the respondents.

3. Some type of insurance was provided by 74% of the respondents.
4. Benefits provided were felt to be valuable by 34% of the respondents, and 12% said they were very valuable.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Introduction

The agricultural laborer has been generally thought of as a low income individual. Seasonal and full-time agricultural laborers with a gross annual income of less than \$3,000 were considered to be poor.¹ Perhaps some of these individuals should not be classified as poor, since they receive perquisites, non-monetary remuneration for their labor, in addition to cash wages. Since most perquisites provided are not of a taxable nature, they have little effect on gross income. Thus, an individual receiving \$3,000 in cash wages plus perquisites may be better off financially than someone who is paid more than \$3,000 cash wages and receives no perquisites.

Purpose of the Study

The writer in this study attempted to determine the nature of a sample population of Montana Agri-Producers who provide perquisites, what monetary value the Agri-Producers put on perquisites provided and the effect perquisites have in helping Agri-Producers obtain and keep hired farm labor. Perquisites included in the study were housing, meals, incentives and employee benefits.

¹Helen H. Lamale, "Poverty: The Word and the Reality," Monthly Labor Review, (July, 1965), 822-827.

Need for the Study

The Montana Agricultural Production Manpower Study (MAPMS) of 1972 found that it is difficult to fill agricultural manpower needs in Montana. Some of the difficulty was linked with low wages paid in agriculture.

Agriculture must compete with industry to fill its manpower needs.

"The large farm operator is faced with all the problems inherent in maintaining an efficient, dependable work force. To keep a good employee, he must compete with the non-farm industries who provide workers with attractive incentives. If he does not know how to attract, or keep regular employees, the operator must mechanize so his family or seasonal workers can handle the peak workload; or he must keep the farm small enough that his family alone can operate it."²

Outside of Agriculture

Most non-agricultural industries are unionized. The unions bargain for wages and benefits which include wage rate, hours of work, working conditions, insurance, retirement as well as other benefits.

"The average industrial employer is currently spending \$1,500 to \$1,600 per year per employee for fringe benefits."³

²Walter E. Sellers, Jr., Family and Hired Labor Used on U.S. Farms in 1966, Economic Research Service Statistical Bulletin number 459, (December, 1970), 24.

³Robert D. Collins, edited by Arthur J. Deric, "Other Fringe Benefits", The Total Approach to Employee Benefits, American Management Association, Inc., (1967), 101.

Information on perquisites provided to non-agricultural employees is readily available from such publications as "The Conference Board Record", "Pension and Welfare News", the American Management Association publications and some economics journals. The Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys all non-agricultural firms every other year, and specific industries in the intervening years.

Inside Agriculture

Iowa State Employment Security offices found difficulty in filling manpower needs, similar to the condition which exists in Montana. Farms were becoming larger and fewer in number. Capital was replacing labor. New kinds of labor were needed, people who were capable of operating more complex and more expensive machinery. Farm wage rates were not as high as non-farm rates. With these facts in mind, research into problems of hiring and keeping full-time labor was initiated. Special attention was given to the total compensation received, especially to perquisites. Research was conducted by Richard B. Smith, an agricultural economist with the Farm Production Economics Division of the Economics Research Service, ERS, USDA; and Earl O. Heady, distinguished professor of economics and director of

the Center of Agricultural and Economic Development at Iowa State University.⁴

The type of information gathered by Smith and Heady is needed to provide Montana's farmers and ranchers with information about the success or failure other farmers and ranchers are experiencing with the perquisites they provide. Using this information, Montana's agri-producers will probably experience less difficulty finding and keeping competent full-time help.

Objectives

The major purpose of this study was to determine what perquisites were being provided, how much they cost the producer, and whether or not the producer felt they were of value in obtaining and keeping full-time help. The following objectives were needed to accomplish this purpose:

1. To determine what types of operations provided housing, its quality and its estimated monetary value.
2. To identify those incentive programs being provided and to estimate their monetary value.
3. To determine what employee benefits are provided and estimate their monetary value.

⁴Richard B. Smith and Earl O. Heady, "Paradox of Farm Labor", Iowa Farm Science, (June, 1970), 3-5.

4. To determine length of employment of present employees and relationship to the employer.
5. To determine if the employer felt that perquisites have brought about changes in employee attitudes, quality of work performed and an increase in the profits to the employer.

Assumption

The writer accepted the assumption that the data gathered and evaluated by MAPMS (1972) were accurate.

Limitations

Limitations common to survey research were accepted by the writer.

Definition of Terms

Agri-Producer: One who engages in "activities associated with principles and processes involved in the planning related to and the economic use of facilities, land, machinery, chemicals, finances and labor. These components are involved primarily in the production of plant and animal products. Agricultural production also includes, to varying degrees, the preparation of these products on farms and ranches for man's use and their disposal by marketing."⁵

⁵ Max L. Amberson and Douglas D. Bishop, Agricultural Production Manpower Report, (Bozeman, Montana: Department of Agricultural Education, Montana State University), (1972), 7.

Hired Labor: All persons paid to perform services related to the business of the employer. Employees will be broken down by relationship to the employer (members of immediate family, related, and not related).

Perquisite: Those benefits provided an employee which have a definite monetary value but are not paid in cash.

Identifying the Population

In 1972, the MAPMS sample was obtained by a random sampling of a list of Montana producers combined from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, ASCS, State office and the Ogden office of the Internal Revenue Service, IRS. All 26,000 names on the ASCS List were producers in Montana and were identified by size of operation and type of ownership. The IRS list, 10,028 names, indicated whether or not the employer hired help. The lists were combined and duplications were removed. A total population of 7255 names remained. From this, a random sample of 4161 producers was drawn. A mailing of 4161 surveys resulted in a return of 1495 or 35.99%.

The population for the study of perquisites was considered to be the 444 respondents to the MAPMS who indicated that they hired full-time help. A sample of 180 producers was drawn from the population.

Development of the Study

A purposive sample of respondents of the MAPMS was mailed a questionnaire with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study

and a stamped return addressed envelope on March 19, 1973. On April 23, 1973, the follow-up procedure was started. Non-respondents were mailed another identical questionnaire with a different cover letter and stamped return addressed envelope. Follow-up responses were not accepted after May 14, 1973. Answers to the questionnaire were coded and key punched; respondents were kept separate from follow-up respondents. The data were processed by computer. To determine if there was a difference between respondents, data were compared statistically using a Chi Square test. When the one hundred variables were tested, it was found that thirteen were significantly different at the .05 level. Variables found to be significantly different were reported separately in the data chapter. Variables which were not significantly different were combined, and data were presented in the aggregate. Information obtained from the survey will be presented in tabular and in narrative form in Chapter III.

Development of the Questionnaire

The first formal draft of the questionnaire was presented with the proposal. The questionnaire was then revised. Each revision was critiqued by one or more of the writer's graduate committee members. When the final draft was accepted, four questionnaires were sent out to validate the questionnaire. Two questionnaires were sent

to agri-producers in the Gallatin Valley, and two to agri-producers in the Madison Valley. The respondents appeared to have no difficulty understanding the questionnaire, and their responses would have been acceptable had they been part of the sample population. Questionnaires were then printed and mailed to the sample population.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of research and related literature was conducted to substantiate the need for research to identify the perquisites Montana agri-producers provide for their full-time employees.

There is a paucity of information on perquisites provided to full-time agricultural employees. The United States Department of Agriculture Statistical Reporting Service, Crop Reporting Board, publishes a weekly report, "Farm Labor", reporting farm hours worked and wages paid. The section on wages gives a monthly, weekly, daily and hourly rate, with house, with board and room and without board and room. The figures are given for each state and the average for the United States. No other perquisites are reported in this publication.

Businesses Outside of Agriculture

Weiss found that one of the problems hospitals have had with perquisites was a problem of communication:

" . . . There is evidence to show that employees do not understand the benefits because the supervisor and other channels of communication have failed to answer the employer's

basic question of what the benefits mean to an individual employee and what an individual employee will get."¹

Collins found that the average industrial employer spent between \$1,500 and \$1,600 annually for perquisites provided to each employee.²

Zollitsch and Langsner, in their writing on administration of wages and salaries, express six reasons for providing perquisites, the first two of which are appropriate for agricultural employers.

"Generally, the primary purpose of supplementary compensation is to attract and to retain the best employees, thereby reducing labor turnover. Typical of our competitive system of free private enterprise, some employers offer more supplementary compensation than others, just as some employers offer more attractive wage-base rates and salaries than their competitors within the same community or industry. Other things being equal, employees naturally tend to gravitate toward employers who offer the most complete benefits and service programs. Such employers install supplementary compensation programs for the purpose of providing economic security for their employees and hope that the employees will in turn reciprocate with loyal support of the company and a continued interest in their jobs that leads to continuous increases in productivity."³

"The rapid expansion and growth of supplementary benefits is, in part, a result of their ability to more completely fulfill the employees' needs. Employees have found that

¹Willard W. Weiss, "The Hardest Story Ever Told: Employee Benefits", Public Relations Journal, 22, (August, 1966), 16-17.

²Collins, Total Approach to Employee Benefits, p. 101.

