THE ORGANIZATION OF COUNTRY MARKETS

FOR GRAIN IN NORTH DAKOTA

BY

PAUL DWIGHT VALENDE

(B.S., University of Minnesota, 1962)

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree; Master of Science

North Dakota State University

August, 1964
This thesis is approved by:

Fred R. Taylor, Chairman
Department of Agricultural Economics

Aug. 4, 1964 (date)
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge and express his gratitude to the people who assisted him with this study. To the staff members of the Department of Agricultural Economics, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the graduate program. I wish to give special thanks and recognition to Dr. Jerome W. Hammond who supervised the work on this project. His patience, guidance, and helpful suggestions enabled me to complete this thesis.

The assistance of Dr. Fred R. Taylor, Dr. Rex Cox, and Dr. James McDowell in reviewing the manuscript and their constructive criticism greatly improved the quality of the study.

A debt of gratitude is due the many people in the grain industry who cooperated in making this study possible.

Last, but not least, to my wife Carol; I wish to acknowledge her patience with my numerous absences and the encouragement and assistance she gave throughout the course of this study.

P.D.V.

iii
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives of Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Market Structural Relationships</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. TRENDS IN THE INDUSTRY</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Size of Elevator Plants</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Size of Firms</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Types of Business Organization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Elevator Numbers Per Location</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Number of Buyers from Country Elevators</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Concentration of Commission Firms</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of Grain Buying Firms</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. FACTORS AFFECTING INDUSTRY NUMBER, CONCENTRATION, AND PLANT SIZE</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size and Utilization Effects for an Elevator's Costs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hypothetical Relationship Between Short-Run and Long-Run</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Run Cost Relationship</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Run Cost Relationships</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economies of Multi-Plant Firms</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Costs of Multi-Plant Firms</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape of Hypothetical Average Cost Curve for Multi-Plant Firms</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Economies to the Industry</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Reallocation in the Industry</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Optimum Size to Degree of Concentration</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Survivor Technique as a Measure of Efficiency</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Survivor Technique to the Country Grain Industry</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape of Average Cost Curve for Plants by Survivor Technique</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. INDUSTRY INTEGRATION, DIVERSIFICATION, PRODUCT DIFFERENTIATION, ENTRY, AND EXIT</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economies of Vertical Integration</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Motive for Vertical Integration Into the Country Grain Industry</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors Encouraging Vertical Integration</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification by Country Elevators</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Degree of Product Differentiation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Product Differentiation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising by Country Elevators</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Entry</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Entry</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of New Competition</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Exit</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Exit</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of Merging Elevators</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF COUNTRY ELEVATORS</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Grain Sales Used by Country Elevators</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Shift in the Pattern of Marketing Grains</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of Pricing Policy to Farmers</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of Nonprice Factors in Procurement of Grains</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair Competition</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Influence of Spatial Considerations on Conduct</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. COUNTRY ELEVATOR PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Ratios</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Profits</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Capacity</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Efficiency—An Industry Adjustment Problem</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Structural Characteristics</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Characteristics of Country Elevators</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Performance</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Recommendations</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Appendix Tables</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Questionnaires</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Capacity, Number of Elevators, and Average Capacity Per Elevator, North Dakota, 1953 and 1957-1962</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Degree of Concentration of Elevator Ownership, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concentration of Number of Elevators Controlled by Largest Firms, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proportion of Country Elevators Controlled by Firms, by Capacity, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Elevators by Legal Type of Firm Organization, North Dakota, 1953 and 1957-1962</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percentage Distribution of Country Elevators by Type of Firm Organization, North Dakota, 1953 and 1957-1962</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Capacity by Type of Firm Organization, North Dakota, 1953 and 1957-1962</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Average Capacity Per Elevator by Type of Organization, North Dakota, 1953, 1958 and 1962</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number and Proportion of Multi-Plant Locations, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total Capacity of Multi-Plant Locations, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Average Cost Per Bushel by Type of Firm Organization, North Dakota, 1962</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Licensed Storage Capacity, Volume Capacity, Excess Storage Capacity, and Excess Volume Capacity for 72 North Dakota Elevators</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Number of Elevators Providing the Following Services (77 Responses), North Dakota, 1962</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Volume of Grain Sold To Arrive, On Track, or Spot Cash, and Grain Sold on Consignment or On Spot, North Dakota, 1962</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLES

16. Responsibilities of the Buyer and Seller According to Various Methods of Sales .............................................. 81

17. Methods Managers Used to Learn About Prices Offered by Other Elevators, North Dakota, 1962 .................. 84


19. Profit Rate of North Dakota Country Elevators as a Percentage on Equity (Before Income Tax) by Type of Legal Organization, 1961 and 1962 ......................... 94

20. Profit Rate of North Dakota Country Elevators as a Percentage on Equity (Before Income Tax) by Size of Elevator Based on Licensed Capacity, 1961 and 1962 .... 94

21. Profit Rate of North Dakota Country Elevators as Percentage of Total Assets and Fixed Assets (Before Income Tax) by Type of Legal Organization, 1961 and 1962 .... 96


23. Relationship of Average Licensed Capacity (Elevator Size) to Industry Performance, North Dakota, 1962 ......... 100

Appendix Tables


2. Average Capacity of Multi-Plant Locations, North Dakota, 1953 and 1962 ..................................................... 117


4. Liquidity Ratio for Country Elevators by Legal Type of Business Organization, North Dakota, 1962 .................. 119
# List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Theoretical Relationship Between Long-Run Average Cost and Short-Run Average Cost</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Long-Run Average Cost Curve for 52 Country Elevators, North Dakota, 1962.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Relationship of Per Unit Costs to Ratio of Grain Volume to Licensed Capacity for 52 Country Elevators, North Dakota, 1962</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Economies of Size at Various Levels of Utilization, North Dakota, 1962.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Hypothetical Average Cost Curve for Firms, North Dakota, 1962.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The Long-Run Average Cost Curve for Elevators by the Survivor Technique, North Dakota, 1962.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many changes that affect the operation of country grain elevators, directly or indirectly, are taking place in North Dakota agriculture. Important structural changes include consolidation of grain firms, shifts in elevator location, changes in elevator and firm capacity, and the changing role played by central and local markets. These structural changes have influenced the competitive practices and behavior of firms operating within the industry. The behavior of firms will, in turn, have an important influence on the performance of the industry.

These changes have important implications for those firms operating in the industry as well as for farmers and consumers. North Dakota farmers are concerned with the efficiency of the grain marketing industry because they must compete with other grain producing areas in the United States and with other nations to a greater and greater degree. Consumers are concerned with the efficiency of the grain marketing industry because, in the final analysis, they bear most of the costs of inefficiencies.

Country grain elevators serve as the initial link in the movement of grain from the farm, through the marketing system, and into the hands of consumers. Country grain elevators are primarily engaged in receiving grain from farmers by truck or trailer for future delivery to a secondary elevator, terminal, or processor. Country elevators are widely distributed throughout the grain producing regions of North Dakota and the United States. These country elevators perform many services necessary
in grain marketing, such as storing, grinding and mixing for feed purposes, grading and blending or segregating good grain and poor grain. They also serve as retail feed and farm supply outlets.

Country elevators, as considered in this study, are establishments which:

1. Handle at least 10,000 bushels of grain per year.
2. Receive over 50 per cent of their supply of grain directly from farmers.
3. Sell at least 50 per cent of their supply in the form of grain.

When looking at the North Dakota grain industry, it is found that elevator numbers have decreased greatly over time. To indicate the magnitude of changes in elevator numbers in North Dakota, a list of licensed elevators was compiled for various years from 1953 to 1962 (Table 1). An elevator, in this study, shall refer to all the facilities available at one location under the central control of one firm. Total elevator numbers decreased from 936 in 1953 to 797 in 1962, a decrease of 139 elevators or almost 15 per cent. During this same period, total grain production of major crops remained about the same in North Dakota. In 1953 the average elevator handled approximately 180,000 bushels, whereas in 1962 the average elevator handled approximately 365,000 bushels (Appendix Table 1). This represents over a 100 per cent increase in volume of grain handled per elevator.

These changes raise two questions: Why are these changes in the structure of the country elevator industry taking place, and what are the implications for the industry and society? The purpose of this study is to analyze the impact of organizational changes on the structure,
conduct, and performance of the industry in an attempt to answer these questions.

**Objectives of Study**

The overall objective of this study is to determine the causes and results of changes in market structure of the grain industry at the country elevator level. These changes will be analyzed primarily from the point of view of North Dakota. The more specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To determine the importance of major changes in market structure at country points in North Dakota and central markets for grain.

2. To determine the importance of behavioral characteristics of country elevators in purchasing grains, market policies, the response of elevators to competitor market policies, and the presence or absence of predatory practices.

3. To measure industry performance in terms of output efficiency, the extent of excess capacity, the extent of excess profits, and the impact of structural changes on performance.

4. To ascertain if the legal type of elevator organization affects firm behavior and performance.

The number and size of country elevators, the degree of loyalty, service differentiation and market knowledge, and the conditions of entry and exit are three major structural factors which greatly determine the competitive conditions under which firms operate. The degree to which market structure changes have occurred and the resulting influence on the conduct of elevators are of primary importance. The conduct of firms greatly influences the efficiency of market performance by the industry. Efficient market performance by firms and the industry as a whole is the
ultimate goal of society. Therefore, the degree to which changes in
market conduct can be ascertained and the effect on the performance of
the industry are of great importance.

Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure

Several sources of data were used for information presented in
this study. Numbers of elevators and firms, type of firm organization,
and size of elevators and firms in terms of licensed storage capacity
for North Dakota for the years 1953 and 1957-1962 were calculated from
information in the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota
Directory. The number of licensed elevator operations does not mean
that all plants that hold licenses handle grain, but it seems to be a
fairly good approximation. Some elevators may be used primarily for
storage facilities or handling seed products.

A postcard questionnaire was mailed to 176 firms to determine
legal type of business organization. Type of business organization was
cross-checked in the files of the Office of the Secretary of State at
Bismarck, North Dakota.

A line elevator was classified as a firm owning more than 10
elevators with central offices in a major terminal market. A cooperative
elevator was a firm which qualifies as defined by the Capper-Volstead Act.
The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is a multi-plant firm and is
organized as a cooperative. Grain Terminal Association was arbitrarily
included in the cooperative groups.

A questionnaire was designed to obtain sample data necessary to
determine and measure the various characteristics and changes in the
market structure, conduct, and performance of country elevators. Country elevators were classified into four groups: proprietary (proprietorships and partnerships), local corporations, line elevators, and cooperatives. A 10 per cent random sample was selected from each group. All except two of the elevators in the sample were interviewed. These two refused. Two additional elevators were randomly sampled to take the place of the two non-respondents. After analyzing the completed questionnaires, it was determined three should be thrown out because the information was insufficient or unreliable. In all, 77 country elevator questionnaires were used in this study. Some elevators that cooperated during the interview refused to give financial information. In other cases, this information was not available. As a result, reliable financial information was obtained from only 52 out of 77 questionnaires for the years 1961 and 1962. Elevators in all areas of the state were included in the sample.

Financial data from country elevators were obtained from annual audit reports for most elevators; but for some local cooperatives, this information was obtained from the annual report they submit to their farmer patrons. Commission firms present audit reports for associated elevators. Each commission firm presented reports in varying forms.

Additional information on central market activities and competitive behavior was obtained by personal interviews with commission firm and line elevator company personnel in Minneapolis and St. Paul. This was necessary because several elevators in the sample were line elevators, and many questions were not answered adequately by managers of these plants. These questionnaires were designed to facilitate and provide a cross-check on responses obtained at the country elevator level. The
questionnaire also provided information on the degree and influence of vertical and horizontal integration and the influence of changes in the central market on the market structure of country elevators. Because of the small number of commission and line elevator firms, six of the eight line firms operating elevators in North Dakota were interviewed. Four commission firms, including three non-vertically integrated, were interviewed.

Expected Market Structural Relationships

Economic theory specifies a number of hypotheses regarding expected interrelationships between structure, behavior of firms, and performance of industries. For example, economic theory suggests that behavior of firms in an industry with specific structural features of large numbers of small firms, homogeneous products, and free entry and exit will result in each firm operating as if in isolation. The performance of the industry will therefore be characterized by an output that sells at a price equal to both marginal and average cost. The other limiting type of market situation is monopoly where one firm is the industry. Monopoly features a structure which results in conduct and, therefore, performance where marginal cost equals marginal revenue but does not equal average revenue. The result is that the firm or industry may be earning excess profits and will usually be restricting output. Between these two limiting market situations, the concepts of imperfect competition provide a useful beginning to the understanding of market structures.
Methodology

The methodological approach of analysis used in this study is that of market structure. Market structure analysis is research oriented. It is not only a theory, but it is a method which can be conveniently used to categorize characteristics of an industry. Market structure studies the structural elements in the market in an attempt to empirically predict the behavior of firms and the performance of the industry. Thus, economic and market structural theory suggests that certain structural features of the market will cause or result in certain market behavior of firms which will cause or result in certain market performance. Market structural analysis draws from economic theory by considering the ceteris paribus features of theoretical models as units of inquiry. Bain states:

The theory of industrial organization enables researchers to do four things: (1) to analyze how an industry functions or to give a descriptive account of the operation of an industry; (2) to explain why an industry behaves as it does by establishing logical links between its performance and the determinants of performance; (3) to predict how an industry will work in response to changing conditions; and (4) to evaluate the performance of an industry with respect to certain goals of welfare economics.¹

It is within this framework that this report will endeavor to test hypotheses suggested by economic theory and industrial organization. Several hypotheses will be used in the succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A convenient starting place in studying the country elevators is to review previous research. The literature on market organization of the grain industry, especially at the country elevator level, is quite limited. There were no studies reviewed that dealt specifically with structure, conduct, and performance of the industry. It is understood that a number of studies are presently being researched in this area. However, there are some reports that will aid in the understanding and development of this study.

A study by Farris in 1955 analyzed the pricing process for soft red winter wheat at the country elevator level in selected areas of Indiana. The study analyzes two phases of price discovery for grade No. 2 wheat. The first phase involves quoted paying prices by elevators, and the second involves differences between elevator and laboratory grading and price discounting of wheat.

It was found that frequent day-to-day variations of several cents per bushel occurred in prices paid by elevators. No elevator consistently paid a high or low price throughout the season. The general tendency was for prices paid by all elevators in an area to be grouped together. This question may be asked: "Who sets the prevailing price?"

A sample was taken by the elevator and graded. This same sample

---

was then graded by the Purdue University Agronomy Department and compared with the elevator's grade. It was found that considerable differences in total discounts existed between the final grade and discounts taken by the elevator manager and actual discounts calculated by the Agronomy Department. Protein content as a quality factor (very important in North Dakota) was not considered because it is not a source of price variation for soft red winter wheat in Indiana.

Two reasons were suggested for great variations in actual grade discounts and elevator discounts. First, to avoid farmer dissatisfaction, managers are reluctant to discount grain and, as a result, many follow a practice of lenient grading. This type of practice is possible only if quoted prices were lower than perfectly competitive conditions would allow. Second, an elevator not only buys grains but sells merchandise. Therefore, the elevator has a constant problem of maintaining and building a sufficient volume of business.