³Herbert G. Zollitsch and Adolph Langsner, Wage and Salary Administration, South-Western Publishing Co., Cincinnati, Chicago, Dallas, (1970), 621.

benefits provided by the company are better able to fulfill their needs than if they were given the money to provide the benefits for themselves. This is a result of two economies. First, the employee does not have to pay a federal income tax on many of the benefits, whereas he would on any income he would receive in lieu of the payments. Second, by taking advantage of the economies of larger numbers, companies, in most cases, can provide at a lower cost the same benefits the employees could buy on their own if they acted singly."⁴

Businesses in Agriculture

McElroy, in doing research for the USDA's Federal Extension Service, gathered data on cash wages earned by farm workers on the national level:

"Only 21 percent (of the 1969 hired farm working force) were engaged chiefly in farm wagework. Of these, 301,000 were year around workers, who were the most fully employed and highest paid, averaging 319 days of farm wage work and earning \$3485."⁵

His report did not mention the value of perquisites received by the hired farm work force samples in his research, nor the proportion of the workers who received the perquisites.

The United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, ERS, published a bulletin, "Cash Wages and Perquisites Received by Regular Hired Farmworkers, 1966", but it was broken down by region and type of farm only.

⁴Ibid., p. 624.

⁵Robert C. McElroy, The Hired Farm Working Force of 1969, Federal Extension Service Report AER-180, (1970), 2.

The USDA, ERS maintains records on five types of perquisites:

1. House only - a house together with normal upkeep.
2. Room and board - includes food and sleeping accommodations and may include such things as washing and ironing of clothes.
3. Meals only - includes at least one meal per day of work.
4. House and other - includes a house and other items such as a garden plot, meat, employer-paid insurance, automobile, etc.
5. Any other perquisite - any noncash items that do not include a house, room and board, or meals.⁶

These records of perquisites are taken from a sample of about 9600 farmers in 417 counties throughout the 48 contiguous states. The data have been broken down by type of farm and also by region throughout the 48 contiguous states.

"Nearly half of the workers from all farms surveyed were furnished a house. Of those receiving perquisites, about 62 percent were furnished a house. Three-fourths of those furnished a house also received other perquisites. About 13 percent were furnished room and board, another 12 percent did not receive room, board, meals, or a house, but received 'other perquisites'. Four percent of the workers received 'meals only'.

⁶U.S.D.A. Economic Research Service, Cash Wages and Perquisites Received by Regular Hired Farmworkers, 1966, Statistical Bulletin No. 458, (September, 1970), 32.

Workers furnished houses worked the greatest number of hours. This reflects the locating of workers where they are needed on farm operations requiring timeliness and dependability. Workers on dairy and other livestock farms generally were provided housing. By furnishing housing, the operators can locate workers with less difficulty than if they resided elsewhere.

Workers receiving room and board and 'any other perquisite' had a large percentage of their wages in the form of perquisites.

For time spent at work, the value of perquisites ranged from \$0.23 per hour for those receiving 'housing only' or 'meals only' to \$0.93 per hour for those receiving 'any other perquisite.' "7

Sellers, in his study of family and hired labor, observed that agriculture must compete with industry to fill labor needs. One of the most useful tools for this competition is the perquisite, if properly communicated to prospective employees.

"The large farm operator is faced with all the problems inherent in maintaining an efficient, dependable work force. To keep a good employee, he must compete with the non-farm industries who provide workers with attractive incentives. If he does not know how to attract, or keep regular employees, the operator must mechanize . . ."8

Smith and Heady conducted a study of wages and perquisites received by full-time employees of 98 commercial farms in thirteen eastern Iowa counties in 1968. They found that the average overall annual value of perquisites received was \$1,403. The average annual value of cash wages plus perquisites was \$5,780. Cash wages and perquisites

⁷Ibid. p. 7.

⁸Sellers, Family and Hired Labor, 1966, p. 24.

were broken down by skill levels, marital status, age, years worked, distance to the nearest city and education.⁹

Smith and Heady published three additional articles concerning the study cited above: (1) "Farm Labor Pay Packages", (2) "Characteristics of Commercial Farm Operators and Their Employees", (3) "Problems of Hiring and Keeping Full-Time Farm Employees". These three articles were also broken down by skill levels, marital status, age, years worked, distance to the nearest city and education.

The shortage of available information on perquisites provided to agricultural employees is especially evident in relation to Montana. The only figures specific to Montana, that the researcher was able to find, came from a Montana Experiment Station bulletin. Non-cash wages were delineated for Northeast, Northcentral and South-central Montana, \$0.24, \$0.21, and \$0.14 per acre, respectively.¹⁰ The non-cash wages discussed in this bulletin were discussed only in the aggregate, individual perquisites provided were not discussed.

⁹Smith and Heady, "Pay Packages of Full-Time Farm Employees in Eastern Iowa", Iowa Farm Science, Vol. 26 No. 2, (October, 1970), 11-17.

¹⁰Walter G. Heid, Jr., "Cost and Returns of Montana Dryland Wheat Production", Cooperative bulletin - Montana Agricultural Experiment Station and Farm Production Economics Division Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, (November, 1970), 10.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The data presented in this chapter were obtained through the use of a survey instrument. The data were key punched in preparation for analysis using the Sigma 7 computer at Montana State University. Mean, median and standard deviation were calculated on all variables. All variables were cross-tabulated by form of ownership and acres in production.

Survey instruments were mailed to 180 Montana farms and ranchers who responded to MAPMS indicating that they hired full-time labor. Of the 180 surveys mailed, 151 (83.9%) responded to the survey; however, 29 (16.1%) of the responses were not usable because the respondents did not hire full-time labor at that time. This left 122 (67.8%) responses for use in the study.

The response percentages, which appear in the tables, do not always total 100%. This is true since the computer program used for analysis rounded to the nearest whole number before totaling the percentages.

Many of the respondents provide the same benefits in more than one form at the same time; for example, housing on and off the farm, or meals for single men, and meat and eggs for married men.

All tables presented in this report use symbols to represent various forms of ownership and operation. Since the explanation of the code is rather lengthy, it does not appear on the tables.

OO...OWNER OPERATOR - operates and owns at least part of the land being farmed.

OP...OPERATOR - operates the farm or ranch on which he resides, but someone else owns the land.

OPJ...JOINT OPERATOR - two or more operators who do not own the land.

OPC...CORPORATION - operates the farm, the articles of incorporation and has the business registered as a corporation.

OPP...PARTNER - more than one person operating the farm, but does not own the land.

OOJ...JOINT OWNER OPERATOR - operates as a partner on one or more of the income producing farm enterprises.

OW...OWNER - owns land but does not farm the land.

OOC...OWNER OPERATOR CORPORATION - owns some of the land, is the operator and is incorporated.

OOP...OWNER OPERATOR PARTNER - owns some of the land being farmed and is in a partnership.

Throughout the report, all persons who responded to either the initial questionnaire or the follow-up questionnaire are referred to as respondents, except in Tables 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 16. Answers from respondents and follow-up respondents were significantly different, at the .05 level, for 13 different questions. The variables

affected by these different answers are presented separately in the tables. An asterisk (*) precedes data obtained from the initial questionnaire, referred to as respondents. A double asterisk (**) precedes data obtained from the follow-up questionnaire, referred to as follow-up. Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.

Size and Form of Ownership of the
Sample Population

Tables 1 and 2 contain data relating to the size and form of ownership of the sample population, Table 1, and the size and form of ownership of the respondents, Table 2.

Data presented in Table 1 show the sample population broken down both by size of operation and type of ownership. The sample population was heavily concentrated in two types of ownership, 64 Owner Operators and 73 Operators, which represents 36% and 40% of the population, respectively. The largest representation by size was 36 people in the 10,001 acres plus group, followed by 32 in 2,001 to 4,000 acre group and 30 in the 6,001 to 10,000 acres group, which represents 18%, 17% and 16%, respectively.

Data in Table 2 present a breakdown of respondents to the survey by type of ownership and by size of farm in acres. There were responses from employers in each of the nine categories of ownership

TABLE 1

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY SIZE IN ACRES
AND TYPE OF OPERATION. N = 180

Type of Operation	Producers acres in Operation												
	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6001 to 10,000	10,001 to plus	Total			
OO	1	5	4	6	4	13	2	10	19	64			
OP	0	5	5	7	12	13	8	11	12	73			
OPJ	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3			
OPC	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	5	1	12			
OPP	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	1	0	8			
OOJ	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2			
OW	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4			
OOC	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	2	3	13			
OOP	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1			
Total	1	12	9	21	24	32	15	30	36	180			

TABLE 2

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION BY TYPE OF OPERATION
AND SIZE IN ACRES. N = 122

Producers Type of Ownership	Producers Acres in Operation												
	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000	10,001 to plus	Total			
OO	0	(4)	(3)	(3)	(2)	(11)	(2)	(6)	(10)	41			
OP	0	2	2	(6)	(9)	(8)	(5)	(10)	(11)	53			
OPJ	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	(1)	2			
OPC	0	0	0	(2)	(1)	(1)	0	(5)	0	9			
OPP	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	2			
OOJ	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
OW	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	(1)	0	2			
OOC	0	0	0	(2)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(3)	11			
OOP	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	1			
Total	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	25	122			

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation by respondents within that size or ownership group.

and from producers in each of the size categories except for the smallest, 1 to 100 acres. Distribution of responses among the types of ownership and acres in operation was about the same as the distribution of the total sample. All but two size and ownership groups had 50% or greater response.