Overall results showed substantial and serious departures from perfect competition. The major implication of the study was that present grading and discounting methods did not permit the pricing system to reflect quality wheat preferences to farmers.

A study by Wright made an attempt to do two things: (1) determine and describe pricing patterns and trading practices for grain in the North Central Region, and (2) attempt to explain relationships believed to exist between pricing patterns and trading practices for grain in the North Central Region. The methodology of the study was primarily

---

descriptive. A description of production patterns, elevator facilities, sources of price information, methods of sale, and factors influencing the development of pricing and trading practices were assembled for each state in the North Central Region. Only those findings of significance to the current study of North Dakota country elevators will be summarized.

It was found that the development of subterminal elevators in some states such as Kansas and Illinois was apparently due to grains in these areas moving in many directions while North Dakota grains, especially wheat, move primarily East. Population increases in the West, Southwest, South, and Southeastern parts of the United States relative to the Northeast will cause outlets for the North Central (including North Dakota) Region surplus grain to become more diverse in the future. This will lead to further decentralization of grain buying agencies and further growth of subterminal elevators.

It was also found that sources of price information are often quotations by institutions that buy grain from country elevators. The major source of price information for North Dakota is the terminal market at Minneapolis. Where livestock populations are significant and feed grains (corn and oats) are produced, such as in southeastern North Dakota, truckers and feeders are often the source of price information and outlet for grain handled by country elevators.
CHAPTER III

TRENDS IN THE INDUSTRY

Market structure as outlined by Bain refers to those organizational characteristics which determine the relationship of sellers in the market to each other, of sellers to buyers, and of established sellers to other actual or potential competitors.¹ Economic theory suggests that the degree and effectiveness of competition among country elevators (sellers) will be greatly influenced by the degree of concentration in the industry. The country grain industry has undergone significant changes in concentration for the 10-year period 1953-1962. Mergers have taken place at the local level, and many small elevators have withdrawn from the industry.

Number and Size of Elevator Plants

There has been a fairly consistent trend of decreasing number of elevators since 1923. There were 1,832 licensed elevator plants in North Dakota in 1923.² For the 31-year period 1923-1953, the average decrease in number of elevators was 1.58 per cent per year. The average decrease in number of elevators was 1.41 per cent per year for the 40-year period 1923-1962. The average decrease in number of elevators was 1.49 per cent

per year for the 10-year period 1953-1962. In 1953 there were 936 country elevators in North Dakota (Table 1). In 1962 there were 797 country elevators. This represents a decrease of 139 elevators in 10 years (almost 15 per cent); an average of almost \( \frac{1}{4} \) elevators per year. The effect of \( \frac{1}{4} \) elevators withdrawing from local communities each year has had a significant impact on the degree of concentration and competition at the local community level.

**TABLE 1. TOTAL CAPACITY, NUMBER OF ELEVATORS, AND AVERAGE CAPACITY PER ELEVATOR, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1957-1962**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total capacity (000 bu.)</th>
<th>Number of elevators</th>
<th>Average capacity per elevator (000 bu.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>63,964</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>86,925</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>95,725</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>112.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>117,135</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>139.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>120,540</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>144.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>124,086</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>151.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>122,735</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net change: 1953-1962 57,771 139 85.7


At the same time that the number of elevators has decreased, the total licensed capacity for the state has increased for the 10-year period 1953-1962. Therefore, the average capacity per elevator has steadily increased. Total licensed capacity increased from 63,964,000 bushels in 1953 to 122,735,000 bushels in 1962 (Table 1). This represents an increase of 57,771,000 bushels in 10 years and an increase
from 68,300 bushels to 154,000 bushels average capacity per elevator (12.5 per cent).

The unit used to measure country elevator size in this study is bushels of licensed storage capacity. A significant correlation between licensed storage capacity and number of bushels handled was found for the 1961-1962 period and for the 1962 year for the sample of elevators (70 elevators responding). For the 1961-1962 period, the correlation was significant at the 5 per cent level and it explained 85 per cent of the variation. A correlation between licensed storage capacity and number of bushels handled for the 1961 crop only was not significant at the 5 per cent level. However, the explained variation was 72 per cent. The same correlation for the 1962 crop was significant at the 1 per cent level. Ninety-one per cent of the variation was explained by capacity. Thus, licensed storage capacity will often be a good measure of concentration for country elevators' size because it appears to approximate volume of business.

The average increase in total capacity for the period 1923-1953 was 1.82 per cent per year. The average increase in total capacity from 1953-1962 was 9.03 per cent per year. The greater increase in total licensed capacity from 1953 to 1962 was primarily due to the Commodity Credit Corporation storage program which increased the rate of payment to elevators to build storage facilities with a guaranteed per cent occupancy during the 1950's. In 1960 the CCC storage program reduced rate payments and no longer guaranteed occupancy to country elevators. Without additional government actions on grain storage, the rate of increased licensed storage capacity is likely to level off and possibly
will decline in the future. Total licensed storage capacity decreased from 1961 to 1962.

**Number and Size of Firms**

The size of elevator firms is also measured by the amount of licensed capacity each firm controls. A firm, in contrast to an elevator (plant), is an enterprise controlling one or more elevators (plants). A firm may also control more than one level of grain merchandising and/or processing.

There were 524 firms in 1953 and 499 firms in 1962 owning country elevators in North Dakota (Table 2). This represents a small reduction of 4.8 per cent when compared with the reduction in the number of elevators. The number of single elevator firms decreased by 3.8 per cent. The number of multi-plant elevator firms decreased by 8.7 per cent. An analysis of the data presented in Table 2 illustrates that of 139 elevator reductions from 1953 to 1962, 121 (87 per cent) were from multi-plant firms. Thus, the reduction in elevators is largely the result of a reduction in plants operated by the multi-plant firms. Concentration in regard to number of elevators controlled by the largest firms has decreased for the 10-year period 1953-1962 (Table 3).

The concentration of capacity controlled by the largest firms in the industry has also decreased from 1953 to 1962 (Table 4). The largest four firms controlled 26.2 per cent of total capacity in 1953 and 21.2 per cent in 1962. The largest eight firms controlled 32.9 per cent of total capacity in 1953 and 26.0 per cent in 1962. The largest 20 firms controlled 39.4 per cent of North Dakota's total country elevator
### TABLE 2. DEGREE OF CONCENTRATION OF ELEVATOR OWNERSHIP, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Dakota's elevator firms</th>
<th>Number of elevators 1953</th>
<th>Number of elevators 1962</th>
<th>Net changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest 1 firms(^a)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest 8 firms</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest 20 firms</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of firms</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of elevators</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of single plants under one ownership</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of multi-plant firms</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Ranked on the basis of licensed storage capacity.

**SOURCE:** North Dakota Grain Dealers Association Directories, 1954 and 1963.

### TABLE 3. CONCENTRATION OF NUMBER OF ELEVATORS CONTROLLED BY LARGEST FIRMS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Dakota country elevator firms</th>
<th>Percentage of country elevators 1953</th>
<th>Percentage of country elevators 1962</th>
<th>Per cent increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 firms(^a)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 8 firms</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 firms</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All multi-plant firms</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average capacity per firm**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(000 bu.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 firms(^a)</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 8 firms</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All multi-plant firms</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All firms</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>101.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Ranked on the basis of capacity.

**SOURCE:** North Dakota Grain Dealers Association Directories, 1954 and 1963.
capacity in 1953 and 33.9 per cent in 1962. Looking only at the country elevator level of grain merchandising and the correlation found between volume handled and licensed capacity, it appears that the relative share of grain handled by the largest 4, 8, and 20 firms in the grain industry has decreased for the 10-year period 1953-1962.

TABLE 4. PROPORTION OF COUNTRY ELEVATORS CONTROLLED BY FIRMS, BY CAPACITY, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Dakota country elevator firms</th>
<th>Percentage of North Dakota country elevator capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 4 firms</td>
<td>26.2 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 8 firms</td>
<td>32.9 26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 firms</td>
<td>39.4 33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All multi-plant firms</td>
<td>43.7 36.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRanked on the basis of capacity.


Legal Types of Business Organization

Changes in number and size of elevators have had an important influence on the number and size of plants operated under the various legal types of business organization. The number of proprietary and line elevators has decreased from 1953 to 1962, while the number of local corporations and cooperatively organized plants has increased. These trends are illustrated in Table 5. The decrease in the number of proprietary type elevators is due to an increase in the number of incorporations of these firms and small firms going out of business.
Much of the increase in number of corporate type firms is due to the incorporation of proprietary type firms. Most of the changes in number of elevators controlled by cooperative firms are due to changes in number of plants owned by the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association. Number of line elevators decreased from 297 to 176; 121 plants or almost 41 per cent in 10 years.

### TABLE 5. NUMBER OF ELEVATORS BY LEGAL TYPE OF FIRM ORGANIZATION, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1957-1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Number of elevators)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local corporations</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The per cent of elevators and licensed capacity controlled by legal type of firm organization has also changed significantly for the 10-year period. The total licensed storage capacity and number of elevators controlled by proprietary and line firms decreased, while corporation and cooperative licensed storage capacity and number of elevators increased. The extent of these changes is shown in Tables 6 and 7, respectively.
TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTRY ELEVATORS BY TYPE OF FIRM ORGANIZATION, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1957-1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(per cent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 7. TOTAL CAPACITY BY TYPE OF FIRM ORGANIZATION, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1957-1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proprietary</th>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Line private</th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thou. Per</td>
<td>Thou. Per</td>
<td>Thou. Per</td>
<td>Thou. Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bu. cent</td>
<td>bu. cent</td>
<td>bu. cent</td>
<td>bu. cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>6,342</td>
<td>10,082</td>
<td>18,041</td>
<td>29,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>8,756</td>
<td>13,816</td>
<td>22,279</td>
<td>42,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>8,756</td>
<td>13,816</td>
<td>21,122</td>
<td>48,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>10,233</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>23,229</td>
<td>61,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>23,401</td>
<td>23,155</td>
<td>63,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>10,571</td>
<td>23,959</td>
<td>22,946</td>
<td>66,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>21,922</td>
<td>66,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average licensed storage capacity of all elevators in 1953 was 68,300 and was 154,000 in 1962. Table 8 shows the average storage capacity per elevator by type of firm organization. All types of firms have increased their average storage capacity. The average capacity per elevator for proprietary and line elevators was below the average for all elevators for 1953 to 1962, while corporation and cooperative average capacity per plant was above the average for all elevators in 1953 and 1962.

**TABLE 8. AVERAGE CAPACITY PER ELEVATOR BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953, 1958 AND 1962**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of firm organization</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(000 bu.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>130.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>174.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>124.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>168.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For all elevator plants</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Trends in Elevator Numbers Per Location**

Changes in the number and size of elevators have had a significant effect on the location of plants. The decrease in the total number of elevators from 1953 to 1962 came primarily from "locations" with two or more elevators (Table 9). The number of locations with five elevators

---

3 Locations refers to all points where country elevators are located.
decreased from two in 1953 to none in 1962. The number of locations with four, three, and two plants also decreased from 1953 to 1962. Although the total number of locations with two or more elevators decreased from 250 to 180 (-70), the number of one-elevator locations increased from 359 to 386 (58.9 per cent to 68.3 per cent) from 1953 to 1962. The per cent of total storage capacity controlled by locations with one elevator increased for the 10-year period (Table 10). The major trend appears to be toward one-elevator locations, with the exception of major central locations such as holding and inspection points. For example, at Minot, North Dakota, which is both a holding and inspection point, the number of elevators increased from three in 1953 to four in 1962 with the possibility of increasing to five plants in the near future.

There were nine locations in North Dakota other than holding points and grain inspection points where the number of plants increased during the 10-year period 1953-1962. The number of elevators increased by 10 in these locations. Relocation of elevators due to rising waters of the Garrison Reservoir accounts for an increase in elevators in three locations. Examples of other locations where the number of elevators increased are: Carrington, Hatton, Langdon, and Manvel.

Changes in Number of Buyers from Country Elevators

Economic theory further specifies that the degree and effectiveness of competition among country elevators (sellers) will be significantly influenced by concentration of buying firms within the industry.
TABLE 9. NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MULTI-PLANT LOCATIONS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of elevators per location</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>Net change</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of elevator locations: 609 (100.0) in 1953, 566 (100.0) in 1962. Net change: -43.

Locations refers to all points where country elevators are located.


TABLE 10. TOTAL CAPACITY OF MULTI-PLANT LOCATIONS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of elevators per location</th>
<th>Total capacity per location</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand bushels</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Thousand bushels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3538</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>10,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,677</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25,361</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>49,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,859</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 63,964 (100.0) in 1953, 122,735 (100.0) in 1962.

Increased Concentration of Commission Firms

The questionnaires to commission firms and main offices of line firms in Minneapolis revealed that the number of commission firms had decreased significantly for the 10-year period. The number of commission firms that operate only as commission firms and are not vertically integrated into terminal operations, country elevators, processing, etc., has decreased from approximately 10 in 1953 to 3 in 1962 for the Minneapolis market. The number of commission firms, including those vertically integrated with terminals, country elevators, etc., has decreased from approximately 15 in 1953 to 10 in 1962.

The survey of commission firms revealed that the major reasons for fewer commission firms are:

1. Less grain available to commission firms.
2. Greater credit needs of country elevators.
3. More grain being shipped by truck.

The reasons for less grain volume transacted through commission firms is that more grain has been marketed through CCC. A trend towards a bid market rather than a consignment market has resulted in more grain purchased directly by terminal elevators and processors. Much of this grain by-passes the Minneapolis Grain Exchange. This trend will be discussed in more detail in a later section.

Greater credit needs of country elevators resulted in their switching accounts to the larger and financially stronger commission firms. This forced the remaining smaller commission firms to merge with the larger commission firms and also to merge with integrated terminal operations when they could agree on terms. Officers of commission firms
stated that commission services and terminal operations are complementary.

Commission firms do not handle grain transactions shipped by trucks unless they originate the trucks. A greater volume of grain is being shipped by trucks in recent years. The shipment of grain by trucks in North Dakota was 5 per cent for the 1956-1957 crop, 7 per cent for the 1957-1958 crop, and 14 per cent for the 1958-1959 crop.\textsuperscript{4} The country elevator survey (71 responses) indicates that total grains shipped by truck from North Dakota for the 1962-1963 crop year was between 25 and 30 per cent. The above figure was substantiated by data received from commission firms and line elevator main offices.

Concentration of Grain Buying Firms

The number of buyers of grains has decreased for the 10-year period 1953-1962.\textsuperscript{5} This increased concentration has occurred because of larger firms purchasing smaller firms, some smaller firms dropping out of business, and, in some cases, mergers by larger firms. The officers of commission and line firms were asked to estimate the degree to which the number of buyers of grain had decreased. All firms interviewed agreed that the number of buyers had decreased. Administrative officers estimated that the number of buyers of all grains in general had decreased from 10 to 25 per cent between 1953 and 1962. The effect of

\textsuperscript{4}Taylor, Fred R., and Nelson, David C., \textit{Truck Shipment of Grain from North Dakota Elevators}, Agricultural Economics Report No. 17, Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Fargo, North Dakota, May, 1960, p. 1.

such increased concentration decreases the degree of competition among buyers of grains.

However, concentration is only one variable that affects the degree of competition. Competition among buyers of grains may actually have increased, even though concentration has increased. The degree of competition may have increased because of changes in use of transportation facilities and communication facilities.