Housing: Conveniences and Furnishings
Included with Housing

Table 3 deals with housing provided, Table 4 with the value of housing, and Table 5 with the conveniences and furnishings which are included with the house.

Data in Table 3 show a cross tabulation of responses on the location and type of housing provided. Housing of one type or another was provided by at least 50% of the respondents in each group. Housing was provided on the farm by 88% of the respondents which represented at least 50% of the members of each size and ownership group. Off farm housing was provided by 10% of the respondents. An adjustment in the employee's salary to allow the employee to secure housing for himself was provided by 7% of the respondents.

Several different types of housing were offered to full-time employees. A family house was provided by 50% of the members in all but one of the respondent groups. Mobile homes were provided by 30% of the respondents. Single men were provided with a bunkhouse by 25%

TABLE 3
HOUSING BENEFITS PROVIDED

Location of Housing	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation												
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1000 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6,000	6,001 to 10,000	Plus	Total
Housing	Yes	114	93	(39)	(49)	(2)	(8)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(10)	(1)	114	0	(6)	(5)	(13)	(14)	(19)	(10)	(23)	(24)	114
	No	8	7	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	1	8
a. On farm	Yes	107	88	(39)	(44)	(2)	(7)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(9)	(1)	107	0	(6)	(5)	(11)	(13)	(18)	(10)	(23)	(21)	107
	NR	15	12	2	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	0	4	15
b. Off farm	Yes	12	10	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	(1)	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3	4	12
	NR	110	90	41	44	2	8	2	1	2	2	10	0	110	0	7	5	12	14	21	10	20	21	110
c. Housing allowance	Yes	8	7	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	(1)	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	8
	NR	114	93	41	49	2	8	2	1	2	2	9	0	114	0	7	5	14	14	20	10	20	24	114
Type of housing																								
Family house	Yes	93	76	(32)	(40)	(2)	(7)	(2)	0	(2)	0	(7)	(1)	93	0	(5)	(4)	(11)	(8)	(15)	(8)	(20)	(22)	93
	NR	29	24	9	13	0	2	0	1	0	1	4	0	29	0	2	1	3	7	7	3	3	3	29
Mobile home	Yes	36	30	10	16	0	2	(1)	(1)	0	0	5	(1)	36	0	1	(3)	4	7	4	3	6	8	36
	NR	86	70	31	37	2	7	1	0	2	2	6	0	86	0	6	2	10	8	18	8	17	17	86
Bunk house	Yes	31	25	12	11	(2)	2	0	0	0	0	(4)	0	31	0	1	2	2	2	5	3	5	11	31
	NR	91	75	29	42	0	7	2	1	2	2	7	1	91	0	6	3	12	13	17	8	18	14	91
Line shack	Yes	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	NR	121	99	41	52	2	9	2	1	2	2	11	1	121	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	24	121
Other	Yes	5	4	2	1	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	5
	NR	117	96	39	52	1	9	2	1	2	2	10	1	117	0	7	5	13	15	21	10	23	23	117
Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.																								

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.

TABLE 4

VALUE OF HOUSING. N = 122

Housing arrangement	Response	Type	N	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation										Total
				1	101	301	501	1001	2001	4001	6,001	10,001	Plus	1	100	300	500	1000	2000	4000	6000	10,000	Plus	
Rent paid to employer	Yes	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	No	112	92	39	48	2	7	2	1	2	10	0	112	0	6	5	12	14	18	10	23	24	112	
	NR	9	7	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	1	0	1	9	
Amount of rent paid.																								
Annual allowance provided to allow the employee to obtain his own housing	Size	0-49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100	50-99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	199	NR	41	53	2	8	2	1	2	11	1	121	1	0	7	5	13	15	22	11	23	25	121	1
	200	N	41	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	122	1	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	25	122	1
	299		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	399		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	400		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	499		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monthly rent value of equivalent housing	600		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	799		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	800		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	999		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1000		1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Plus	NR	40	49	2	8	2	1	2	9	0	113	0	7	4	14	14	20	10	20	24	24	113	0
	N		41	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	122	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	25	122	0	0
	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	49		15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	99		18	25	(2)	(5)	0	(1)	(2)	4	0	57	0	3	1	(7)	6	9	4	(12)	7	5	30	0
Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.	100		4	7	0	2	(1)	0	0	1	0	15	0	1	2	3	0	2	2	2	2	3	15	0
	149		0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	199		0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	249		0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	299		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	349		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	350		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Plus	NR	4	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	1	1	1	1	2	6	2	1	2	16	0
	N		41	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	122	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	25	122	0	0

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.

TABLE 5

FURNISHINGS AND CONVENIENCES. N = 122

Items provided with the house		Response		Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation											
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000	Plus	Total	
Refrigerator	Yes	87	71	(28)	(39)	(2)	(6)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(7)	(1)	87	0	(4)	(3)	(8)	(11)	(15)	(6)	(20)	(20)	87	
	NR	35	29	13	14	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	0	35	0	3	2	6	4	7	5	3	5	35	
Cooking stove	Yes	88	72	(26)	(41)	(2)	(7)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(7)	(1)	88	0	(4)	(3)	(9)	(11)	(13)	(6)	(20)	(22)	88	
	NR	34	28	15	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	34	0	3	2	5	4	9	5	3	3	34	
Washing machine	Yes	43	35	12	(20)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	4	0	43	0	3	1	3	3	6	4	10	13	43	
	NR	79	65	29	33	1	7	0	0	0	1	7	1	79	0	4	4	11	12	16	7	13	12	79	
Clothes dryer	Yes	28	23	7	11	(1)	1	(2)	0	(1)	5	0	0	28	0	0	0	2	1	4	4	6	11	28	
	NR	94	77	34	42	1	8	0	0	1	1	6	1	94	0	7	5	12	14	18	7	17	14	94	
Electric heat	Yes	15	16	6	3	(1)	1	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	2	0	15	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	1	7	15	
	NR	78	84	26	36	0	6	2	0	0	0	8	0	78	0	5	2	9	9	14	10	16	13	78	
**	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	NR	29	100	9	14	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	29	0	1	2	2	6	6	1	6	5	29	
Forced air heat	Yes	43	46	14	18	0	(5)	(1)	(1)	0	0	(5)	0	43	0	2	(3)	5	(5)	6	4	(10)	8	43	
	NR	50	54	18	21	1	2	1	1	1	1	5	0	50	0	4	0	7	4	10	6	7	12	50	
**	Yes	7	24	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	7	
	NR	22	76	8	9	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	22	0	1	2	2	4	5	1	4	3	22	
Hot water heat	Yes	15	12	4	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	6	2	15	
	NR	107	88	37	43	2	8	2	1	2	11	1	1	107	0	7	5	14	12	19	10	17	23	107	
Central or furnace	Yes	58	48	17	(30)	(1)	3	(1)	0	(1)	4	1	0	58	0	3	2	(9)	(10)	8	(6)	8	12	58	
	NR	64	52	24	23	1	6	1	1	1	1	7	0	64	0	4	3	5	5	14	5	15	13	64	
Other	Yes	13	11	5	5	(1)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	2	1	2	3	0	3	2	13	
	NR	109	89	36	48	1	7	2	1	2	11	1	1	109	0	7	3	13	13	19	11	20	23	109	
Electricity	Yes	104	85	(35)	(45)	(2)	(7)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(9)	(1)	(1)	104	0	(5)	(5)	(11)	(13)	(17)	(10)	(21)	(22)	104	
	NR	18	15	6	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	18	0	2	0	3	2	5	1	2	3	18	
* Running water	Yes	86	92	(30)	(37)	(1)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(9)	0	86	0	(5)	(3)	(11)	(9)	(13)	(9)	(17)	(19)	86	
	NR	7	8	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	1	7	
**	Yes	20	69	(7)	(8)	(1)	(1)	0	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	20	0	(1)	(1)	(2)	(4)	2	0	(5)	(5)	20	
	NR	9	31	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	0	9	
* Indoor toilet facilities**	Yes	85	91	(29)	(38)	(1)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	(8)	0	85	0	(5)	(3)	(11)	(9)	(14)	(8)	(16)	(19)	85	
	NR	8	9	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	1	8	
	Yes	20	69	(7)	(7)	(1)	(2)	0	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	20	0	(1)	(1)	(2)	(4)	2	0	(5)	(5)	20	
	NR	9	31	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	0	9	

* Response to initial questionnaire

significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.

of the respondents. A line shack was offered by only one individual, an OP in the 10,000 plus acreage class.

The value of housing provided is shown in Table 4. Only one employer, an OPC with 501 to 1000 acres, required his employee to pay rent. Nine employers provided an annual housing allowance for their employees so that they could obtain their own housing.

Producers were asked to estimate what it would cost their employees per month to rent housing of equal quality to that being provided in the nearest rural community. Fifty-seven, (47%) of the respondents, valued the housing they provided at \$100 to \$149, while 30 (25%) said the housing was worth \$50 to \$99 and 15 (12%) thought it would cost \$150 to \$199 per month.

Table 5 lists conveniences and furnishings included with the house that the employer provides. It was found that there was a significant difference between the responses of the respondents and three of the follow-up respondents, at the .05 level, for electric heat, forced air heat, running water and indoor toilet facilities.