Competition between grain buyers may have increased because of greater competition between railroads, trucks, ships, and barges. Greater competition in the transportation industry has reduced grain freight rates in some areas. The reduction of grain freight rates in some areas has changed the traditional price structure which may have given some firms an established advantage over others. The lowering of freight rates has also opened up new markets for grains from North Dakota. For example, a ship traveling from Duluth to Germany must travel only a few miles further than a ship traveling from New York to Germany. A freight reduction to the West Coast from North Dakota would open new markets for grains to Asian countries—especially Japan. Lower freight rates (by truck) from North Dakota to southern states have resulted in more shipment of feed grains to this area. As a result of upsetting traditional freight rates, mode of transportation, and the opening of new markets, buyers of grain from country elevators have been forced to compete more on the basis of price. The surveys of country elevators, commission firms, and main offices of line firms revealed that grain from North Dakota is moving in a greater number of directions. This was especially true for feed grains which travel by truck, barge, and rail in several directions. This results in wider markets and more
competition for grain originating at country elevator points.

Competition between grain buyers may also have increased because of improved and greater use of faster communication facilities such as telephone, telegraph, and teletype machines. These changes have allowed the spread of available market information among grain buyers and among managers of country elevators to a much fuller degree. The only essential for a market is that buyers (grain) and sellers (country elevators) be in constant touch with each other. Therefore, improved methods of communication and their greater use will widen the markets and increase competition among grain buyers.

It appears that the effect of these factors on competition may have been great enough to have offset increased concentration among grain buyers. The above generalizations do not rule out the possibility that increased concentration in a specific industry may have decreased competition for a particular grain.
CHAPTER IV

FACTORS AFFECTING INDUSTRY NUMBER, CONCENTRATION, AND PLANT SIZE

Concentration for country elevators has decreased. Both the number of sellers (elevators) and the number of buyers has decreased. Before proceeding further, it is appropriate to determine what general forces effect concentration and number of sellers (elevators). This study is specifically interested in those forces applicable to country elevators.

Industry Technology

An important characteristic of the country elevator segment of the grain marketing industry is the nature of its technological progressiveness. The survey of country elevators revealed that there have been no major technological innovations in the industry for the 10-year period 1953-1962. In fact, there have been no major technological innovations for several decades. However, there have been gradual improvements in dockage testing equipment, grain cleaners, leg elevators, scales, rodenticides, aeration and fumigation of stored grains, movement of grain horizontally by compressed air, etc. The treating of grain has been developed and improved within the last 10 years. Improved technical grading equipment (used to separate large kernels from small and allowing better grain to be sold at premiums) and protein testers helped managers to purchase grains from farmers more accurately. However, these two improvements have been adopted only by a few larger, more centrally
located country elevators. In the past, grading of grain into various sizes and testing protein content were functions performed primarily by terminal markets.

Size and Utilization Effects for an Elevator's Costs

There are two basic types of cost-volume relationships which need to be considered in any industry. They are referred to as (1) short-run cost and (2) long-run cost relationships.

Economic theory suggests that, as the size of a plant is increased, there are certain economies such as specialization of labor, use of specialized machinery, specialization of management, etc. up to a point. As size of plant is increased past the point, costs will rise. Economic theory also suggests that the short-run average cost curve will decrease up to a point due to spreading fixed costs over a larger volume. Average costs increase past this point because of the principle of diminishing returns.

The Hypothetical Relationship Between Short-Run and Long-Run

A hypothetical relationship between the short-run average cost curves and the long-run average cost curve is illustrated in Figure 1. It is clear that, for any given output, average cost cannot be higher in the long run than in the short run, because any possible resource adjustment which will reduce per bushel costs in the short run must also be possible in the long run. In contrast, it is not always possible to handle grain at lowest cost per bushel in the short run. If volume of grain changes, it is impossible to vary the amount of some resources
Figure 1. The Theoretical Relationship Between Long-Run Average Cost and Short-Run Average Cost
(such as building) in the short run. The long-run average cost curve can, therefore, never intersect a short-run average cost curve. It is possible for the long-run average cost curve to lie below any one short-run cost curve for many outputs. But, at any given output, there must be one short-run cost curve tangent to the long-run average cost curve.\textsuperscript{1} The long-run planning curve in Figure 1 is drawn tangent to each one of the U-shaped short-run cost curves.

Each point on the planning curve represents the minimum cost for handling that particular volume of grain. In Figure 1, point A on cost curve 5 has a higher cost than point B on cost curve 4, even though the short-run cost curve 5 is a more optimum size plant. This possible relationship indicates that short-run economies of utilization may be greater than long-run economies of size. It also explains why a more optimum size plant may have higher costs than a smaller plant in the short run.

**Long-Run Cost Relationship**

The long-run cost relationship refers to the effect of alternative plant sizes on costs. Long-run costs are illustrated in Figure 2 by comparing the cost per bushel of successively larger plants. This type of cost-volume relationship is referred to as "economies of size."

The long-run relationship (Figure 2) shows that, as plant size is increased, cost per bushel decreases up to the point somewhere between 150 and 750 thousand bushels licensed capacity. It should be noted

\textsuperscript{1}Stonier, A. \textit{et al.}, and Hague, D. C., A Textbook of Economic Theory, Longmans, London, 1953, p. 120.
Figure 2. Long-Run Average Cost Curve for 52 Country Elevators, North Dakota, 1962
points of observation (various size plants) fall on both sides of the planning curve. Predicting the shape of the long-run planning curve is especially dangerous where the number of observations are few. It is possible that the long-run planning curve continues to fall very slowly rather than rise from the point 750,000 bushel licensed capacity. However, 1962 was the largest grain crop in the history of North Dakota and, therefore, the volume of grain handled per elevator plant was quite large compared to the average. Thus, it appears that cost points A and B in Figure 2 tend to illustrate the shape of the long-run planning curve for those size plants, even though observations are few in this part of the curve.

The approximate volume handled by plants of various sizes is also illustrated in Figure 2. The triangular symbols represent plants that handled 40,000 to 299,999 bushels in 1962. The square symbols represent plants handling 300,000 to 499,999 bushels and the circle symbols represent plants that handled over 500,000 bushels in 1962. The various symbols point out that plant size (licensed capacity) and volume of grain handled are closely related to cost per bushel.

There appear to be economies associated with larger plants up to a point, but this larger size plant must also obtain a larger volume of grain. Elevators must first depend on the volume of grain available in its competitive area. Available grain is primarily determined by weather conditions and acreage allotments. Therefore, volume of grain handled varies greatly from year to year. Second, a country elevator must depend on the proportion of the total grain available in its competitive area that it expects to receive. The point is that an elevator cannot
automatically handle a larger volume, even if it is known that handling (obtaining) more grain will lower per unit costs.

Short-Run Cost Relationships

The free-hand cost curve in Figure 3 is not the short-run average cost curve for country elevators, because the observation points represent different size plants. The short-run cost relationship refers to the effect of volume on costs for one given size plant. The cost per bushel within a given size plant depends on the intensity with which the plant and its related resources are used.

However, the ratio of grain volume handled to licensed storage capacity allows various size elevators to be analyzed on the basis of a common denominator. Costs per bushel plotted against this ratio indicates that short-run economies do exist.

The relationship between cost per bushel and the ratio of volume of grain handled to licensed storage capacity per plant in 1962 (Figure 3) shows that short-run economies accrue as a plant increases the volume of grain handled. These economies are obtained by spreading fixed costs over a larger volume in the short run. Fixed cost does not vary with the volume of grain handled per plant. It is expected that a point will be reached where diseconomies will force per unit costs to rise.

The per cent of fixed and semi-fixed costs of total costs in elevators is quite large. Manager's salary, general labor (mostly fixed), interest on long term capital, light, heat and power (mostly fixed), auditing and bookkeeping, taxes, insurance, and depreciation on buildings and equipment are fixed expenses. Depreciation is one of the major fixed
Figure 3. Relationship of Per Unit Costs to Ratio of Grain Volume to Licensed Capacity for 52 Country Elevators, North Dakota, 1962
expenses. A variable cost is one that increases or decreases as the volume of grain handled increases or decreases. For any one given plant variable, expenses do not change significantly per unit at varying annual volumes. Thus, most of the expenses associated with operating an elevator are fixed expenses and, as a result, short-run costs per bushel are lowered significantly by handling a larger volume of grain.

The ratio of volume of grain handled to licensed storage capacity (Figure 3) shows the extent to which a plant's capacity to handle grain is being used. A higher ratio indicates greater intensity in use of plant. To diversify into related products, generally referred to as sidelines, is to use related resources such as labor with greater intensity. Point A in Figure 3 illustrates an elevator that handled a volume of grain seven times greater than its licensed storage capacity. It is also observed that this particular plant had the lowest cost of all other plants in the sample. This plant was not a very large plant when measured by licensed capacity.

Note that the short-run curve drawn in Figure 3 does not reach a point where per bushel costs begin to rise. This indicates that the majority of the elevators are not operating at their optimum or lowest cost volume. The primary reason for such a condition is unused plant capacity. Unused plant capacity causes costs per bushel to be much higher than need exist. An oversize building will cause per bushel heating, lighting, cleaning, maintenance, and depreciation costs to be higher than necessary. Unused plant equipment capacity and labor also

---

causes higher per bushel costs.

Short-run economies of handling a larger volume are very great up to a ratio of 2.5. Even though costs decrease at a considerably slower rate from a ratio of 2.5 to 7.25, the free-hand curve (Figure 3) does not reach the point where higher per unit costs set in. In the country elevator survey, one elevator handled a volume of grain 12 times its licensed capacity. Unfortunately, cost data were unavailable. However, after observing Figure 3, it is expected that costs per bushel for this elevator would tend to be quite low relative to other plants.

Figure 4 illustrates the expected change in costs for plants within given size ranges at low, medium, and high levels of utilization. Elevators within the smallest size range (40,000 to 99,999 bushels licensed capacity) can expect to reduce costs per bushel about 15 cents by moving from low utilization to high utilization. Elevators within the size range of 241,000 to 299,999 bushels licensed capacity can expect to reduce costs per bushel about 5 cents by moving from a low to a high level of utilization. The larger potential reduction in costs for smaller elevators compared to larger elevators is due to the higher cost per bushel of licensed storage capacity for smaller elevators. On this basis, it appears the level of use is more important than the economies of size.

To summarize, the short-run relationship illustrated in Figure 3 indicates that (1) economies are quite great due to spreading fixed costs over a larger grain volume, and (2) observed elevators have not reached the optimum point of efficiency for a fixed size plant. Figure 2 illustrates that there appear to be economies (lower costs per bushel)
because of handling a larger absolute volume (long-run cost relationship). Figure 4 illustrates economies of size at low, medium, and high levels of utilization.

**Economies of Multi-Plant Firms**

In addition to economies of plant size, firms may also find that additional economies of size may exist by growing large enough to manage and operate more than one optimum size plant. In any case, firms in the grain industry, as in other industries, have acquired a total productive capacity which is a multiple of an optimum size plant. Economies of multi-plant firms, unlike the economies of larger plants, are likely to be due to economies of (1) large-scale management, (2) large-scale distribution, and/or (3) large-scale buying from suppliers (pecuniary economies).³

The survey of line elevator main offices indicated that each of the above were possible reasons for the existence of multi-plant operations. If these economies are available, increasing the size of the firm beyond one optimum size plant will lower per unit costs of handling grain and distribution of sidelines. However, the officers of line elevators stated that costs per bushel for their elevators were not lower than single optimum size plants. They stated that, although there were some economies of multi-plant operations, other diseconomies such as higher communication costs appear to offset the economies.

Average Costs of Multi-Plant Firms

The average cost per bushel by legal type of firm organization varies considerably (Table 11). Because of differences in accounting procedures, conclusive inferences cannot be drawn from Table 11. But, given the limitations of the average cost per bushel data, the data indicate that average cost per bushel is certainly not lower and may even be higher for line elevators (multi-plant operations) than for other single plant firms. The great majority of non-line firms would be single elevator firms. This conclusion tends to substantiate the information given by administrative personnel of the large line elevator firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of firm organization</th>
<th>Number of plants reporting</th>
<th>Average cost per bushel (cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It appears that the tendency for the largest firms (all multi-plant firms) to decline has been due to diseconomies of the multi-plant operation. However, higher per bushel costs for line elevators may be partly due to inability to attract large enough grain volumes for the
individual elevators in the short run. Line elevator companies generally had smaller sized elevators than the average for all elevators. This, of course, was not true for all line elevator firms. An analysis of differences in efficiency between the very largest business firms and somewhat smaller (but still large) firms in various industries, though not conclusive, indicates that the very large firms are in general neither perceptibly more nor less efficient than firms which are simply large.\textsuperscript{4}

Shape of Hypothetical Average Cost Curve for Multi-Plant Firms

The shape of the hypothetical average cost curve for firms in the grain industry is illustrated in Figure 5. A firm with one plant could obtain the lowest attainable cost by reaching the optimum size sufficient to handle the volume at $Q_1$. But a firm could also handle a volume at $Q_2$ without increasing costs by expanding the number of optimum size plants. The shape of the average cost curve for firms is based on information concerning number and size of firms using primarily the survivor technique. However, there appears to be no reason that multi-plant firms could not be larger than some established firms. Information on actual costs of larger multi-plant operations is not available. As a result, the number of optimum size plants that one firm could own before per bushel costs increase could not be estimated. Many of the multi-plant firms included in the study also own and operate elevators in other states. In any case, economic theory suggests that average costs will

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 152.
Figure 5. The Hypothetical Average Cost Curve for Firms, North Dakota, 1962
eventually increase for multi-plant firms where the number of plants is large, as exists in the grain industry. It therefore appears the shape of the average cost curve for country elevator firms may look like the hypothetical curve drawn in Figure 5.

Application of Economies to the Industry

The cost information in Figures 2, 3, and 4 will allow a country elevator firm to review its present and future plant (or plants') needs and select the plant from the planning curve that will best suit their prospective volume and needs. The cost curves presented in Figures 2, 3, and 4 are average curves constructed from average costs of 52 elevators. These cost points would all lie somewhere above the theoretical planning curve of Figure 1. The cost curves are useful in that they each show the average short-run and long-run economies that have been achieved. Potential savings in cost may be greater than are indicated by the average planning curves, because (1) some points of observation lie below the indicated planning curve, and (2) the minimum average cost point was not obtained by any plant in the short run.

In Figure 2 the cost curve decreased from approximately 12 cents per bushel at 100,000 licensed capacity to 4 cents per bushel at 450,000 to 750,000 bushel licensed capacity. This illustrates the potential per unit cost savings possible by building larger plants, assuming that a larger volume of grain can be obtained.

In Figure 3 cost decreased from 15 cents per bushel for a plant with a ratio of volume handled to licensed capacity of 1; to 4 cents per
bushel for a plant with a ratio of volume handled to licensed capacity of 7. The cost curve in Figure 3 illustrates the potential per unit cost savings possible by making greater use of present facilities.

The extremely short harvest season for small grains such as wheat, barley, and flax, compared to dairy products and non-agricultural industries, results in added problems for elevators. This means that grain comes to country elevators primarily in a very short period. Therefore, the volume of grain the plant is able to handle is greatly affected by its ability to obtain railroad cars and to some extent trucks. Country elevators would be much more efficient if they could fully use their grain merchandising facilities all year. However, we shall see later that this condition is changing due to greater farm storage of grain at harvest time. This trend not only results in more orderly marketing, but probably increased the market price offered to farmers.

Planning Readjustments in the Industry

Because many elevators have not taken advantage of available short-run economies, many plant locations may achieve greater cost savings by reorganizing elevators in the area. In locations where there are two to four plants, large cost savings can be made by consolidation of operations into larger volume plants of more economic size. More than one less-than-optimum size elevator in one location causes excessive overlapping in the procurement of grains. At any rate, the lower costs associated with fewer and larger plants is the basic underlying force causing small inefficient firms to either drop out of business or merge (be purchased) with a larger firm.
Country elevator managers stated that smaller elevators generally do not quit or merge until they are virtually forced to cease operations. This method may not be the lowest cost procedure in obtaining the same end. The potential cost savings from reorganizing elevators into fewer and larger plants may be considerably greater than the potential cost savings made possible by operating at the optimum point on the particular short-run average cost curve. This can be seen more clearly by examination of Figure 1.

The potential cost savings obtained by moving from SRAC₁ to SRAC₅ are substantially greater than moving from point A to point C (Figure 1). Figure 3 illustrated that the potential cost savings possible by using present facilities with greater intensity are substantial. But, in order for an elevator (A) to obtain a larger volume of grain, some other elevator (B), especially in a multi-plant location, has to take less volume. This would cause costs to rise for elevator B. The alternative is, of course, to reorganize plants into fewer and larger plants, especially in multi-plant locations where the greatest potential cost savings can be obtained.

It appears that line elevator companies are engaged in reorganizing the location of their elevators with this idea in mind. Line companies try to sell their smaller and more inefficient plants in multi-plant locations to other established firms. They also are closing the operations of small plants where there are no interested buyers. At the same time, line companies are building larger and more efficient operations in locations where they have a greater advantage. These actions are consistent with obtaining greater efficiency in the industry.
Significance of Optimum Size to Degree of Concentration

We might logically ask the question, "Of what significance is optimum size of a plant and the degree of concentration in an industry?" Differences in optimum size are extremely significant in determining the minimum degree of elevator concentration which is required for an industry to attain maximum efficiency. In this case, efficiency is measured only by plant size. A larger share of the grain market handled by an elevator of minimum optimum size results in fewer elevators needed to handle the industry volume. For example, if one elevator of optimum size could handle 10 per cent of all grain produced in North Dakota, then only 10 elevators could exist in the industry under perfectly competitive conditions.

An elevator of approximately 450,000 to 750,000 bushels licensed storage capacity is the optimum size plant in terms of lowest per bushel costs (Figure 2). This elevator would need to obtain 1,850,000 to 2,000,000 bushels of grain to attain an optimum short-run operation. A greater volume for this size plant might lower costs even more. The degree licensed storage capacity is used to store and handle CCC grain is an additional important factor in building a plant of this size. The degree to which labor and facilities are more fully employed in sideline activities is also an important factor in obtaining lowest costs.

An elevator of this optimum size will handle approximately 0.7 to 1.2 per cent of North Dakota's total grain volume depending upon the size of crop that year. Therefore, if an elevator of optimum size is able to handle 1.0 per cent of the total volume available in North Dakota, 100
such plants would be able to handle the available grain most efficiently in terms of lowest cost per bushel. However, this does not take into account the desires of farmers in terms of the distance they would be willing to haul grain and the increased cost per bushel to them in hauling longer distances.

This study is by no means advocating that there should be only 100 elevators compared with 797 in 1962. But the evidence does point to a definite reduction in the number of plants needed to most efficiently handle the available grain. A more realistic goal might be to reduce the number of small inefficient elevators to the point where all excess capacity is eliminated.

The country elevator survey indicated 36 per cent excess grain handling capacity in 1962 (Table 12). If we assume the small inefficient elevators are eliminated first, then 510 elevators (797 minus 36 per cent of 797) could handle the available grain in North Dakota with potential savings for farmers. A reduction of 287 (797-510) elevators would not significantly increase transportation costs to farmers. The number of locations with one or more elevators was 566 in 1962 (Table 9). It appears that a short-run goal to reorganize (decrease the number of elevators to about 510) is quite reasonable, and would improve industry efficiency without significantly raising transportation costs to farmers.

Many of the remaining plants would still not be of optimum size. At any rate, the evidence indicates that one large elevator in most multi-plant towns could handle the available grain at lower costs per bushel. The exception would be in larger, more central locations such as grain inspection points, holding points, and possibly a few larger communities.
TABLE 12. LICENSED STORAGE CAPACITY, VOLUME CAPACITY, EXCESS STORAGE CAPACITY, AND EXCESS VOLUME CAPACITY FOR 72 NORTH DAKOTA ELEVATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant size a (000 bu.)</th>
<th>Number of reporting elevators</th>
<th>Total licensed storage capacity</th>
<th>Total volume handled in 1962</th>
<th>Excess handling capacity in 1962 b</th>
<th>Excess licensed storage capacity c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-95</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-160</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-460</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261-460</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-1,200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total licensed storage capacity</th>
<th>Total volume handled in 1962</th>
<th>Excess handling capacity in 1962 b</th>
<th>Excess licensed storage capacity c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>30,440,000</td>
<td>23,615,000</td>
<td>3,930,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMeasured by licensed storage capacity.

bPer cent volume that could be handled over 1962 volume.

cExcess licensed storage capacity if no government storage program existed for country elevators, calculated as a per cent of 1962 licensed capacity.


The Survivor Technique as a Measure of Efficiency

The pursuit of efficiency as a determinant of concentration is based on the proposition that there are systematic forces at work which induce firms to strive towards the most efficient size or some size within the range of efficient sizes. Only under the conditions of pure competition is theory able to predict that sellers will be forced to attain optimum sizes in the long run. As a result, the degree of seller concentration will automatically be consistent with maximum efficiency. The real issue involved is whether or not competition will force firms
in the industry to attain optimum sizes to survive.

Stigler, in a paper on The Economies of Scale for the National Bureau of Economic Research, suggests the survivor technique as an alternative to the actual cost method used previously in this study. Other methods are objectionable for one or more of the following reasons:

1. They demand data which are unattainable from many firms.
2. The data obtained vary in accounting procedure (such as depreciation).
3. Difficulty in obtaining up-to-date information.
4. Some data are incapable of precise measurement (such as income).

The survivor technique avoids the problems of resource valuation and the hypothetical nature of technological studies. According to the survivor technique, if the market share of a given class falls, it is considered relatively inefficient, and in general is more inefficient the more rapidly the share of a given class falls. Based on this hypothesis, an efficient size plant is one which survives all the forces affecting competition in the industry. These forces may be government regulations, unstable markets, rapid innovation, or great variation in crop production.

Application of Survivor Technique to the Country Grain Industry

Country elevators were classified by size on the basis of licensed storage capacity and the share of industry licensed storage capacity. The share of industry licensed storage capacity for each class was

---

calculated for the years 1953 and 1962 (Table 13).

Plants of 15,000 to 50,000 licensed storage capacity declined substantially during this period. Elevators from 51,000 to 100,000 bushels licensed capacity also declined in relative importance. On the basis of the survivor technique, it is concluded that these elevators are generally quite inefficient. Thus, the survivor technique substantiates the previous conclusion that a reduction of about 287 small inefficient elevators is a reasonable goal.

Plant size classes from 101,000 to 200,000 and 201,000 to 400,000 bushels licensed capacity increased substantially both in number of plants and the per cent of licensed capacity controlled. The remaining two larger classes showed moderate increases in per cent licensed capacity. Plant survivor data for plants larger than 100,000 bushels licensed capacity suggests that these plants are relatively more efficient.

It should be noted that there were no plants in the class size of 601,000 to 1,600,000 bushels licensed capacity in 1953. Actual cost data illustrated optimum economies of plant size were between 450,000 and 750,000 bushels licensed capacity, and plants of larger than 750,000 bushels licensed capacity are likely to incur diseconomies of size. But, based on the survivor technique, it would appear that there are no diseconomies of size for plants greater than 750,000 bushels licensed capacity. However, this may be drawing an incorrect conclusion since further evidence for plants of this class size needs to be analyzed before one can say whether economies or diseconomies of plant size exist. The larger plants may have been built in anticipation of being more efficient and handling more volume. Only more time and a means of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class interval capacity (000 bu.)</th>
<th>Number of elevators</th>
<th>Per cent of elevators</th>
<th>Total licensed capacity</th>
<th>Per cent licensed capacity</th>
<th>Number of elevators</th>
<th>Per cent of elevators</th>
<th>Total licensed capacity</th>
<th>Per cent licensed capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-50</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>13,161</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>33,458</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>17,201</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>51,524</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>33,126</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13,133</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>936</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,964</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>797</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** North Dakota Grain Dealers Association Directories, 1954 and 1963.
comparison will indicate if they are efficient enough to survive. A future decrease in the per cent of licensed capacity and number of plants for these size plants would indicate possible inefficiencies or diseconomies of size.

Shape of Average Cost Curve for Plants
by Survivor Technique

It should also be recognized that a single optimum size plant will exist in the country grain industry only if all plants are able to use identical resources. Because elevators employ resources of varying quality, and because they have access to volumes of grain of varying sizes, there will tend to develop a frequency distribution of optimum plant sizes. The survivor technique allows us to estimate the shape of the long-run average cost curve from this frequency distribution. The survivor technique does not allow an estimate of how much higher than the optimum (lowest cost) point are the costs of plant sizes whose shares of industry are declining. 6

The shape of long-run average cost curve for country elevators by the survivor technique is shown in Figure 6. The results of the survivor technique conform somewhat with the analysis of cost data; namely, that the range of optimum plant sizes appears to be quite wide. However, the survivor technique indicates a wider range than actual cost data. A possible reason for a wider range of optimum sizes is the restriction placed on plant sizes due to volume available and a high cost of transporting grain large distances by farmers. The higher transportation

6Ibid., p. 59.
costs associated with hauling larger distances are probably greater than the economies of size associated with larger plants.
CHAPTER V

INDUSTRY INTEGRATION, DIVERSIFICATION, PRODUCT
DIFFERENTIATION, ENTRY, AND EXIT

Economies of Vertical Integration

Thus far, a description and analysis of the optimum size of an
elevator and firm has been measured by its licensed storage capacity.
This dimension of size is referred to as horizontal size. Expansion of
size horizontally can occur by expansion of business volume in a given
plant or the owning of more than one plant performing the same handling
process.

However, there is another dimension of size and another direction
in which firms may grow. This dimension of market size or firm growth
is referred to as vertical integration. Vertical integration is simply
a form of business organization in which firms perform two or more
handling processes.

In the grain industry of the United States, some firms have verti-
cally integrated into all possible levels of grain merchandising:
(1) the country elevator level (grain procurement), (2) terminal elevator
merchandising level, and (3) grain exporting level. Firms who perform
all the above levels of grain merchandising have incorporated commission
firms' services into their operation. Some vertically integrated grain
firms have integrated even further into flour milling, soybean processing,
feed processing, and other grain processing services. Some grain firms
have also integrated into farm supply distribution (sidelines).
There are many market and technological reasons encouraging and discouraging firms to vertically integrate either forward or backward or both. Economies of vertical integration are especially apparent in cases where technologically complementary handling processes can be brought together in a single plant.¹ Diseconomies of vertical integration may also occur. For example, manufacturers of flour have not found it economical to integrate forward into grocery wholesaling or retailing since their own product is a small fraction of the total merchandise which must be handled by grocery stores.

The Motive for Vertical Integration Into the Country Grain Industry

The survey of administrative personnel of the large line elevator firms indicated that their motive for integration at the country elevator merchandising level was to enable better procurement of grain. They stated that "the trend was towards a few efficient grain firms who want a pipe line of grain behind them in order to keep a flow of grain from producers to consumers." The quality of various grains varies considerably throughout North Dakota due to local weather conditions. The integration of large grain firms into the country elevator merchandising level allows these larger firms to obtain the quality of grain desired. It enables them to know what quality of grain is available at various locations and what price they need to pay in order to fulfill their buyers' desires.

For the firms which are integrated into feed processing, flour milling, or other grain processing operations, a multi-plant operation at the country elevator level will facilitate the procurement of grain at lower costs and enable the firm to know existing market conditions to a greater degree than could be realized by such a processor purchasing grain through an independent commission firm. For example, an integrated line elevator and feed processing operation could lower costs by grading grains into high quality and low quality. The low quality grains would be used for feed processing and the high quality to other processing for human consumption such as cereals, cake mixes, etc. If this separation of grains is performed at the country elevator level rather than the terminal market, it saves the cost of shipping processed feeds back into rural areas. The decentralization of feed processing has increased in recent years primarily for this reason. A multi-plant elevator operation also provides an excellent outlet for processed feeds.

It appears that lower costs of procurement and increased market knowledge are also major reasons for the merging of terminal elevators, millers (and other processors), commission firms, and multi-plant operations at the country elevator level. This results in much grain movement by-passing the Minneapolis Grain Exchange even though they use it as a pricing mechanism.

Factors Encouraging Vertical Integration

We have seen that changes in a few structural features of the grain market appear to cause a chain reaction. That is, changing some structural variables which in turn may further influence changes in the
original structural variables that initiated the action. Several factors appear to have had the most influence in initiating changes in structural variables.

Commodity Credit Corporation activities gave incentive to farmers, as well as country elevators, to build storage facilities for grain. The increased action of farmers to build storage facilities for grain gave them a choice which allowed them more control over their product. This action has gradually resulted in a shift in market competition for grain from the Minneapolis Grain Exchange to the country elevator and to some degree even further towards the farmer.

Competition in the transportation industry (between trucks, rails, barge and ships) has upset traditional patterns of price and grain movement. This, in turn, has caused greater competition among country elevators and other larger grain firms in the procurement of grain at the lowest cost. For example, alternative modes of transportation may give a country elevator or a larger integrated firm the opportunity to compete at the same or lower transportation costs than fixed rail rates allowed. Since trucks prefer to travel on "good" highways, country elevators located on these highways versus those elevators located on "poor" roads may incur lower costs.

Greater use and improvement of communication facilities has allowed the shift of competition for grain to the country elevator to proceed at a faster and more efficient rate.

The preceding changes have encouraged vertical integration into all levels of grain handling and in some cases have included the integration of grain processing operations. Thus, the primary motive for
the combining of these former independent levels of grain merchandising and processing is to ensure a smoother pipe line of grain from producers to consumers. This conclusion does not rule out the profit motive which gives business firms the needed incentive to proceed.

Diversification by Country Elevators

The basic service rendered by country elevators is the purchasing of grains from farmers. However, country elevators were providing more auxiliary services in 1962 than in 1953. Elevators have become a center for farm supplies and their related services.

The degree to which elevators were diversified into related services is illustrated in Table 14. Some of the major services provided were: cleaning, treating, feeds, fertilizer, chemicals, seeds, feed grinding, coal and general merchandise, etc. There were 37 cooperatives in the study and in these elevators most of the decisions relative to adding or deleting services were made by elected directors or by farmers themselves. It seems safe to assume that the services offered by cooperative elevators reflect the desires of farmers.