A refrigerator, a cooking stove and electricity were provided by at least 50% of all size and ownership groups.

Incentive Programs

Tables 6 and 7 contain data relevant to incentive programs. Information on incentives provided is presented in Table 6, and the size of the incentives is the subject of Table 7.

Incentive programs provided to full-time agricultural employees is the subject of Table 6. Incentive programs examined were opportunities to share in ownership or profits of the farming business, bonuses and opportunities for employees to raise livestock and/or crops of their own.

The incentives, which were examined in the study, were opportunities to share in the ownership of the business, share in the profits, and other participation incentives. Bonuses for exceeding a production quota, bonuses for helping keep production costs low, year end bonuses based on length of service, letting employees run livestock of their own, letting employees grow their own crops, providing a garden space, and other crop and livestock incentives were also studied.

The survey showed that 75% of the respondents do provide one or more incentive programs for their employees. All size groups and all but 2 ownership groups had at least 50% participation. The most common incentive was the chance for employees to run their own

TABLE 6
INCENTIVE PROGRAMS PROVIDED. N = 122

Type of Incentive	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation										Total	
		Type	N	%	OO	CP	CBJ	Q2P	Q2J	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1	101	301	501	1001	2001	4001	6,001		10,001
Provide Incentive programs	Yes	92	75	(30)	(42)	0	(8)	(2)	0	(2)	(8)	0	92	0	(4)	(3)	(13)	(10)	(16)	(8)	(19)	(19)	92
	No	30	25	11	11	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	30	0	3	2	1	5	6	3	4	6	30
a. Share in ownership	Yes	8	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	8
	No	114	93	37	51	2	9	3	1	1	10	1	114	0	7	4	13	15	20	10	21	24	114
(1) Interest must be sold back	Yes	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	4
if employee leaves	No	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
	No	116	95	39	51	2	9	2	1	1	10	1	116	0	7	4	13	15	21	10	21	25	116
b. Share in Profits	Yes	11	9	3	5	0	1	0	0	(1)	1	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	3	11
	No	111	91	38	48	2	8	2	1	1	10	1	111	0	7	5	12	13	21	10	21	22	111
c. Other participation incentive	Yes	7	6	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	7
	No	115	94	40	49	2	7	2	1	2	11	1	115	0	7	5	13	14	22	11	22	21	115
d. Bonus for exceeding a prod. quota	Yes	12	10	2	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	6	12
	No	110	90	39	44	2	8	2	1	2	11	1	110	0	7	4	12	13	21	11	23	19	110
e. Bonus for helping keep prod. cost low	Yes	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	No	121	99	41	52	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	5	14	15	22	11	23	24	121
f. Year-end bonus based on length of service	Yes	39	32	13	17	0	4	0	0	(1)	4	0	39	0	0	1	6	4	6	2	7	(13)	39
	No	83	68	28	36	2	5	2	1	1	7	1	83	0	7	4	8	11	16	9	16	12	83
g. Other Bonuses	Yes	12	10	5	4	0	1	(1)	0	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	1	3	12
	No	110	90	36	49	2	8	1	1	2	10	1	110	0	7	5	13	14	17	10	22	22	110
h. Let employee-run livestock	Yes	61	50	(23)	25	0	(5)	(2)	0	(1)	5	0	61	0	2	1	(8)	5	(12)	5	(15)	(13)	61
	No	61	50	18	28	2	4	0	1	1	6	1	61	0	5	4	6	10	10	6	8	12	61
i. Let employee-grow own crops	Yes	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
	No	118	97	39	51	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	118	0	7	4	13	15	21	11	22	25	118
j. Provide * garden space **	Yes	60	65	(20)	(26)	0	(6)	(1)	0	(1)	(6)	0	60	0	2	(2)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(5)	(12)	(15)	60
	No	33	35	12	13	1	1	1	1	0	4	0	33	0	4	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	33
k. Other * crop incentives	Yes	10	34	2	5	0	(1)	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	10	0	0	(1)	(2)	1	(1)	(3)	1	1	10
	No	19	66	7	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	1	1	0	5	5	0	3	4	19
	Yes	12	13	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	5	12
	No	81	87	27	34	1	6	2	1	1	9	0	81	0	6	3	9	8	15	10	15	15	81
	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	No	29	100	9	14	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	29	0	1	2	2	6	6	1	6	5	29

* Response to initial questionnaire significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation within that size or ownership group

TABLE 7

[illegible]

TABLE 7--Continued

Type of incentive	Response	Employers Type of Ownership												Employers Acres in Operation										Total	
		N	%	OO	OP	OFJ	ORC	ORP	OOJ	OW	OC	OC	OP	Total	100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6001 to 10,000	10,001 to plus		
Year-end bonus based on length of service	<\$100	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
	100-199	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
	200-299	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	300-399	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	400-499	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	500-599	5	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	600-799	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	800-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1000 Plus	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
	NR	99	81	34	41	2	7	2	1	2	9	1	99	0	7	4	9	11	21	11	19	17	17	99	
No. of cattle employees can run	No. of animals																								
	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	3-5	4	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	6-10	12	10	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	11-15	7	6	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	16-20	7	6	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	21-30	6	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	31-50	3	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	50	4	3	1	0	0	1	(1)	0	(1)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
NR	76	62	22	35	2	5	1	1	1	8	1	76	0	6	4	8	12	13	7	13	13	13	0	76	
No. of horses employees can run	1	4	4	1	2	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	
	2	7	8	1	2	0	1	0	0	(1)	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	7	
	3	15	16	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	7	15	
	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	NR	67	72	21	30	1	6	1	1	0	7	0	67	0	6	3	11	7	11	8	10	11	0	67	
**	1	2	7	0	2	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	2	
	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	4	2	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	NR	24	83	8	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	24	0	1	2	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	4	24

TABLE 7--Continued

Type of incentive	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation										Total		
		Size	N	#	OO	OP	OEJ	OFC	OFB	OCJ	CW	OC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000		6,001 to 10,000	plus
No. of sheep employees can run	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	9	1	1	0	1	0	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	119	0	7	4	12	15	22	11	23	25	119
	NR	119	98	40	51	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	119	0	7	4	12	15	22	11	23	25	119	0
No. of swine employees	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	3-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	11-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	16-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	21-30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	31-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NR	119	98	40	51	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	119	0	7	5	14	14	22	11	23	24	119	0
No. of acres of crop employees can plant	1-25	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	26-50	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76-100	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	101-150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	151-200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	201-500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	501-1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1000 plus	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	NR	118	97	39	51	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	118	0	7	4	13	15	21	11	22	25	118	0

* Response to initial questionnaire significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within that size or ownership group.

livestock, provided by 50% of the respondents. Year end bonuses based on length of service were provided by 32% of the respondents.

Respondents and follow-up respondents showed a significant difference in their response, at the .05 level, in regard to two incentives. Garden space was provided by 65% of the respondents and only 34% of the follow-up respondents provided this incentive. "Any other crop and livestock incentive" was provided by 13% of the respondents and none of the follow-up respondents.

Data relating to the size of incentive programs provided to full-time employees on Montana farms and ranches are presented in Table 7. Ninety-two (75%) producers indicated on Table 6 that they provide incentives for their employees, but a poor response was received to the question "how large were the incentives".

The number of cattle a hired man is allowed to run was the only incentive which received a good reply, with 38% respondents reporting the number of cattle their employees can run. Twelve producers responded that their men can have 6-10 head of cows, 7 allow 11 to 15 head, 7 allow 16 to 20 head, 6 allow 21 to 30 head, 4 allow 3 to 5 head, 4 allow more than 50 head, 2 allow 2 head, 3 allow 31 to 50 head and 1 respondent allows 1 head.

Year end bonuses was the next most frequent perquisite reported with 23 (19%) of the respondents reporting the size of the bonuses.

The range in size of bonuses was from less than \$100, 3 respondents, to \$1000 and up, 3 respondents. The most common bonus reported was \$500 to 599, 5 respondents.

A significant difference, at the .05 level, between respondents and follow-up was noted in the number of horses employees could keep.

Vacation and Leave of Absence

Tables 8 and 9 are devoted to vacation and leave of absence. Table 8 presents data on vacations; the length, choice of dates, and pay. Table 9 deals with various forms of leave, paid and unpaid, for such reasons as employee sickness, family illness, personal business, employment and other leave time.

Table 8 is devoted to vacation granted to full-time employees. Vacation of some type is allowed by 96% of the respondents, all size and ownership groups reported at least 50% participation. Unused vacation time could be accumulated by 24%. Employees have free choice of vacation dates, during slack time, in 82% of the reported cases; all size and all but one ownership group reported at least 50% participation in this employee benefit. Lengths of vacations vary. The most common length is two weeks, 44%, with one week being allowed on 21% of the farms. Three weeks, four weeks and some other arrangement were reported at 7%, 4% and 11%, respectively.