It was a consensus of managers that, "if they could provide services desired by farmers, the elevator would receive their grain business." One hundred per cent of the 68 elevator managers responding to this question indicated a major reason for diversifying was to encourage patronage. Managers of eight (12 per cent) elevators stated that most of their services were offered at or very near cost in an effort to encourage more patronage. Fifteen per cent of the managers indicated fuller use of labor was at least part of their reason to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General misc. merchandise</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twine</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldmen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain bins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and oil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augers and sprayers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelleting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified seed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Survey of country elevators, 1963.
diversity into related services. In the final analysis, increased income was the primary reason for diversifying. The survey of line companies' main officers indicated that their primary reason for diversifying into related services and sidelines is to increase income. It was a consensus among line companies that "diversifying allowed their elevator plants to lower per unit costs; that it increased income without increasing cost proportionately."

Diversification reduces the chances that all areas of the business will be unprofitable at the same time. It therefore enables the firm to survive and grow. An underlying force causing elevators to diversify may be to ensure their survival as a business. If a country elevator, for example, experiences a decreasing volume of grain business, its costs per bushel will rise and the elevator will find itself unable to compete. The elevator manager, owner or board of directors will then (if not sooner) seek to find other means of ensuring the survival of the business. Diversifying into related farm supply services provides the next best alternative for country elevators experiencing a decreasing volume of business.

Country elevators, as well as horizontally and vertically integrated grain businesses, also wish to diversify even though they are not under a current threat of elimination because it tends to ensure their survival in the long run. The popular business philosophy that "a business which is not growing is dying" causes business to expand by diversifying when other means, such as increasing grain volume, have been obstructed.

Diversifying provides another major advantage to country elevators. Because of the extreme variability in crop production, elevators may
handle a large efficient volume of grain in years of bumper crops, but handle a very small inefficient volume in years of small crops. Therefore, in an effort to spread risk, country elevators diversify into related services which are not as variable as the volume of grain handled. The survey of line elevator main offices indicated that large horizontally and vertically integrated firms in the grain merchandising business are diversifying into related services, as well as unrelated services, in an effort to spread risk and ensure the survival of their business.

Because the gains and losses from handling sidelines are not easily separated, no attempt was made to determine the cost of handling grains or sidelines separately. However, the following observations were made: The handling of sidelines for some smaller elevators was generally more important than handling of grain. In fact, for some elevators grain handling was a sideline to other departments of business. A study of Indiana elevators showed that variable costs are relatively greater than fixed costs for sideline elevators than for grain elevators. As a result, elevators with large grain volumes can usually afford to pay farmers relatively higher prices for grain and sell sidelines to patrons at relatively lower prices than sideline elevators with similar total dollar sales.²

²Hinrichs, A. F., An Economics Analysis of Local Grain Elevators in Indiana, Bulletin No. 403, Agricultural Experiment Station, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, July, 1935, pp. 30-32.
The Degree of Product Differentiation

The term product differentiation refers to the extent to which outputs (even though very similar) are viewed as non-identical by buyers. This definition may be extended to account for and include the degree to which buyers view a firm as being different from another even though they are similar; product differentiation may also include buyer service attached to the use or production (handling) of a product. In other words, the sources of product differentiation within an industry are all considerations which induce buyers or sellers to prefer one competing output or outlet to another.

Sources of Product Differentiation

There are three possible sources of product differentiation. The first source is differences in quality or design among competing products. In the country elevator industry, the manager can do very little to change the quality of the grains he receives. However, in recent years buyers of grain are becoming more and more conscious of the quality characteristics of grains. These quality characteristics include color, size of kernel, weight per measured bushel, moisture content, shrunken and broken kernels, etc.

Protein content is a quality characteristic which has become very important to wheat and barley buyers in recent years. Protein is not a grading factor, but is quoted and priced separately as a premium to the

---

3Bain, op. cit., p. 214.
basic price for each individual grade of hard red spring wheat.\textsuperscript{4}

The sedimentation test has also been used in recent years to measure the quality of gluten in wheat. When the sedimentation test is used in conjunction with other recognized quality tests, it may provide useful supplemental information to assist in classifying wheats into broad quality ranges of weak, medium, and strong.\textsuperscript{5}

We have seen that buyers of grain from country elevators are emphasizing quality characteristics of grain to a much greater degree in recent years. As a result, country elevators have used blending techniques to a greater degree in an effort to up-grade the overall quality of grain handled. Quality characteristics are reflected in market prices. Larger elevators, plants, and firms will probably (due to more grain and better blending facilities) be able to attract a larger number of bids, and it is possible that some bids may be higher. However, the quality of all grains is largely determined by local weather conditions. The degree to which any one elevator can establish a consistent reputation of having "better" quality grain over a competing elevator would be very small.

The second source of product differentiation results from the ignorance of buyers regarding the important characteristics and qualities of the products they purchase. This is more likely to be true of


consumer buyers than would be true of business firms buying grain from country elevators. Furthermore, the majority of grain sold by country elevators is sold on the basis of a federal inspection which certifies the quality characteristics of the grain. Therefore, product differentiation due to inadequate market knowledge or misinformed buyers of grains (as a group) from country elevators would be practically nil.

Inadequate market knowledge and misinformed country elevator managers may be a source of product differentiation. Clodius and Mueller suggest that the availability of relevant market information, its distribution among buyers and sellers, and its adequacy in terms of sharpening price-quality comparisons is an important concept that should be included under the degree of product differentiation. 6 The degree of market knowledge of country elevator managers is extremely important because changes in the prices of grains occur every day and possibly several times a day. A change in the price of grain of a few cents can cause great changes in the profitability of country elevators and firms because they generally operate on a profit margin of a few cents.

The degree of market knowledge and information appears to be slightly greater in 1962 than in 1953. There is greater use of telephone, telegraph, teletype, fieldmen, etc., and generally much more communication with country elevator managers in 1962. Even though this is extremely difficult to measure, there appears to be much need for improvement in the industry. Many managers of country elevators have very little information available to them concerning the trends and

---

changes that have been taking place in their industry. There is, as a result, even less knowledge about the implications to their industry concerning these trends and changes.

Most managers generally accept the advice of a fieldman as to general market information. The larger vertically and horizontally integrated firms are able to do some research on their own. But even these larger firms do not provide their elevator managers with sufficient market information. This leads to the concept of differential usefulness of market information to firms depending on their size and other characteristics. The larger elevators and firms generally make much greater use of available market information than smaller firms. In larger plants, the manager usually has additional labor which allows him more time to review and analyze available market information. This is especially true during the harvest period. However, the managers of larger plants will be the first to admit that the industry needs more relevant information.

Perhaps the industry is similar to farms where the number of firms and the margin of profit is small enough so that it does not pay any one firm (some are very large relative to the smallest) to conduct its own research. If such is the case, then cooperation between all grain firms, transportation firms, communication firms, universities and government is needed to promote and develop new ideas concerning the dissemination of relevant market information.

The third source of product differentiation occurs where buyers' preferences for certain products are influenced by persuasive sales-promotion activities of sellers by the use of advertising techniques. An important characteristic of product differentiation, therefore, may
be due to irrational or emotional influences created by advertising or possibly due to particular "beliefs" of the buyer or seller.

Farmers differentiate between cooperative and private legal type of business organizations. This response by farmers has an effect upon the market structure of the grain industry. The extent to which this type of differentiation has influenced market structure was not determined. The degree to which it influences market structure from one local competitive area to another varied greatly.

Managers were asked what per cent of the farmers in their area preferred cooperatives, preferred private, or were indifferent. The responses were: 30 to 35 per cent of the farmers prefer cooperative elevators and 20 to 25 per cent of the farmers prefer private elevators, even if the price and services were better from other types of firm organization. The remaining 40 to 50 per cent of the farmers were indifferent. That is, they would tend to go to the elevator where they thought the price and services were best.

Another factor affecting the market structure of a local competitive area is the degree of loyalty of farmers to a particular firm, manager, or community. Generally, the degree of loyalty by farmers is to a particular manager. The survey of administrative personnel of line elevators revealed that obtaining a well-liked and personable business manager for their line elevators was one of their major problems. This statement emphasizes the importance of the relationship between managers and farmers.

These considerations generally tend to have about the same effect as product differentiation. That is, it helps to create and develop
market shares for particular elevators in their local competitive area.

Advertising by Country Elevators

Advertising by country elevators is not used to differentiate grains. Rather it is used to acquaint farmers with various sideline services offered by the elevator. Most advertising expenditures are connected with feed, fertilizer, and chemical sales. The opinion was expressed by the majority of managers that their advertising expenditures were used mostly as "good will" and to "support their local community." Ten out of 64 responses stated that they advertised because other elevators in their local competitive area did so.

Of 71 responses, 54 or 76 per cent spent less than $500 for advertising. Most of these expenditures by elevators were for pencils, calendars, Christmas gifts, or handouts in general. For cooperatives, the annual meeting expense was generally included as advertising expense. One elevator gave Gold Bond stamps with its feed sales. The manager remarked that this advertising technique was very successful. A great majority of managers stated that selling of sidelines and their services, such as fertilizer spreading to farmers, encouraged farmers to sell their grains to the elevator. Therefore, advertising expenses generally associated with sidelines are, to a degree, used to obtain a larger grain volume.

A total of 31 questionnaires contained information on both advertising expenditures and gross sales. The average expenditure on advertising as a per cent of gross sales was 0.064 per cent. This would be classified as an industry with negligible product differentiation due to
pursuasive advertising by the country elevators.

**Condition of Entry**

The condition of entry as a dimension of market structure is important, because it has a substantial influence on the conduct and performance of sellers. If entry can be blocked, then firms within the industry may be able to raise prices above minimum average costs and earn excess profits. Therefore, the condition of entry may be measured by defining the advantages that established firms have over potential sellers which may desire to enter. This can be done by measuring the per cent by which established sellers elevate their prices above minimum average costs without inducing new sellers to enter the industry in the long run. These prices are usually referred to as "entry forestalling" prices, which means they are low enough to discourage entry.⁷

Although in reality it is quite difficult to precisely measure "entry forestalling" prices from available data in the country elevator industry, the objective shall be to obtain a meaningful estimate of possible barriers to entry. Bain defines entry as (1) the addition of a legal entity new to the industry, and (2) the addition of productive capacity new to the industry.⁸ This definition of entry is fairly narrow because entry may be considered as potential competition from any source, including the expansion in size and capacity of existing firms.

⁷Bain, op. cit., p. 237.

already in the industry. Certainly, in a local competitive area, the entry of a new elevator by an already existing firm not previously operating in this local competitive area should be considered the entrance of new competition into the area. On the other hand, the exit of an existing elevator from a local competitive area, even though it may be one of several elevators controlled by one firm, should be considered the exit of competition from the area. At any rate, the entry or exit of such an elevator will certainly have a significant effect on the degree of competition in a local competitive area. Entry might better be defined as new competition into the relevant market.

Farriers to Entry

Managers of established elevators and firms stated that farmers' loyalty to their elevator and to the community plus the plants' reputation was the major barrier to entry of new elevators. Another advantage of established elevators listed by managers was high capital investment, although the capital investment required to enter the country elevator industry is not high relative to many other industries in the United States.

Managers were asked to estimate the cost of starting a new elevator in their local competitive area that would be able to compete with existing elevators. Most managers agreed that the minimum size would cost between $100,000 and $125,000 and would be of about 100,000 bushels licensed capacity. Managers of larger elevators estimated that the

---

9It should be noted that the average size elevator in North Dakota in 1962 was 154,000 bushel capacity.
required investment for a new elevator which could compete with them would be between $250,000 and $400,000. These elevators had a licensed capacity between 450,000 to 1,200,000 bushels. According to cost data on optimum size elevators, the average investment in an optimum size plant varies between $250,000 to $300,000.

A third advantage of established elevators mentioned by some managers was the fact their elevator was cooperatively organized. These managers were implying that a cooperatively organized elevator plant had an advantage over the entry of non-cooperative or privately organized elevators. This implication is partially substantiated by other data obtained in the country elevator survey. Two elevators in the sample which were not organized as cooperatives operated as cooperative elevators; that is, they gave patronage dividends. One of these firms was a corporation and the other was owned by farmers. A third elevator which was previously owned by a group of farmers recently reorganized as a cooperative elevator. The reason given for this action by these three managers was that "farmers' demand warranted these changes." The advantage of cooperatively organized elevators is further supported by data on the number of cooperative elevators relative to non-cooperative elevators. Forty-one per cent of the total number of elevators in operation in 1953 were cooperatives, while 49.3 per cent of the total number of elevator plants in 1962 were cooperative (Table 10). Cooperatives controlled 46.1 per cent in 1953 and 53.8 per cent in 1962 of total industry licensed capacity. These data tend to support the hypothesis that farmers have a preference towards cooperatively organized elevators.

Most of the managers of smaller elevators felt that their
particular elevators had no advantages over potential entries into their competitive areas. We might expect this answer to be fairly accurate, especially considering these firms are potential exits from the industry.

Examples of New Competition

The following are examples from the survey of country elevators which partially explain the condition of entry in the industry. Three specific cases were found in the sample where new competition entered a local competitive area. One case was a cooperative which invested $127,000 (140,000 bushel licensed capacity). This elevator was previously in business at another location about 10 to 15 miles away which was decreasing as a center for farmers to bring grain. The older elevator was to continue in operation, but mainly as a "filler" elevator during the harvest season and for CCC storage purposes. The new elevator (in a new location but in the same general competitive area) found that customer loyalty was quite difficult to overcome the first two to three years, but that considerable progress was being made to gain new customers. The manager stated that it was easier to build in a new location as a cooperative than a non-cooperative elevator because capital stock was sold to farmers in the community. And, as a result, farmers took a greater interest in the business and gave their support in the form of patronage. This entry of new competition was in a location where there were two existing elevators, one private and the other cooperative. Both of these established elevators were below average licensed capacity for the industry.

Another case is an established line firm which recently built an
elevator in a new competitive area where there were several other estab-
lished elevators. The firm entering invested over $300,000. This
elevator entered a location where much competition prevailed with both
cooperatives and private elevators. The manager stated, "This was as
tough a position to enter for a new elevator that could be found." He
also stated that competition for patrons was very difficult during the
first two to three years, but that the elevator was gaining new customers
every year. The entry of this new elevator was in a competitive area in
which the available volume of grain has been increasing.

A third firm purchased two existing elevators (six miles apart)
which had previously ceased operations. These elevators were extremely
small with a licensed capacity of between 25,000 and 50,000 bushels.
The manager stated that the reason for purchasing these two elevators
was the high margins charged by much larger cooperative elevators in
their local competitive area. Farmers had voiced their disapproval of
the high margins and were willing to give their patronage to new com-
petitors.

The manager indicated one had a total volume of grain handled of
less than 125,000 bushels. This elevator was purchased for $20,000.
Although cost information could not be obtained for this elevator, data
from other elevators (Figures 3 and 4) indicate that an elevator of this
capacity and volume would be very inefficient relative to an optimum
size elevator. However, the elevator was purchased for approximately
half the cost to build a new elevator of this size. Other seasonal
employment by the manager allowed lower labor costs to the elevator.
These factors probably contributed to lower per bushel costs than might
normally occur.

The manager stated that the operations of these two elevators had reduced the operating margin of competitors by 3 cents. Even considering the reason for lower costs, it is expected that established elevators in the competitive area could handle both elevators' volume at a lower per bushel cost. Data from other elevators indicate that surrounding elevators certainly have excess capacity which could handle the additional volume adequately and at lower costs per bushel (Table 12).

The condition of entry in the country elevator industry appears to be characterized by a fairly low capital investment in most cases (relative to most industries), considerable loyalty of farmers to established firms, and some possible advantages of cooperatives over non-cooperative elevators. The barriers to entry into the country grain industry would have to be considered low relative to many other industries. The examples of new competition illustrated that both cooperative and private elevators were able to enter local competitive areas without significant difficulty.

Condition of Exit

Previously, it was determined that an increase in capacity is a necessary condition for entry. It was also determined that capacity might be increased either by the internal growth of a firm by building additional elevators or by the entry of a new firm.
Clodius states that exit is simply negative entry. It is the advantage established sellers have over the potential exiting elevator, and can be measured as the largest percentage price could fall relative to minimum average costs without causing an existing elevator's or firm's capacity to leave the industry. If barriers to exit are high, price would have to fall quite far below minimum average total cost to force elevators or firms out. The higher are the barriers to entry, the higher are the barriers to exit.

Exit is realized where offers by buyers to purchase and offers by sellers to sell are equal. The demand for old assets is determined by their net productivity to both buyers in the industry and buyers outside the industry. Net productivity refers to the productivity of assets after cost of converting to new uses. To each potential buyer in the country elevator industry, the assets of an elevator or firm exiting should be worth the income they will produce discounted over time. Therefore, the value of the assets to potential buyers in the industry will vary greatly. However, the value of assets of an elevator or firm exiting will also depend upon their next best alternative use to buyers outside the grain industry. In the grain industry, because of the nature of the buildings' structure, the alternative uses for elevators are extremely small.

Barriers to Exit

In the survey of country elevators, the managers were asked what problems are involved in ceasing the operations of elevators. Managers indicated that the greatest problem was a limited number of buyers for the assets. In most cases, an exiting elevator has no more than one or two potential buyers within the industry. In cases where an elevator wants to exit but is the only elevator at that location, there may be no potential buyers within the industry interested in the plant. One manager stated that many elevators planning to quit operations get so heavily in debt that they need a high price to break even. In such a case, since the next best alternative use for the assets is practically nil, the elevator may continue in operation in an effort to reduce its debt.

Another major problem of exiting elevators is commitments to store grain both for CCC and farmers. These storage commitments prevent an easy transition from one owner to another owner.

Another possible barrier to exit mentioned by managers is that farmers (because of loyalty, service, convenience, and less competition) may not like to see a nearby plant leave the industry. The extent to which this feeling by farmers is a barrier to exit is not known.

Examples of Merging Elevators

The survey of country elevators revealed that three elevators had recently been purchased by established elevators. Previously it was indicated that an elevator which had ceased operations was purchased for $20,000. This elevator had an insured value of $38,000. There was only
one elevator at this location.

Another elevator with a licensed capacity of 60,000 bushels was purchased for $18,500 by an elevator at the same location. This purchase included a house which was sold for $2,000. There were a total of three elevators at this location before the merger. The purchased elevator was to be used for storage, cleaning, grinding (feed mill), and, to some extent, as an additional unloading facility during harvest. The purchased elevator had been offering to sell for several years.

A similar case was found when an established elevator recently purchased an elevator at the same location for $24,000. The purchase included some additional sideline equipment. The purchased elevator had a licensed capacity of 70,000 bushels. There were three elevators at this location before the merger.

The manager stated that this purchase had increased volume by 150,000 bushels and he expected to increase net income $6,000 per year. He felt it would lower costs per bushel by 2 cents. He stated costs per bushel could be lowered by spreading fixed overhead costs over the larger volume and at the same time receiving additional income from storage and sidelines.

It would seem highly probable that in the country elevator industry incentives for firms to merge are quite great. In the past, the reduction in number of country elevators has been due mostly to one firm purchasing another smaller inefficient plant. Country elevator managers were asked whether they preferred to grow by merger or internally. Of 70 responses, 60 or 85.7 per cent stated that they preferred to grow internally. The opinion was expressed by country elevator managers that
farmers generally were against merger, because they felt it reduced competition. The degree this feeling by farmers and managers impedes the number of mergers is not known. In any case, the mergers of elevators have not taken place at a rate consistent with maximum efficiency in the industry.

Thus, it is concluded that (1) little alternative use for assets outside the industry, (2) lack of buyers and competition for assets within the industry, (3) storage commitments, and (4) the desire of farmers for continued operation are the major barriers to exit from the country elevator industry.

Although exit is generally considered a reduction in industry capacity, the examples described have not resulted in a reduction of industry capacity as measured by licensed storage capacity. For the period 1953-1962, industry licensed storage capacity increased by 57,771,000 bushels. It is evident that much of this additional storage space was not constructed in response to an increase in merchandise activity. Rather, it was the result of an increase in the demand for space to store CCC grain.11

The reduction in number of elevators, especially in a local competitive area, has a significant influence on competition. It therefore appears that the reduction in number of elevators is exit, even though there is no reduction in industry capacity. And exit of elevators increases the interdependence of remaining elevators which may decrease competition.

11Shepherd, Geoffrey S.; Richards, Allen B.; and Wilkin, John T., Federal Grain Storage Programs, Research Bulletin No. 697, North Central Regional Publication No. 111, Agricultural Experiment Station, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, June, 1960, pp. 2-3.
CHAPTER VI

BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF COUNTRY ELEVATORS

Market conduct refers to those acts, practices, and policies which sellers follow in adapting or adjusting to the markets in which they buy and sell. It is the objective of this chapter to determine these characteristics for the country elevator industry. Because of the small number of direct rivals, spatial characteristics, and differentiation of services, it is hypothesized that each elevator in a local market situation shall be able to obtain a partial monopsony relative to a certain group of its patrons for as long as the elevator continues to operate.

Type of Grain Sales Used by Country Elevators

Country elevator managers have gradually shifted their method of selling grains to processors, terminals, and commission firms. The country elevator survey showed that about 65 to 70 per cent (75 responses) of North Dakota grain is shipped (1) on track, (2) cash at the elevator, or (3) to arrive. Except for grains sold as feed or seed, the remainder is sold (4) on consignment or (5) on spot (Minneapolis cash market) (Table 15).

Much greater use is being made of the to-arrive method of sale in recent years. Selling to arrive is selling grain at current terminal market price and delivering the grain at a later specified date. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of firm organization</th>
<th>Volume to arrive, on track &amp;/or spot cash</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Volume on consignment &amp;/or on spot</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>To farmers, processors</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number of elevators reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(000 bu)</td>
<td>(000 bu)</td>
<td>(000 bu)</td>
<td>(000 bu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>16,677</td>
<td>10,644</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5,214</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,619</td>
<td>20,099</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8,692</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

primary reason for increased use of to-arrive sales by country elevators is that it represents a perfect hedge against changes in the price of grain and also against changes in premium payments. Only 11 of 70 responses or 15.7 per cent of the managers indicated that they used hedging practices to any significant degree. This hedging was done almost exclusively with wheat. Hedging grain on the futures market has not given protection on premium payments in the past. However, a recent innovation by the Minneapolis Grain Exchange guarantees a 13.5 per cent or higher protein for wheat deliveries on futures contracts. This innovation may slow the trend towards more to-arrive sales.

In selling on track, the seller accepts a price for the grain loaded in a boxcar at the local elevator. The grain does not need to be in the boxcar to make the sale, but it is the country elevator's (seller's) obligation to load the grain into the car within the agreed upon time. The transportation expenses as well as the risk of price change are the responsibility of the buyer. The price quoted is f.o.b. country elevator. However, the shipper must guarantee quality and pay sampling expenses.

On-track and to-arrive selling are quite similar, with one exception. The to-arrive bid is the price at the terminal and, as a result, country elevators must pay and deduct freight, commission, and other costs before arriving at a net price.

There are times when grains are worth more if they are for sale by sample at the terminal market. For high quality grain, the buyer will pay more "on spot" for grain. This is generally undesirable for the country elevator manager because he bears the risk of price
fluctuation. To shift this risk, the manager must hedge the grain while it is in transit. Many country elevator managers either do not know how to hedge or prefer not to. The futures market has not provided a reliable hedge on premiums which have become a much more important factor in recent years. Another factor causing the spot market to be higher than deferred shipments is there may be an immediate need for a car of grain, and therefore buyers are willing to pay a small premium for grain already in the terminal and available for sale.2

The fourth method by which grain is sold is on consignment sales. In consignment sales, the commission firm acting as an agent for the country elevator tries to sell the grain at the best possible price. The boxcar of grain may be sold while it is in transit rather than waiting for it to reach the terminal and sell on the spot market. The commission firm may also divert a consigned car to a different market if the price is better. The majority of consignment sales are eventually sold on the spot market.3

The survey of line elevator firms indicated that terminal markets are buying more and more grain "cash at the elevator." This type of sale is often referred to as "spot cash" market. In this method of selling grain, the country elevator receives a bid from a terminal buyer much the same as an on-track bid. However, the term spot cash at the country elevator generally refers to buyers such as millers, feed

2Sogan, Arthur B., Grain Merchandising at the Country Elevator, Agricultural Economics Department, Agricultural Experiment Station, South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota, August, 1959, p. 11.

3Ibid., p. 12.
firms, large grain terminals such as Cargill and GTA who wish to by-pass the Minneapolis Grain Exchange.

A comparison of the various methods of selling grains is illustrated in Table 16. The types of sales which are increasing are the to arrive, on track, and cash sales at the country elevator. On consignment and on spot sales are decreasing. Country elevators are using the "bid sales" to a greater extent in recent years in order to shift price risk to the buyer.

**TABLE 16. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BUYER AND SELLER ACCORDING TO VARIOUS METHODS OF SALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of sale</th>
<th>Place at which price applies</th>
<th>Price applies at time of</th>
<th>Who pays freight</th>
<th>Who bears price risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To arrive</td>
<td>Terminal market</td>
<td>Sale (delivery)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consignment</td>
<td>Terminal market</td>
<td>Sale (delivery)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Country elevator</td>
<td>Sale (delivery)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On spot</td>
<td>Terminal market</td>
<td>Sale (delivery)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at the elevator</td>
<td>Country elevator</td>
<td>Sale (delivery)</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A Shift in the Pattern of Marketing Grains

The general character of the market has shifted from an on consignment market to a bid market. This makes the country elevator more the center of competition for procurement of grains. This shift has been gradual in nature and still has a considerable way to go, if it does at all.
It has been stated by many people in the grain business that the reason for this change has been activities by CCC. This is true to some extent, but the cause goes a little deeper than CCC activities. Commodity Credit Corporation has been in existence since the 1930's. Yet the change has been very slow until recent years. The reason for this change is that CCC provided a choice for farmers. That choice was to sell on the cash market or seal and store grain. Farmers were paid to seal and store grain which gave them an incentive to build up their capacity to store grain, which is especially important at harvest time. As a result, farmers have been storing greater quantities of grain on their farms. They have been waiting for the buyer to come to them rather than to ship on consignment, and in essence say, "What will you give me for my grain?" This change has also been due to pressure on the part of "on track" buyers who want the grain.

Increased storage capacity and more concern with price differences by farmers have forced grain buyers to come to the country elevator for grain. This, in turn, has forced the country elevator to come to farm bins to obtain grain. In the survey of country elevators, 47 per cent of the managers stated that they visited farms in an effort to solicit business. The majority of these managers further stated that they sampled the farmer's grain and made price bids based on quality. Managers also stated that farmers bring in samples of grains to elevators for bids and this practice has been increasing in recent years. It was reported that some trucks have begun to pick up grains directly from some of the larger farmers. Thus, procurement of grains has had a tendency to shift from the central market at Minneapolis to the country
elevator, and has had a tendency to shift even further, to the farmer.

**Determination of Pricing Policy to Farmers**

The price of grains offered to farmers by country elevators is based on the Minneapolis prices minus transportation costs, commission charges, and the elevator's operating margins. The only factor country elevators can influence is operating margins. Since the market structure (due to spatial considerations) is characterized by relatively few elevators and many producer sellers, country elevators have greater bargaining power and, therefore, can vary price to some degree. The degree operating margins can vary depends on local competitive conditions.

The elevators were the price makers and this made some type of pricing policy necessary. The most common pricing policy was to learn through farmers or call other managers. Of 77 responses, 49 (65 per cent) of the managers stated that they called other managers to learn what prices were being offered to farmers (Table 17); 27 (36 per cent) of the managers both called managers and learned through farmers; 20 (27 per cent) of the managers voluntarily stated that managers in their area "mutually agreed" on the prices of various grains offered to farmers.

It was a consensus of the managers that farmers were generally "quick to let you know" if their price was under other elevators' prices. Even though farmers were "quick to let managers know," it was found that a majority of the managers stated that they depended on information directly from other managers. Prices of grains are quite unstable so managers had to keep in daily touch with prices offered by competitors (more true during harvest), but telephoned their competitors only when
a relatively great change in prices of grains occurred. It was not
stated whether these were personal calls to other managers in all cases.
One manager stated that he pretended to be a farmer asking about prices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method used</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Per cent of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through farmers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call other managers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both call managers and through farmers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual agreement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of questionnaires</strong></td>
<td><strong>77&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>By telephone.

<sup>b</sup>This total was arrived at by the following equation: \((53 + 49 - 27 + 2)\)

**SOURCE:** Country elevator survey of North Dakota, 1963.

Managers were asked if there was another elevator in their competitive area which other elevators depended on for information about prices. Twenty of 57 responses (35 per cent) indicated that there was such an elevator in their competitive area. Seventy per cent of these responses (70 per cent of 20) stated that these elevators were able to influence the price offered by other elevators. These local price leaders appear to act as a reflector of market conditions.

It appears that the "equilibrium price" arrived at each day is determined by explicit agreement. However, since managers are aware that grade and dockage can be used to readily influence net purchasing
price, it is more plausible to say that managers are "tacitly agreeing" not to compete on the basis of price. Thus, prices of grain generally are not used as a strategic device for increasing grain volume for country elevators.

The Importance of Nonprice Factors in Procurement of Grains

The greater efficiency of larger plants over smaller plants was generally passed on to farmers in the form of offering more services and patronage refunds by cooperatives. Managers of country elevators were asked if they emphasized a higher price or nonprice services in an effort to obtain a larger volume of business. Fifty-four out of 66 managers (82 per cent) stated that they emphasized nonprice services. Twelve managers (18 per cent) said they emphasized higher grain prices to farmers. Three managers stated they emphasized both higher prices and nonprice services. The managers, in continuing these services, appear to feel that these services are a more effective way to increase and stabilize volume than to eliminate the services and pay a higher price for grains.

There are two major reasons why managers prefer to compete on a service basis rather than on a price basis. First, because of the small number of competing elevators, they are quite sensitive to changes in price and are able to retaliate faster. Therefore, competitors are more likely to meet price changes and thus nullify the effects. Second, farmers' loyalty to a particular manager, elevator, or community and the development of farmer preferences by differentiating legal type of business organization and services offered tends to reduce the
sensitivity of farmers to price. This leads to marketing habits by some farmers which tend to stabilize grain volume to elevators.