VACATION. N = 122

Vacation arrangement	Response	Employers Type of Ownership												Employers Acres in Operation												Total
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OCJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000	10,001 plus			
Provide vacation	Yes	117	96	(39)	(50)	(2)	(9)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(11)	(1)	117	0	(7)	(4)	(14)	(15)	(21)	(10)	(22)	(24)	117			
	No	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2			
	NR	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3			
a. Paid	Yes	96	79	(33)	(39)	(1)	(9)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(10)	(1)	96	0	(4)	(3)	(14)	(11)	(18)	(6)	(19)	(21)	96			
	No	16	13	6	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	4	2	3	16			
	NR	10	8	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	10			
b. Accumulate unused vacation	Yes	29	24	10	14	(1)	2	0	0	(1)	1	0	29	0	1	0	3	3	5	4	7	6	29			
	No	62	51	22	23	0	5	2	1	0	8	1	62	0	6	2	9	5	12	4	10	14	62			
	NR	31	25	9	16	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	31	0	0	3	2	7	5	3	6	5	31			
c. Choice of vacation date	Yes	100	82	(36)	(41)	(1)	(9)	(2)	0	(1)	(9)	(1)	100	0	(5)	(4)	(12)	(10)	(21)	(9)	(20)	(19)	100			
	No	7	6	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	7			
	NR	15	12	3	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	15	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	2	3	15			
d. Length	Weeks	N	%																							
	1	26	21	7	11	0	4	0	0	0	(1)	3	0	26	0	0	1	6	1	3	1	8	6	26		
	2	54	44	(22)	20	(2)	2	(2)	(1)	(1)	3	(1)	54	0	(4)	1	5	(9)	10	4	9	12	54			
	3	8	7	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	2	8			
	4	15	12	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	5			
	5	14	11	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	1	3	14			
	Other	15	12	3	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	0	1	3	2	2	1	3	2	1	15		

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

TABLE 9

LEAVE OF ABSENCE. N = 122

Type	Response	Employers Type of Ownership												Employers Acres in Operation											
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	CPJ	OPC	OPF	OOJ	OW	COC	OOJ	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000 plus	Total		
Provide leave of absence	Yes	112	92	(36)	(50)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(10)	(1)	112	0	(7)	(4)	(13)	(14)	(20)	(11)	(20)	(23)	112	
	No	5	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	
	NR	5	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	5	
a. Paid sick* leave	Yes	63	68	(23)	(24)	(1)	(6)	(1)	0	(1)	(7)	0	63	0	(4)	(2)	(9)	3	(12)	(5)	(11)	(17)	63		
	No	12	13	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	12	0	1	0	2	2	2	3	2	0	12		
	NR	18	17	5	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	18	0	1	1	1	4	2	2	4	3	18	
**	Yes	18	62	(6)	(8)	0	(1)	0	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	18	0	0	(2)	(1)	(5)	2	(1)	(3)	(4)	18	
	No	9	31	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	9		
	NR	2	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2		
b. Unpaid leave for family illness	Yes	61	50	18	(29)	(2)	3	(1)	0	(1)	(6)	(1)	61	0	(5)	1	5	(9)	(12)	5	11	13	61		
	No	12	10	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	1	1	2	0	2	-1	3	2	12		
	NR	49	40	18	18	0	6	1	1	1	4	0	49	0	1	3	7	6	8	5	9	10	49		
c. Unpaid leave for personal business	Yes	63	52	20	(30)	(2)	2	(1)	0	(1)	(7)	0	63	0	(4)	1	4	(8)	(12)	(6)	(13)	(15)	63		
	No	14	11	4	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	0	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	14		
	NR	45	37	17	16	0	6	1	0	1	4	0	45	0	0	3	7	6	8	4	8	9	45		
d. Unpaid leave for off-farm employment	Yes	39	32	13	20	(2)	0	(1)	0	(1)	2	0	39	0	(5)	1	2	(8)	8	2	6	7	39		
	No	35	29	10	15	0	3	0	1	0	5	1	35	0	2	1	6	2	6	3	8	7	35		
	NR	48	39	18	18	0	6	1	0	1	4	0	48	0	0	3	6	5	8	6	9	11	48		
e. Other leave	Yes	17	14	9	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	0	0	1	1	0	5	2	2	6	17		
	NR	105	86	32	47	2	8	2	1	2	10	1	105	0	7	4	13	15	17	9	21	19	105		

* Response to initial questionnaire significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

Leaves of absence are provided by 92% of the respondents sampled; there was 50% participation by all size and ownership groups, as illustrated in Table 9. There was a significant difference, at the .05 level, reported on the paid sick leave benefits provided. Respondents reported that 63 (68%) do and 12 (13%) do not provide paid sick leave, while the follow-up respondents indicated 18 (62%) do and 9 (31%) do not provide sick leave. Unpaid leave of absence for family illness is provided by 61 (50%) of the respondents. Unpaid leave for personal business is provided by 63 (52%) of the respondents and 39 (32%) provide unpaid leave for off farm employment, during slack time. Other forms of leave time are provided by 17 (14%) of the respondents.

Meals and Their Value

Meals are one of the more commonly provided perquisites. The data in Table 10 are devoted to the number of meals provided and their cost if provided in a local restaurant.

Fifty percent of the respondents provide meals for their employees. The most common arrangement is to provide three meals a day, 36% of the respondents. The 3 meals provided are valued at \$4.01 to 7.00 by 21% of the respondents, \$1.00 to 4.00 by 18%, \$7.01 to 10.00 by 8% and over \$10 by 1% of the respondents.

TABLE 10

MEALS. N = 122

Meal arrangements	Response	Employers Type of Ownership													Employers Acres in Operation												
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 100	101 300	301 to to to to	501 1000	1001 2000	2001 4000	4001 6000	6001 10,000	10,001 plus	Total			
Provide meals	Yes	61	50	(21)	26	(2)	3	(2)	(1)	(2)	(2)	4	0	61	0	3	(3)	6	5	(13)	4	(12)	(15)	61			
	No	50	41	17	21	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	1	50	0	3	1	8	7	8	7	6	10	50			
	NR	11	9	3	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	5	0	11			
a. Number	#/day	N	%																								
	1	9	7	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	2	9			
	2	5	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	5			
b. Equiva- lent cost in local resta- rant	3	44	36	15	17	(2)	3	(2)	(1)	(1)	3	0	44	0	3	1	4	5	9	4	8	10	43				
	NR	64	52	21	29	0	6	0	0	0	7	1	64	0	4	3	8	10	10	7	11	11	64				
	Value/ day	N	%																								
plus	\$1-4	22	18	7	9	0	1	(1)	0	(2)	2	0	22	0	0	2	2	2	6	1	5	4	22				
	4.01- 7.00	26	21	7	12	(2)	1	(1)	(1)	0	2	0	26	0	3	1	1	3	6	3	3	6	26				
	7.01- 10.00	10	8	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	10				
plus	10.01 plus	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1				
	NR	63	52	21	28	0	6	0	0	0	7	1	63	0	4	2	8	10	7	11	11	11	63				

Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

Insurance

Insurance has long been an important component of the industrial benefit package. Little has been known about insurance for agricultural employees before the Occupational Safety and Health Act. The data in Table 11 list some of the insurance benefits provided employees by respondents to the survey.

Some kind of insurance is made available to employees by 90 (74%) of the respondents to the survey. All size and ownership groups reported at least 50% participation. Liability insurance was the most prevalent form of insurance carried on employees with 66 (54%) of the respondents carrying insurance. All but 2 size groups (4001 to 6000 and 6001 to 10,000) and 1 ownership group (OPC) had at least 50% participation. Health plans are carried for employees of 38 (31%) of the respondents. Life insurance is carried on employees by 11 (9%) and unemployment compensation is carried by 6 (5%) of the respondents.

Transportation

Use of the employer's automobiles is shown in Table 12. Eighty (66%) of the respondents reported that they allow their employees to use vehicles owned by the employer. All size groups and all but one ownership group reported at least 50% participation. Use of vehicles is limited to on ranch use only, by 47 (51%) of the respondents and 21 (72%) of the follow-up respondents. Use in the

TABLE 11
INSURANCE

Benefits provided		Response		Employers Type of Ownership												Employers Acres in Operation											
Type	N	%	CO	OP	OPJ	OFC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 100	101 300	102 500	103 1000	104 2000	105 4000	106 6000	107 10,000	108 plus	Total					
Provide insurance	Yes	90	74	(32)	(35)	(1)	(7)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(9)	(1)	90	0	(6)	(3)	(10)	(11)	(15)	(7)	(19)	(19)	90				
	No	29	24	8	16	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	29	0	1	1	4	4	7	3	3	6	29				
	NR	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3				
a. Health	Yes	38	31	10	15	0	(5)	2	0	0	(6)	0	38	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	(13)	12	38				
	NR	84	69	31	38	2	4	0	1	2	5	1	84	0	7	4	11	13	18	8	10	13	84				
	Yes	11	9	4	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	11				
b. Life	NR	111	91	37	49	2	7	2	1	2	10	1	111	0	6	4	14	15	22	10	19	21	111				
	Yes	66	54	(27)	23	(1)	3	(1)	(1)	(2)	(7)	(1)	66	0	(6)	(3)	(7)	(10)	(12)	5	10	(13)	66				
	NR	56	46	14	30	1	6	1	0	0	4	0	56	0	1	2	7	5	10	6	13	12	56				
d. Unemployment	Yes	6	5	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	6				
	NR	116	95	39	52	2	7	2	1	2	10	1	116	0	7	5	13	13	22	10	21	25	116				
	Premium paid to	Allow- ance	85	70	31	35	1	5	2	1	1	8	1	85	0	6	3	9	11	14	7	17	18	85			
Agent	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1				
	NR	36	30	9	18	1	4	0	0	1	3	0	36	0	1	2	5	4	7	4	6	7	36				
	Amount	N	%																								
Size of annual premium	1-100	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2				
	101-200	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3				
	201-300	8	7	0	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	1	8				
a. Health insurance	301-400	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2				
	401-500	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	2				
	501-600	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1				
b. Life insurance	601-700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	701-800	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1				
	801-up	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
c. Liability insurance	NR	103	84	39	45	2	5	0	1	2	8	1	103	0	7	5	11	15	19	9	15	22	103				
	1-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	101-200	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1				
* Liability insurance	NR	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	6	5	14	15	22	11	23	25	121				
	1-100	5	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2				
	101-200	7	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	7				
401-500	201-300	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2				
	301-400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	401-500	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1				
NR	78	64	24	35	1	7	2	1	0	0	8	0	78	0	4	3	11	9	12	7	15	17	78				

TABLE 11--Continued

Benefits provided	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation												
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPF	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6001 to 10,000	Plus	Total
a. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-100	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		101-200	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	2	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	2
		201-300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		301-400	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		401-500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		501-600	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		601-700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		701-800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		801-plus	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		NR	22	76	8	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	2	1	3	6	1	4	5	22
b. Life	NR	1-500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		601-700	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		701-800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		801-plus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Liability	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	5	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
		51-75	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		76-100	12	10	1	6	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	3	12
d. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
e. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
f. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
g. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
h. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
i. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
j. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
k. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
l. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
m. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
n. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
o. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
p. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
q. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
r. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		51-75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		76-100	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
s. Unemployment-ment	NR	1-25	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		26-50	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

* Response to initial questionnaire significantly different at .05 level of confidence.
 ** Response to follow-up questionnaire
 Numbers in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondent size or ownership group.

TABLE 12

USE OF FARM VEHICLES BY EMPLOYEES.

Vehicle use arrangements		Response		Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation										
Type	N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	100	300	500	1000	2000	4000	6000	8000	10,000	Total		
Allow employees to use ranch vehicles	Yes	80	66	(25)	(36)	(2)	(1)	(4)	(2)	0	(1)	(5)	0	47	0	(3)	(2)	(8)	3	(9)	(8)	5	9	47
	No	39	32	15	15	0	3	0	1	0	5	0	39	0	2	0	4	5	7	2	10	9	39	
	NR	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3		
a. On the ranch	Yes	47	51	14	(20)	(1)	(4)	(2)	0	(1)	(5)	0	47	0	(3)	(2)	(8)	3	(9)	(8)	5	9	47	
	No	14	15	9	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	3	4	14	
	NR	32	34	9	6	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	32	0	1	1	3	6	3	2	9	7	32	
b. Around neighborhood	Yes	21	72	4	(13)	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	(1)	(1)	21	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(6)	(5)	(1)	(5)	1	21	
	No	5	17	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	
	NR	3	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	
c. Other	Yes	22	24	9	6	0	3	(2)	0	0	2	0	22	0	(3)	1	4	2	6	2	1	3	22	
	No	29	31	10	15	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	29	0	2	1	2	1	6	3	6	8	29	
	NR	42	45	13	18	1	2	0	0	1	7	0	42	0	1	1	6	6	4	5	10	9	42	
d. Estimated annual value	Yes	12	41	2	(8)	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	(3)	(3)	(1)	(3)	2	12	
	No	12	41	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3	3	12	
	NR	5	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	
e. Other	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
f. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
g. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
h. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
i. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
j. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
k. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
l. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
m. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
n. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
o. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
p. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
q. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
r. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
s. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
t. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
u. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
v. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
w. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
x. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2	11	1	121	0	7	4	14	15	22	11	23	25	121	
	NR	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
y. Estimated annual value	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	No	121	99	40	53	2	9	2	1	2</														

neighboring communities is allowed by 22 (24%) of the respondents and 12 (41%) of the follow-up. The estimated annual value of this vehicle use was reported as being \$1 to \$100 by 19 (16%) of the respondents, 6 (5%) said the value was \$101 to \$200, 4 (3%) reported \$201 to \$300 and another 4 (3%) reported \$401 to \$500 as the estimated value, \$800 to \$1000 and \$1000 plus were both reported by 3 (2%) and 1 (1%) claimed \$501 to \$600 as the estimated value.

Employers reported they provide some of the supplies needed for maintenance and operation of employees' personal automobiles. Data in Table 13 show some of the supplies furnished and the estimated annual value.

Employees' automobile supplies are provided by 41 (34%) of the respondents. Gasoline is provided by 33 (27%) of the respondents, oil is provided by 31 (25%), grease is provided by 27 (22%), minor repair parts are provided by 11 (12%) and 8 (28%) of the follow-up respondents, and some other supplies are provided by 3 (3%) of the respondents. The estimated annual value ranged from \$1 to \$600. Ten (8%) of the respondents estimated the value of the supplies they provide at \$1 to \$100, 7 (6%) said \$201 to \$300, 4 (3%) said \$101 to \$200, \$301 to \$400 and \$401 to \$500 were both claimed by 2 (2%) and 1 (1%) estimated the value at \$501 to \$600.

TABLE 13
SUPPLIES PROVIDED FOR EMPLOYEES PERSONAL AUTOMOBILES

Automobile supply benefits	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation											
		Type	N	OO	OP	CPJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	100 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6001 to 10,000	10,001 plus	Total	
Provide supplies for operation & maintenance of employees personal automobiles	Yes	41	34	15	15	(2)	3	(2)	0	(1)	3	0	41	0	2	(3)	2	2	(11)	2	9	10	41
	No	77	63	25	36	0	6	0	1	1	7	1	77	0	5	1	12	13	11	7	13	15	77
	NR	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	4
a. Gasoline	Yes	33	27	13	12	(1)	1	(2)	0	(1)	3	0	33	0	2	2	2	1	9	2	7	8	33
	NR	89	73	28	41	1	8	0	1	1	8	1	89	0	5	3	12	14	13	9	16	17	89
b. Oil	Yes	31	25	11	11	(2)	3	(2)	0	(1)	1	0	31	0	1	2	1	1	9	1	8	8	31
	NR	91	75	30	42	0	6	0	1	1	10	1	91	0	6	3	13	14	13	10	15	17	91
c. Grease	Yes	27	22	10	9	(2)	3	(1)	0	(1)	1	0	27	0	1	2	1	1	9	0	6	7	27
	NR	95	78	31	44	0	6	1	1	1	10	1	95	0	6	3	13	14	13	11	17	18	95
d. Minor repair parts	Yes	11	12	2	3	0	3	(2)	0	0	1	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	4	1	11
	NR	82	88	30	36	1	4	0	1	1	9	0	82	0	6	2	12	9	12	9	13	19	82
	Yes	8	28	3	4	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	(1)	0	1	(3)	(1)	1	1	8
	NR	21	72	6	10	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	21	0	1	1	2	5	3	0	5	4	21
e. Other	Yes	3	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
	NR	119	97	41	51	2	8	2	1	2	11	1	119	0	7	4	14	15	21	11	22	25	119
f. Estimated annual value	Amount	N	\$																				
	1-100	10	8	4	3	(1)	0	(1)	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	5	10
	101-200	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	4
	201-300	7	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	2	7
	301-400	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
	401-500	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
	501-600	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	601-800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
801-1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1000-plus	95	76	30	42	1	9	1	1	1	1	9	1	95	0	6	2	12	15	15	10	18	95	

* Response to initial questionnaire significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

Retirement

Retirement benefits are an important benefit provided to employees. Data in Table 14 show the types of retirement plans which are provided by respondents, other than social security.

Fourteen (11%) of the respondents indicated that they provide a retirement plan for their hired help. The different plans offered and percent who offered them were: profit sharing - 2 (2%), Keough - 3 (2%), stock in corporate farm or ranch - 1 (1%), invested matching funds - 1 (1%), unfunded cash payments for life - 1 (1%), cash value of life insurance - 1 (1%) and pension trust funds - 3 (2%). Two-thirds of the respondents, who provide retirement plans, report that the retirement income is vested, that is, the retirement income is not lost if the employee quits and moves to another job.

Questionnaires do not provide all the alternative answers to a question, therefore, the questionnaire used in this study provided a place for respondents to list any benefits and their estimated value provided for their employees. Data in Table 15 show the estimated annual value of benefits not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire.