Unfair Competition

Concepts of fair competition and unfair competition are frequently employed in connection with competitive practices within an industry. These concepts are generally based on ethical considerations and on the common practices of the grain trade. Many attempts have been made by law to define and eliminate unfair competition.

No attempt was made in this study to define "unfair" competition. Managers were asked, "Do you feel your competitors use any unfair business practices?" Of 66 responses, 38 per cent indicated "yes." Managers who answered "yes" were asked what practices they considered unfair.

The practices considered unfair are listed in Table 18. "Overgrading" is the practice of lenient grading of grain. Ninety-six per cent of the managers indicated this practice to be unfair. For example, a manager may give a farmer a No. 2 grade rather than a lower grade which would lower the price paid to a farmer. The higher grade would result from taking less dockage.

Managers also felt that paying a higher price than advertised or "tacitly agreed to" was an unfair practice. Forty per cent of 25 managers indicated this was a problem. Another unfair practice indicated by 28 per cent of the managers was paying a higher price to another elevator's patron in an effort to attract his business. All of the above practices, including extending credit to farmers, are done in an effort to attract more patrons. This is especially true if they are not
regular customers. For this reason, some farmers find it profitable to "shop around" for the "best deal."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfair practice</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overgrading</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying a higher price than advertised</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over pay other elevators' customers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending credit to farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives are an unfair business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of managers responding | 25


There is no consistent grading pattern followed by managers from one farmer to another. As a result, even though the price for two or three elevators may be the same, the grade given will influence the net price to the farmers. If, for example, one elevator is offering a higher price to farmers but grading much "stricter," the net effect may mean a lower price to farmers. About 30 elevator managers reported the practice was used in their competitive area. Although this practice is generally considered unfair by managers, it appears to be a highly effective practice used by managers to establish a personal relationship between themselves and farmers.

The managers who indicated unfair practices being used in their competitive area were asked if they felt that competition has forced
them to use any similar practices. Nine of 25 managers reported that they had been influenced by competition to adopt similar practices. Some of the managers answering in the negative stated that they might be forced to use these practices in the future.

It is evident that some managers tended to regard any competitive practice as unfair if it hurt their business. Some of the competitive practices considered unfair, such as paying a higher price, operating as a cooperative business, and extending credit, were necessary competitive practices for a dynamic grain marketing industry.

The majority of the practices which managers considered unfair were aimed at overcoming the industry's reluctance to compete on the basis of price. As a result, the efficiency of the pricing system in allocating resources was impaired. The manipulation of dockage, weight, and grade makes it possible for an inefficient elevator to compete on a price and service basis with a more efficient competitor. Eighteen of 74 managers reported that more favorable grading practices were used to encourage larger farmers or more distant farmers to trade with their elevators. The per cent of managers using this practice may be higher than indicated because of a reluctance to admit to the practice.

The Influence of Spatial Considerations on Conduct

Spatial considerations are involved in the locational distribution of elevators (buyers) and farmers (sellers). The distance between farmers and elevators affects (1) farmers' knowledge of prices and services; (2) farmers' confidence in elevators' grading policy, and
(3) transportation costs from farmers to the elevator.\textsuperscript{4}

Elevators tend to be located separately because of their need to obtain a relatively large volume in order to achieve reasonable economies of size. Country elevators had an average of 5.5 competitors. The number of competitors generally varied from 2 to 15 depending upon the number of farmers and how far farmers were willing to haul their grains in each local competitive area. The procurement area for elevators averaged a 1\frac{1}{4}-mile radius for 90 per cent of their volume. Therefore, farmers have a choice between only a few elevators unless they are willing to haul grain large distances. This will increase their cost of transportation which at some point will be higher than the value farmers place on higher prices, more services, and reliability.

The area within which elevators obtain grains overlaps to a considerable degree. This is especially significant in multi-plant towns. Each elevator has a small range within which it can modify price because of pairing of elevators and farmers. The pairing of elevators and farmers is due to loyalty to managers, communities, and service and spatial differentiation. However, the interlocking of procurement areas of rival elevators in each local competitive area creates a network of communication which connects all elevators in the market. As a result, the effects of price changes tend to be relayed throughout the market. The resulting market situation for country elevators prevents both independent action and overt collusion. The alternatives most compatible for

\textsuperscript{4}Manning, Travis W., and Nelson, Ralph E., Procurement Policies and Practices of Dairy Manufacturing Plants in Eastern South Dakota, Bulletin No. 497, Economics Department, Agricultural Experiment Station, South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota, September, 1961, pp. 36-37.
managers is tacit agreements on price or price wars. The threat of
price wars may have caused managers to focus competitive practices and
techniques on nonprice services.

A factor which tends to offset decreasing number of elevators and
increase competition among country elevators is the increasing number of
trucks owned by farmers. There were 55,640 trucks owned by farmers in
1950 and 75,424 in 1960. It seems safe to assume that the size of
trucks is increasing also. These factors will tend to lower per bushel
costs of transportation to farmers. In the survey of country elevators,
managers reported that farmers are hauling more grain longer distances
in recent years. However, this practice was reported more prevalent
during winter months than at harvest.

Another factor which tends to offset decreasing elevator numbers
is increased farm storage capacity, especially at harvest. During the
winter months, farmers who have stored their grains have the opportunity
to bring samples to several elevators and take bids on their grains.
This procedure allows farmers to receive the highest net return without
fear of grade or dockage manipulation. It appears that farmers' willingness
to purchase more and larger trucks and store grains for bids has
offset decreasing elevator numbers to a considerable degree.

The preceding data tend to support the hypothesis that country
elevators in a local competitive area tend to behave as we would expect
an industry with partial monopsony power. Even though country elevators

5Taylor, Fred R., Engelking, R. F., and Herlemes, C. J., North
Dakota Agricultural Statistics, Bulletin No. 408 (Revised), Department
of Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota
State University and Statistical Reporting Service, United States Depart-
buy and sell essentially identical products at nearly identical prices (for most cases in their competitive area), some elevators will have larger market shares than other elevators. As a result, it is quite possible some elevators will attain sufficient market volumes to support an operation of optimum size and others will not. Thus, some elevators in the industry may be "undersized" from the standpoint of efficiency because of inability to attract enough customers. In some cases, these elevators will be forced out of business. But, in other cases, given a certain restriction of competition and some barriers to entry, they may find their operations profitable.
CHAPTER VII

COUNTRY ELEVATOR PERFORMANCE

Market performance refers to those economic results that flow from an industry as an aggregate of firms.\textsuperscript{1} Market structure and competitive behavior significantly influence the economic and social performance of industries. There are many criteria which can be used to measure industry performance. All measures of performance are difficult to measure empirically. The particular dimensions of performance which are analytically significant vary from industry to industry. The particular dimensions of performance used in this study include: profit rates, operating efficiency, unethical practices, exchange efficiency, and technological progressiveness.

Profit Ratios

Industrial organization theory suggests that one criterion of performance is the ratio of profits to net worth in the industry. The reasoning is that the elimination of excess profits improves economic welfare of consumers and farmers. However, the rate of this decline in profits among elevators of different sizes is also important. In the long run, it could change the structure of the industry and thereby make it less competitive than is socially desirable. For example, if cooperatives continue to earn higher profits as a percentage on equity, they

may, in the long run, force other legal types of firm organization out of the industry. This would not be as undesirable as if cooperatives were forced out of the industry, because they tend to operate at cost and return "extra" profits to patrons. Nevertheless, the industry dominated by cooperatives would be undesirable from a social point of view, because rivalry between cooperatives and non-cooperative elevators benefits both farmers and consumers.

One of the profit ratios used to measure market performance is the ratio of net income to net worth. Net income before income taxes was used because it makes a more meaningful comparison where cooperative elevators are included in the sample. Net income to cooperatives before patronage dividends was used in the study. All proprietary, corporation, and line responses were classified as non-cooperatives because the number of responses in each group was small.

The ratio of net income to equity shows that cooperatives obtained the largest (12.8 per cent) average returns to equity for the 1961-1962 period (Table 19). Elevators of non-cooperative organizations earned average returns of 7.9 per cent on equity for the 1961-1962 period. Data on equity were not available for line elevators.

Profit as a percentage on equity by elevator size is illustrated in Table 20. It appears that the largest elevators (276,000 bushels and over) earned less returns on equity on the average than smaller elevators in 1961 and 1962. However, this may be due to a small number of observations. Larger elevators may also be forced to pay higher prices in an effort to attract larger volumes of grain. The average profit rate on equity was slightly greater for elevators of medium size for the
two-year period. The profit ratio for all elevators in 1961 is slightly less than for all elevators in 1962, even though volume handled by elevators was considerably greater in 1962 than in 1961. Therefore, it appears that all elevators operated on larger margins in 1961 than in 1962 because handling larger volumes lowers short-run costs per bushel significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of legal organization</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1961-1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Profit ratio</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aCooperative profits are before patronage dividends.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensed capacity (000 bu.)</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1961-1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Profit ratio</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-175</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-275</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 &amp; over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aProfits include cooperative profits before patronage dividends.

The same relationship is true for profit rates as a percentage on total assets as was true for profits as a per cent on equity (Table 21). However, data were available for line elevators on profit rates as a percentage of fixed assets. The ratio of profit rates to fixed assets was higher in 1961 than in 1962. Including line elevators in the non-cooperative group for profit rates as a percentage of fixed assets did not change the results.

**Excess Profits**

Excess profits for an industry can be determined by subtracting an interest rate on investment from the profit rate as a percentage on equity. Excessive profits are defined as a return to net worth above what could be earned by investing in their next best alternative investment available. The investment chosen should be similar in degree of risk. For example, the alternative rate of interest should not be the guaranteed rate available from banks or savings institutions which entails less risk to the investor.

If it is assumed that an interest rate of 6 per cent is the next best alternative return on investment available to the industry, then it appears the industry operated on larger margins than perfectly competitive conditions would allow (Table 19). This conclusion would be more true for cooperatives as a group than for non-cooperative business organization. If net income to the industry as a percentage on equity were calculated after income taxes, it would appear that non-cooperative elevators as a group are not earning excessive profits and that cooperative elevators are operating on larger margins than necessary.
### TABLE 21. PROFIT RATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COUNTRY ELEVATORS AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ASSETS AND FIXED ASSETS (BEFORE INCOME TAX) BY TYPE OF LEGAL ORGANIZATION, 1961 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of legal organization</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1962</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Profit to total assets</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Profit to fixed assets</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Profit to total assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cooperative profits are before patronage dividends.*

**SOURCE:** Country elevator survey, 1963.
Previously, it was noted that all elevators tend to offer the same price for grains in a local competitive area. Because many cooperatives and some non-cooperative elevators are operating on larger margins than are necessary, many smaller, less-than-optimum size elevators are able to compete in the same local competitive area. It is questionable whether a policy of operating on larger margins than are necessary and returning the "extra profit" at the end of the year in the form of patronage dividends should be followed by cooperative elevators. Such a policy tends to maintain inefficient elevators and excessive profits in the industry.

In some cases, forcing inefficient elevators from the industry will include cooperative elevators. There were about 28 locations where two cooperative elevators were operating in 1962. In about 25 locations one larger, more optimum size elevator could handle the available grain at lower costs per bushel.

**Excess Capacity**

Country elevator managers were asked to consider present facilities of their plant and the volume of grain they handled in 1962. Considering these factors, they were asked to estimate the volume of grain their elevator could handle without too much strain. The excess grain handling capacity for country elevators was 36 per cent in 1962—the largest crop in the history of North Dakota (Table 12). Using the 1961 data, elevator managers indicated that their plants could have handled 50 per cent more bushels. The largest elevators had the smallest excess grain handling capacity. These results tend to support the cost curve
drawn in Figure 3 because large elevators show a tendency towards lower per unit costs.

Much of this excess handling capacity is due to small inefficient elevators which continue to operate. There were 285 elevators of 100,000 or less licensed storage capacity in 1962. According to the survivor principle, these elevators would be considered inefficient as a group. The continued operation of these small inefficient elevators prevents the growth of larger more optimum size elevators which could handle larger volumes at lower costs per bushel.

Country elevator managers were also asked to estimate how much over-capacity (licensed storage capacity) their elevator would have if no government storage program existed for country elevators. The total excess storage capacity for all elevators under this condition was 28 per cent in 1962. This figure would probably be much higher if it were not true that much of country elevator capacity used for government storage is "flat" (quonset-type) storage which managers would use for other purposes if no program existed. The largest elevators indicated 45 per cent excess licensed storage capacity if no government storage program existed. The greater excess storage capacity for larger elevators is probably due to less flat storage, although most managers of larger elevators felt they would use their capacity to merchandise grain to a much greater degree if storage programs were not available.

Operating Efficiency--An Industry Adjustment Problem

Only 11.8 per cent of the elevators were operating near optimum efficiency (3 to 5 cents per bushel) in 1962 (Table 22). Allowing for
differences in accounting and rates of depreciation, 49.0 per cent of
the elevators could be operating near optimum efficiency (3 to 8 cents
per bushel). This results in 15.7 per cent of the elevators operating
at costs per bushel moderately above lowest costs attainable and 35.3
per cent substantially above lowest attainable costs in the industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per bushela (cents)</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Per cent of total</th>
<th>Accumulative per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-8.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1-15.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRepresents total costs of operation 1962-1963
crop year. Note this is the largest crop in North
Dakota history.


The relationship between cost per bushel, elevator size, and
short-run utilization of elevator facilities (ratio) is illustrated in
Table 23. The elevators with lowest costs per bushel had an average
licensed capacity considerably greater than elevators of higher costs
per bushel. However, elevators of larger licensed capacity also had
the largest ratio of volume handled to licensed storage capacity.
Again, a larger ratio indicates fuller use of available facilities and
therefore better performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per bushel (cents)</th>
<th>Number of elevators</th>
<th>Average licensed capacity (000 bu.)</th>
<th>Ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total licensed capacity (000 bu.)</th>
<th>Total licensed capacity (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-5.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300.3</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-8.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>173.6</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1-15.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>186.8</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>194.2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>9,906</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Ratio of volume handled to licensed storage capacity.

<sup>b</sup>Represents total costs per bushel of operation for 1962-1963 crop year. Elevators are classified on the basis of costs per bushel.


The primary reasons for elevators operating at less-than-optimum size appears to be (1) the lack of the price competition for grains at the time of delivery and (2) past structural characteristics of industry.

In the past there was a definite need for many small elevators spaced a few miles apart. Many farmers did not have trucks and if they did they were very small by today's standards. Therefore, the cost of transporting grain large distances was high. Furthermore, farmers with no storage facilities for their grain were forced to deliver grains during the relatively short harvest season. As farmers purchased newer and larger trucks and increased their storage capacity, and as the progressive elevators built larger elevators, inefficient elevators were gradually forced out of the industry. This eventually reduced the
number of elevators to the point where interdependence was recognized. As a result, managers became more reluctant to compete on the basis of price. Increased interdependence led many elevators to compete by differentiating their firms and services.