The benefits, which these values represent, covered such a wide spectrum that only the values will be reported. Twenty (16%) of the respondents reported a range of \$1 to \$1100 plus for the other

TABLE 14
RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Benefit	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation										Total	plus	Total
		N	#	CO	OP	ORJ	OPC	OPP	OOJ	CW	OOC	OOP	Total	100	300	500	1000	2000	4000	6000	10,000			
Provide retirement besides social security	Yes	14	11	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	4	14	
	No	108	89	36	49	2	9	2	0	2	7	1	108	0	6	5	13	12	20	10	21	21	108	
	NR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
a. Type of Plan	1. Profit sharing	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
	2. Keough	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	
	3. Stock in corp.	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
	4. Invested matching funds	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	5. Cash payments for life	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
	6. Cash value of ins.	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	7. Pension trust fund	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	
b. Vested retirement	NR	110	90	36	49	2	9	2	1	2	8	1	110	0	7	5	14	12	20	10	21	21	110	
	Yes	8	7	3	2	0	0	0	(1)	0	2	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	8	
	No	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	
	NR	110	90	36	50	2	9	2	0	2	8	1	110	0	6	5	13	13	20	11	21	21	110	

Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

TABLE 15

VALUE OF BENEFITS NOT SPECIFICALLY NAMED
IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Value of benefits	Response	Employers Type of Ownership												Employers Acres in Operation												Total
		N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OPC	OPP	OCJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6000 to 10,000	10,001 to plus				
Amount		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
1-99		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
100-199		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
200-299..		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
300-399		6	5	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	6			
400-499		7	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	7			
500-599		2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2			
600-699		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
700-899		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
900-1039		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
1100-Plus		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
NR		102	84	34	43	2	8	2	1	2	9	1	102	0	4	3	12	12	21	9	20	21	102			

benefits not specifically named in the questionnaire. Seven (6%) estimated the benefits were worth \$400 to \$499, 6 (5%) said \$300 to \$399, 2 (2%) said \$500 to \$599 and \$1 to \$99, \$101 to \$200, \$700 to \$899, and \$900 to \$1099 were each claimed by 1 (1%).

Length of Employment

High rate of turnover is often reported as a major manpower problem in agriculture. Data in Table 16 provide information regarding tenure of employment. In cases where respondents reported length of employment for more than one current employee, only the length of service for the most senior employee was used for calculation.

Length of service of current employees reported by respondents and follow-up respondents was significantly different, at the .05 level. Respondents reported a range of less than one year to greater than 20 years, with 23 (25%) of the respondents reporting 1 to 2 years service, 20 (22%) reporting 3 to 4 years, 9 (10%) said 5 to 6 years, 8 (9%) reported 9 to 10 years, less than 1 year, 7 to 8 years, 15 to 20 years and more than 20 years were all reported by 6 (6%) and 4 (4%) said 11 to 14 years. Follow-up respondents reported 5 (17%) less than 1 year, 5 to 6 years and 15 to 20 years. Four (14%) reported 11 to 14 years, 2 (7%) reported 3 to 4 years and 1 to 2, 7 to 8, 9 to 10 and more than 20 years were all reported by 1 (3%), respectively.

TABLE 16
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT OF CURRENT EMPLOYEES

Length of employment	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation												
		Years	N	%	OO	OP	CPJ	CPC	OPP	OOJ	CW	OOC	OCP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000	10,001 plus	Total
*	< 1	6	6		1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	6
	1-2	23	25	9	8	9	0	1	(1)	0	0	3	0	23	0	1	2	1	3	6	3	2	5	23
	3-4	20	22	8	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	20	0	2	0	3	3	1	6	4	1	20
	5-6	9	10	2	6	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
	7-8	6	6	2	2	1	0	1	0	(1)	0	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	6
	9-10	8	9	2	3	0	2	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	8
	11-14	4	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	4
	15-20	6	6	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
	> 20	6	6	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	6
	NR	5	5	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	5
**	< 1	5	17	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	5	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	2	(1)	0	0	5
	1-2	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	3-4	2	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	2	0	(1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	5-6	5	17	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	5
	7-8	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	9-10	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	11-14	4	14	2	1	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	(1)	1	1	0	0	1	4
	15-20	5	17	1	2	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	(1)	0	5	0	0	(1)	0	2	0	0	1	1	5
	> 20	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	NR	4	14	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	4

* Response to initial questionnaire

significantly different at .05 level of confidence.

** Response to follow-up questionnaire

Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

Relationship and Anticipated Length
of Continued Employment

Data in Table 17 report the relationship of employees to the family of the employer and also tells how long the employer thinks his present employees will stay.

Employees were members of the immediate family of 32 (26%) of the respondents. Employers who had employees who were related to them estimated that their employees would stay less than 1 year, 1 (1%) of the respondents; 1 to 5 years, 1 (1%); more than 5 years, 15 (12%); uncertain, 12 (10%) and some other length of time, 5 (4%). Employers whose employees were not related to them reported that they expected employees to stay less than 1 year, 4 (3%) of reported cases; 1 to 5 years, 30 (25%); more than 5 years, 33 (27%); uncertain, 34 (28%) and some other length of time, 2 (2%).

Value of Total Benefit Package

Employers were asked to express whether or not they felt the time and money they put into the fringe benefits they provide were worthwhile in relation to employee satisfaction, quality of work and employee attitudes. Data in Table 18 show their responses.

Fringe benefits were considered valuable by 42 (34%) of the respondents, 15 (12%) felt that they were very valuable, 14 (11%) were uncertain about their value, 9 (7%) felt they were of doubtful

TABLE 17
FAMILY RELATIONSHIP AND ANTICIPATED LENGTH OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.
N = 122

Relationship	Response	Employers Type of Ownership											Employers Acres in Operation										
		Type	N	%	OO	OP	OFJ	OFC	OFF	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	100	300	500	1000	2000	4000	6000	10,000	plus
Immediate family	Yes	32	26	13	12	0	1	8	0	1	(2)	0	0	32	0	2	2	2	3	7	2	8	6
	No	87	71	28	39	1	8	0	1	1	0	0	1	87	0	5	3	12	10	15	9	15	18
	NR	3	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1
Anticipated time related employees will stay	< 1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	1-5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	> 5	15	12	6	6	0	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	5	4
	uncer.	12	10	4	4	(1)	0	(1)	0	(1)	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	2	1
	other	5	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
	NR	88	72	28	40	1	8	0	1	1	1	8	1	88	0	5	3	12	10	15	9	15	19
Anticipated time unrelated employees will stay	< 1	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1
	1-5	30	25	7	17	0	2	0	0	0	(1)	3	0	30	0	1	3	3	5	4	8	3	30
	> 5	33	27	11	12	0	(5)	0	(1)	0	0	4	0	33	0	1	0	3	3	7	4	5	10
	uncer.	34	28	11	17	(2)	1	0	0	0	0	2	(1)	34	0	2	0	5	7	4	1	7	0
	other	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	NR	19	16	9	5	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	19	0	3	2	1	1	6	1	3	2

Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation or respondents within the size or ownership group.

TABLE 18

IMPORTANCE OF PERQUISITES PROVIDED
N = 122

Value	Response	Employers Type of Ownership										Employers Acres in Operation											
		N	%	OO	OP	OPJ	OFC	OOP	OOJ	OW	OOC	OOP	Total	1 to 100	101 to 300	301 to 500	501 to 1000	1001 to 2000	2001 to 4000	4001 to 6000	6,001 to 10,000	10,001 Plus	Total
Waste of \$	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Doubtful value	9	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	9
Uncer. Value-able	14	11	6	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	0	1	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	14
Valu-able	42	34	14	18	(1)	4	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	2	(1)	42	0	3	0	3	3	8	4	9	12	42
Valu-able	15	12	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	0	0	1	3	2	1	1	3	4	15
NR	40	33	10	22	1	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	40	0	1	2	3	8	8	4	7	7	40

Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate 50% or greater participation of respondents within the size or ownership group.

value and 2 (2%) felt that fringe benefits are a waste of time. Four ownership groups reported that at least 50% of the members within the group feel that the benefits are valuable.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions, implications and recommendations have been compiled regarding the data presented in the previous chapters:

Conclusions

1. Of the 122 respondents who participated in this survey, 93% provide housing for their employees.
2. Vacations are provided by 96% of the respondents.
3. Leave of absence is granted by 92% of the respondents.
4. Incentive programs of some kind are provided by 75% of the respondents. Allowing employees to raise their own cattle, the most commonly used incentive, is provided by 50% of the respondents.
5. Meals are provided for employees by 50% of the respondents.
6. Seventy-four percent of the respondents provide some kind of insurance for their employees. Liability, the most commonly used insurance benefit, is provided by 54% of the respondents.
7. Use of farm or ranch automobiles by their employees was allowed by 66% of the respondents.

8. A higher percentage of respondents than follow-up respondents provided the benefit under discussion in 9 of the 13 questions which received significantly different answers from the two groups.
9. The length of employment of current employees was longer for the follow-up respondents than for the respondents.
10. The agri-producers who responded to this survey feel that the perquisites they provide are worth the time, money and effort they require. Thirty-four percent of the respondents said they were valuable, 12% said they were very valuable and 11% said they were uncertain. Seven percent said they felt perquisites were of doubtful value and 2% said they were a waste of money.

Implications

1. In only 4 of the 13 significantly different answers to questions were the follow-up respondents above respondents in the percent who provide a benefit, yet follow-up respondents have been able to hold their employees longer than the respondents have. This suggests the possibility that the benefits provided by the follow-up respondents may be more important to the employee than those provided by the respondents.

2. The study found that benefits such as housing, vacation, leave of absence, insurance, meals, certain incentive plans and use of farm or ranch automobiles were being provided by the majority of respondents. Many of the respondents indicated in MAPMS that they had difficulty finding and keeping competent help. This indicates that different or additional benefits must be used to entice workers into agriculture.
3. Response to questions asking what was provided was very good. Questions asking how much, what the benefit was worth or how it was funded, received poorer response. This points to the need for personal interviews to obtain this more personal information from respondents who indicate that they do provide the benefits.

Recommendations

1. Study should be conducted to examine employees' feelings about the benefits provided by their employers.
2. Information on the success of benefits other than those examined in this study should be obtained and compared to the findings of this study.

3. This study, or a similar study, should be done in Montana using a much larger sample. Since 47% of the 81 possible groups had no respondents and 26 others had 5 or less respondents, little can be traced to a particular size of farm or type of ownership.
4. Researchers, who wish to pursue further the data presented in this study, may contact the Agricultural and Industrial Education Department at Montana State University. Data have been retained on IBM cards.

APPENDIX

—Montana State University—

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Tel. 406-587-3121

Department of Agricultural Education
College of Agriculture

Last summer a questionnaire for the recently completed Montana Agricultural Producer's Survey was mailed to you by the College of Agriculture at Montana State University. We would like to thank those of you who participated in the survey.

We now find ourselves in need of additional information since the responses to the original study showed a wide range of benefits provided to full-time employees. We would like more detailed information so that other producers might obtain and keep full-time help. We would greatly appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire if, in fact, you do employ full-time help.

We are aware that this is a busy time for some of you, but the information we ask for is vital to the study, and can only be provided by you. Will you please take ten or fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the self addressed stamped envelope as soon as possible.

If you do not hire full-time help please ignore this request.

We thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David J Sandon, Graduate Student
Department of Agricultural & Industrial Education
College of Agriculture
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

DJS/dms
Encs.

—Montana State University—

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Tel. 406-587-3121

Department of Agricultural Education
College of Agriculture

A questionnaire was mailed to you, as one of the selected Montana agricultural producers, last month in an attempt to gather more complete information on fringe benefits provided to full-time employees. We appreciate, due to the time of year, you may not have had an opportunity to respond.

If at all possible, will you take ten or fifteen minutes to complete the questionnaire if you hire full-time help. If you have already returned the questionnaire we thank you for this response.

In the event that the questionnaire has been misplaced we have included another one and also a return envelope.

We thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David J Sandon, Graduate Student
Department of Agricultural & Industrial Education
College of Agriculture
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

DJS/dms
Encs.



Survey of Employers of Full-Time Help

Please indicate your answer to the following questions by checking the answer or answers that are appropriate for your situation. You may check more than one answer to a question. Please answer the questions on an individual basis if you have more than one employee.

1. Do you provide housing or a housing allowance for your employees? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If your answer is yes, please continue, if no, continue with question number two.
 - A. Location of the house
 - ☐ On the farm.
 - ☐ Off the farm.
 - ☐ A housing allowance is provided to allow the employee to secure their own housing. How much is the annual allowance? \$ _____
 - ☐ Other (specify) _____
 - B. Please indicate the type of housing you provide.
 - ☐ A family house ☐ A bunkhouse ☐ Other (specify) _____
 - ☐ A mobile home ☐ A lineshack _____
 - C. Please indicate which of the following appliances you provide with the house.
 - ☐ Refrigerator ☐ Electric heat
 - ☐ Cooking stove ☐ Forced air heat
 - ☐ Washing machine ☐ Hot water heat
 - ☐ Cloths dryer ☐ Central or floor furnace
 - ☐ Other (specify) _____
 - D. Please indicate which of the following conveniences you provide with the house.
 - ☐ Electricity ☐ Running water ☐ Indoor toilet facilities
 - E. Does your employee pay you rent? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how much per month? \$ _____
How much per month would it cost your employees to obtain equivalent housing in the nearest rural town?

☐ \$ 0-49	☐ \$150-199	☐ \$300-349
☐ \$ 50-99	☐ \$200-249	☐ \$350 _____
☐ \$100-149	☐ \$250-299	

2. Do you provide incentive programs for your full-time employees, other than salary?

___ Yes ___ No

If your answer is yes, please continue, if your answer is no, please continue with question number three.

Please check any of the following incentives you provide.

- A. ___ An opportunity to participate in the ownership of your business.
 Maximum percent? ___%
 Must the employee sell back his interest upon leaving your employment?
 ___ Yes ___ No
- B. ___ An opportunity to share in the net profits of your business?
 Maximum percent? ___%
- C. ___ Other participation incentives (specify) _____

- D. ___ Bonus for exceeding an established production quota.
 Amount in dollars \$ _____
- E. ___ Bonus for helping keep production costs below an established level.
 Amount in dollars \$ _____
- F. ___ Bonus at the end of the year, with the amount based on length of service.
 Amount in dollars \$ _____
- G. ___ Other bonuses (specify) _____

- H. ___ Allow employees to run livestock of their own, up to a certain number.
 How many cattle? _____
 How many horses? _____
 How many sheep? _____
 How many swine? _____
- I. ___ Allow employees to plant crops of their own.
 How many acres? _____
- J. ___ Provide garden space?
- K. ___ Other crop and livestock incentives (specify) _____

3. Please indicate which of the following employee benefits you provide. For benefits you do not provide, check no to the first question and continue to the next lettered question.

- A. Do you provide your employees a vacation? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Yes ☐ No Is it paid?
☐ Yes ☐ No Can vacation time be accumulated, up to an established maximum?
☐ Yes ☐ No Do employees have free choice of vacation dates during your off season?
 How long is the vacation?
☐ 1 wk ☐ 2 wks ☐ 3 wks ☐ 4 wks ☐ Other
- B. Do you allow leave of absence? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Yes ☐ No Do you provide paid sick leave?
☐ Yes ☐ No Do you provide unpaid leave of absence for family illness?
☐ Yes ☐ No Do you provide unpaid leave of absence for personal business?
☐ Yes ☐ No Do you provide unpaid leave of absence for short periods of employment off your farm during your slack time?
☐ Other (specify) _____
- C. Do you provide meals for your employees? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 How many meals per day? ☐ One ☐ Two ☐ Three
 What would the meals cost per day in the nearest community (local restaurant)?
☐ \$1.00-4.00 ☐ \$4.01-7.00 ☐ \$7.01-10.00 ☐ Over \$10.00
- D. Do you provide insurance for your employees? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Health ☐ Life ☐ Liability ☐ Unemployment
 How are premiums paid?
☐ Directly to the insurance company or its agent.
☐ An allowance is provided for this in the employees salary.

	Health	Life	Liability	Unemployment
How many dollars do you pay per year?	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
What percent of the total premium?	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
- E. Do you allow your employees to use your automobiles? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Yes ☐ No For personal use around the farm or ranch?
☐ Yes ☐ No For personal use around the neighboring communities?
☐ Other (specify) _____
 Please estimate the annual dollar value of this use. \$ _____
- F. Do you provide supplies for operation and maintenance of employees personal autos? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Gasoline ☐ Oil ☐ Grease ☐ Minor repair parts ☐ Other
 Please estimate the annual value of these supplies. \$ _____

G. Do you provide a retirement plan for your employees? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please explain it. _____

Is the employees retirement income vested (employee does not lose his retirement if he leaves your employment before retiring)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

H. Please state briefly any other benefits you provide for your employees which you feel are worthwhile for you and your employees, and if possible estimate a dollar value for each. _____

4. How long have your current full-time employees been with you? _____

5. Are your employees members of your immediate family? ☐ Yes ☐ No

A. If your employees are related to you how long do you think they will stay?

☐ Less than a year

☐ Uncertain

☐ One to five years

☐ Other (specify) _____

☐ More than five years

B. If your employees are not related to you, how long do you think they will stay with you?

☐ Less than a year

☐ Uncertain

☐ One to five years

☐ Other (specify) _____

☐ More than five years

6. Worth to you

Do you feel that the employee benefits you provide, as discussed in this questionnaire are worth the time and money you put into them? Can you see any change in employee attitudes, quality of work, and profitability which you feel can be related to these benefits? Please comment.

THANK YOU FOR THE TIME YOU HAVE GIVEN US

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amberson, Max L., and Bishop, Douglas D. Agricultural Production Manpower Report. Bozeman, Montana.: Department of Agricultural Education, 1972.
- Collins, Robert D. "Other Fringe Benefits", The Total Approach to Employee Benefits. Edited by Arthur J. Deric. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1967.
- Heid, Walter G., Jr. Cost and Returns of Montana Dryland Wheat Production, Cooperative bulletin - Montana Agricultural Experiment Station and Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Bozeman, Montana.: Montana State University, 1970.
- Lamale, Helen H. "Poverty: The Word and the Reality", Monthly Labor Review, July, 1965.
- McElroy, Robert C. The Hired Farm Working Force of 1969, Federal Extension Service Report AER - 180, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Sellers, Walter E., Jr. Family and Hired Labor Used on U.S. Farms in 1966. Economic Research Service Statistical Bulletin number 459. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Smith, Richard B., and Heady, Earl O. "Paradox of Farm Labor", Iowa Farm Science, June, 1970, Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, 1970.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, Cash Wages and Perquisites Received by Regular Hired Farm Workers, 1966, Statistical Bulletin number 458, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Weiss, Willard W. "The Hardest Story Ever Told: Employee Benefits", Public Relations Journal, 22 (August, 1966).
- Zollitsch, Herbert G., and Langsner, Adolph. Wage and Salary Administration, Cincinnati, Chicago, Dallas.: South-Western Publishing Co., 1970.