Many elevators increased size and capacity to handle larger volumes by purchasing elevators forced out of business. Other elevators increased capacity by adding additional annexes. This type of elevator expansion has resulted in many elevators having a series of buildings, bins, equipment, etc. that are quite inefficient relative to new optimum size elevator facilities which are built to handle large volumes.²

In essence, handling inefficiencies by country elevators are problems of industry development and growth. The primary ingredient of industry development is the development of new technologies and their adoption. The rate of adoption of technology will vary by industry. In the farm industry, innovation (with government aid) and adoption of new techniques has been rapid in the last two decades. The rapid adoption of technology and more orderly marketing by farmers has forced structural changes in the grain industry—namely, a reduction in number of elevators needed to handle the available grain.

Most of the technological improvements in handling efficiency have been developed outside the grain industry. It is not necessary for the country elevator to innovate in order to have a progressive grain marketing system. In fact, in most cases it would be uneconomical for...

---

²It should be noted again that these elevators are more efficient only upon receiving larger volumes of grain. Because farmers are paired with particular elevators and communities, and because the industry has a tendency towards excess capacity (Table 12), the building of larger optimum size elevators has not been feasible in the great majority of communities.
elevators to research new handling techniques, protein testers, etc.

The adoption of available technology is reflected in the efficiency of elevators in the market. Individually, none of the improvements in equipment are great enough to force the average non-adopting elevator out of the industry. In any case, the reduction in number of elevators has not kept pace with available economies of size in the country elevator industry. The handling of grains from farmers to processors is marketed at roughly 3 per cent of its value aside from transportation costs. As a result, the reduction of costs by innovating and adopting new technology provides very little profit incentive. The reluctance of communities and farmers to cease operations of elevators which are "dead but won't lie down," prevents the industry from re-organizing into larger and more optimum sized plants.

In summary, the preceding analysis of performance of country elevators suggests that lack of price competition and past structural characteristics of country elevators are the primary causes of (1) nearly all elevators operating below grain handling capacity and (2) many elevators operating substantially above lowest costs attainable.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Changes in market structure variables have had an important influence on the behavior and performance of country elevators.

Market Structural Characteristics

There were 797 country elevators purchasing grains from farmers in North Dakota in 1962. This was 139 less elevators than in 1953. The average decrease of almost 1½ elevators per year has had a significant impact on the degree of concentration and competition at the local community level. The procurement areas of these elevators overlapped extensively and thereby formed a network of direct competitive relationships between elevators.

During the same 10-year period, total licensed capacity increased 57,771,000 bushels. Average licensed capacity per elevator increased from 63,000 to 151,000 bushels. Most of the increase in licensed storage capacity was due to the Commodity Credit Corporation storage program. Licensed storage capacity was used as the measure of size for country elevators.

There were 524 firms operating country elevators in North Dakota in 1953 and 499 firms in 1962. Approximately 87 per cent of the decrease in number of elevators was by firms owning more than one plant. Concentration in regard to total licensed capacity and number of plants owned by the largest 4, 8, and 20 firms decreased during the
10-year period. If licensed capacity is indicative of volume of business, then it appears that the volume of grain handled by the largest firms has decreased relatively. To determine this relationship, a simple regression analysis was used which showed the correlation between licensed storage capacity and volume of grain handled to be significant ($R^2 = .85$) at the 5 per cent level for the 1961-1962 period.

The number of proprietary and line elevators has decreased, while the number of local corporations and cooperatively organized elevators has increased. The size of proprietary and line elevators increased less than the size of local corporations and cooperatively organized elevators.

The decrease in total number of elevators (139) came primarily from locations with two or more elevators. The total number of locations with two or more elevators decreased by 43 (7.1 per cent) while the number of one-elevator locations increased by 27 (9.3 per cent). With the exception of major central locations such as grain inspection and holding points, the trend appears to be towards one-elevator locations.

Elevators tend to be located separately because large volumes are needed to obtain reasonable economies of size. Each country elevator had an average of 5.5 competitors. The procurement area for elevators averaged a 1/4-mile radius for 90 per cent of their volume. Each elevator, therefore, has a small range within which it can modify price because of pairing of elevators and farmers. Spatial characteristics contribute to this pairing significantly. It appears that farmers' willingness to purchase more and larger trucks, which enables them to haul longer distances for the same cost, has offset increasing distances between elevators.
There were also important changes in the number of buyers of grain from country elevators. For the 10-year period 1953-1962, the number of commission firms decreased. The survey of commission firms revealed the major reasons for fewer numbers were:

1. Less grain available to commission firms.
2. Greater credit needs by country elevators could not be met by smaller commission firms.
3. A large share of the grain shipped by truck bypasses commission firms (25 to 30 per cent of grains were shipped by truck for the 1962-1963 crop).

Administrative officers of commission firms and line elevators at Minneapolis estimated that the number of buyers of all grains in general had decreased from 10 to 25 per cent. However, increased concentration is only one variable that affects the degree of competition. Competition among grain buyers from country elevators may have increased due to changes in use of transportation and communication facilities. It appears that this increased competition may have been great enough to have offset increased concentration among grain buyers.

Short-run cost relationships were measured by comparing per bushel costs to the ratio of volume of grain handled to licensed storage capacity. Short-run economies of handling a large volume are great up to a ratio of 2.5. Costs continue to fall at a slower rate for ratios greater than 2.5. It did not appear that the optimum point on the short-run average cost curve for country elevators was reached by any elevators in the sample. Short-run economies are large due to spreading large fixed and semi-fixed costs over a larger volume. The short-run cost relationship showed that costs decreased from 15 cents per bushel for an elevator with a ratio of grain volume to licensed capacity of 1; to 4
cents per bushel for an elevator with a ratio of grain volume to licensed capacity of 7.

The long-run cost relationship showed that costs decreased from 12 cents per bushel for an elevator size of 100,000 licensed capacity to 4 cents per bushel for an elevator of 450,000 to 750,000 bushels licensed capacity. In general, it appears that factors affecting utilization (short-run economies) are more important in determining lower costs than elevator size.

An optimum size elevator of approximately 450,000 to 750,000 bushels licensed storage capacity would need to obtain a grain volume of 1,850,000 to 2,000,000 bushels to attain lowest costs per bushel. Storing and handling of CCC grains and sidelines are also important factors in attaining lowest costs per bushel. An elevator of optimum size would handle about 0.7 to 1.2 per cent of North Dakota's total grain volume depending upon crop size that year. Therefore, about 35 to 145 elevators of optimum size would be able to handle available grains at lowest costs per bushel. The evidence points to a definite reduction in number of elevators needed to most efficiently handle available grain. A more practical goal to reduce the number of elevators by about 285 would:

1. Eliminate excess capacity.
2. Eliminate the smallest and most inefficient elevators.
3. Not increase transportation costs to farmers significantly.

In addition to economies of plant size, firms may also find further economies of size by operating more than one optimum size plant.
Given the limitations of accounting data, line elevators in general had higher per bushel costs than single elevator operations. But this may be due to a substantial number of less-than-optimum size plants and inability to attract large enough grain volumes in the short run. This conclusion is not true for all line elevator firms.

Another dimension of firm size and growth is vertical integration. Vertical integration by country elevators, terminal elevators, processors, and commission firms appears to facilitate the procurement of grain at lower costs and enables the firm to know existing market conditions to a greater degree. It appears that lower costs of procurement and increased market knowledge are major reasons for the merging of terminal elevators, processors, commission firms, and multi-plant country elevators. These mergers cause more grain to by-pass the Minneapolis Grain Exchange, even though it is used as a pricing mechanism. More grain by-passing the Exchange results in increased buying of grain from country elevators through the use of bid sales such as to-arrive and on-track sales.

Most advertising expenditures by country elevators are connected with feed, fertilizer, chemical sales, etc. Much of the advertising is in the form of general handouts such as pencils, Christmas gifts, calendars, etc. Advertising associated with sidelines is generally used to attract a larger grain volume. Differentiation due to persuasive advertising by country elevators is negligible.

Farmers differentiate between cooperative and private legal type of business organization. Farmers preferred cooperatives slightly, but it varied greatly from one local competitive area to another. About half the farmers were indifferent and considered price and services only.
Considerable loyalty by farmers to a particular manager, firm, or community was prevalent. Loyalty by farmers tended to create market shares for particular elevators in their local competitive area.

The condition of entry into the country elevator level of grain merchandising is characterized by a fairly low capital investment ($250,000 to $300,000 for optimum size plant), considerable loyalty by farmers to established firms, and some possible advantages of cooperatives over non-cooperative elevators. As a whole, the barriers to entry into the country grain industry are low relative to other industries. Both cooperative and privately owned elevators were able to enter local competitive areas without significant difficulty.

The highest sale value obtainable for an exiting elevator's assets is determined by the net productivity of its assets, the number of potential buyers, and competition among these buyers for the assets. Managers indicated that the greatest problem of exiting elevators wanting to sell was a limited number of interested buyers. Other barriers to exit were little alternative use for assets, storage commitments both to CCC and farmers, and the desire of farmers for continued operation of potential exiting elevators.

Behavioral Characteristics of Country Elevators

The survey of country elevators showed that 65 to 70 per cent of North Dakota grain is shipped (1) on track, (2) cash at the elevator, or (3) to arrive. These three types of sales are referred to as bid sales. Except for grain sold as feed or seed, the remainder is sold (4) on consignment or (5) on spot. The greatest change was increased use of
the to-arrive method of selling. The major reason for increased use of
to-arrive sales was that they represented a good hedge against changes
in price of grains and premium fluctuations for country elevators. Bid
sales by country elevators also shift the risk of price changes to the
buyer.

The general character of the grain market has gradually shifted
from a consignment market to a bid market. This shift results in country
elevators becoming more the center of competition for the procurement of
grains. Forty-seven per cent of the managers (76 responses) visited
farmers to solicit grain business. The majority of these managers
sampled and bid on grains in farmers' bins. Managers also reported that
many farmers brought samples of grains to elevators for bids. This pro-
cedure allows farmers to receive the highest net return without fear of
grade or dockage manipulation.

Factors which appear to have the most influence in initiating
these changes are:

1. Commodity Credit Corporation payments to farmers to
   store grain.
2. Greater competition in the transportation industry.
3. Greater use and improvement of modern communication
   facilities.

Country elevators used various strategies to achieve their
procurement goals. These were classified as price and nonprice
practices. Few managers used manipulation of price as a means to pro-
cure greater volumes because of threat or actual retaliation by compet-
itors. Although farmers were "quick to let the manager know about higher
prices offered by a competitor," 65 per cent of the managers called
other managers to learn about prices. Thirty-six per cent of the managers both called managers and learned through farmers. Twenty-seven per cent of the managers voluntarily stated that managers in their area "mutually agreed" on the prices offered to farmers for various grains.

The greater efficiency of larger elevators over smaller elevators was generally passed on to farmers in the form of more services and patronage refunds by cooperatives. Eighty-two per cent of the managers reported they emphasized nonprice services.

Various service characteristics and loyalty to manager or community were used to differentiate elevators. Each manager appears to convince some of his patrons that he provides a "special" service for him. As a result, some farmers become paired to a particular elevator. This tends to limit "shopping around" for better terms.

Thirty-eight per cent of the managers stated that they considered practices used by their competitors as "unfair." No attempt was made to define unfair competition. Most of the practices considered unfair dealt with lenient grading. However, the practice of paying a higher price than advertised or tacitly agreed to and over-paying competitors' patrons were mentioned several times. It was evident that some managers tended to regard any competitive practices that hurt their business as being unfair. Most practices considered unfair were aimed at overcoming the industry's reluctance to compete on the basis of price. This type of manipulation impaired the efficiency of the price system in allocating resources to the benefit of both producers and consumers.
Market Performance

The excess grain handling capacity for country elevators was 36.0 per cent in 1962—the largest crop in the history of North Dakota. Forty-nine per cent of the elevators operated near lowest costs attainable. This leaves 15.7 per cent of the elevators operating moderately above lowest costs attainable and 35.3 per cent substantially above lowest costs attainable.

The profit ratio of net income (before income taxes and patronage dividends) to equity showed that cooperatives obtained returns of 12.8 per cent and non-cooperatives 7.9 per cent in 1962. The same relationship is true for profit rates as a percentage of total assets. These ratios would be much more meaningful if information was available over a 5- to 10-year period.

Most cooperatives and some non-cooperative elevators are operating on larger margins than are necessary. Consequently, many smaller, less-than-optimum size elevators are able to compete in the same local competitive area.

The primary reasons for elevators operating at less-than-optimum size appears to be (1) lack of price competition and (2) past structural characteristics of the industry.

In essence, handling inefficiencies of country elevators is an industry adjustment problem. The adoption of available technology is reflected in the efficiency of elevators in the market. Individually, none of the improvements in equipment are great enough to force the average non-adopting elevator out of the industry. Country elevators have been reluctant to adopt technological improvements, mainly because
of very small profit incentive.

The analysis of structure, conduct, and performance lead to the following conclusions: Decreasing elevator numbers has resulted in increased interdependence between elevator managers. Increased interdependence has caused managers to "tacitly agree" not to compete on grain prices. Lack of grain price competition has resulted in the reduction in number of elevators not keeping pace with available economies of size in the country elevator industry. As a result, nearly all elevators were operating far below capacity. Efforts by managers, owners, and boards of directors to obtain larger volumes tended to (1) create excessive overlapping of procurement in many local competitive areas, and (2) encourage managers to engage in unethical practices. Because of the small number of direct competitors, spatial characteristics, and differentiation of services, each elevator in a local market situation obtains a partial monopsony. This also tends to inhibit the attainment of available economies of size. The overlapping of procurement in local competitive areas increases costs per bushel to each elevator. However, it gives farmers more choices among elevators. This tends to prevent overt collusion by elevators.

A country elevator cannot automatically handle a larger volume, even if it is known that handling larger volumes and building optimum size elevators will lower costs per bushel. But the lower costs attainable do provide a guide for country elevator firms to review their present and future plant (plants') volume and needs.
Policy Recommendations

The decreasing number of elevators may be thought to contribute to less desirable performance now than in the past. But the evidence shows that combining of elevator facilities in multi-plant locations will generally lead to lower costs. Lower costs per unit are generally considered to be a measure of more desirable performance.

Merger also eases the exit of excess capacity through the purchase and dismantling of small inefficient elevators. In such cases, merger should be encouraged. However, fewer elevators may lead to monopoly power.

Although the relationships between country elevators may constitute reasonably workable competition at this point, the trend toward fewer elevators could cause important aberrations from the ideal in the future. In view of this, the following appear to be reasonable policies to encourage greater efficiency while maintaining or increasing competition in the industry:

1. Encourage the cooperation of industry, university, and government agencies:
   a. To promote the consolidation of smaller elevators into larger and more optimum size elevators
   b. To disseminate more relevant market information
   c. For the development of technological progressiveness and efficiency of the industry.

2. Require publication of prices, discounts, allowances, commissions, gifts, etc. by elevators to farmers for both grains and major sidelines and prohibit any form of collusion at the local level.

3. Encourage farmers to increase farm storage capacity, hold grain from the market, especially at harvest, and obtain bids on their grains from several elevators.
Proposal 1 will aid managers, owners, and boards of directors to become aware of the advantages of mergers in many local competitive areas. Increased information concerning the direction and magnitude of major changes will facilitate required adjustments by the industry. Technological improvements and progressiveness must be developed through cooperation. An important area for cooperation is research for the development of an improved and more consistent procedure in grading and sampling grain purchased from farmers.

Proposals 2 and 3 will force elevators to compete more on the basis of price. Vigorous enforcement of laws prohibiting local collusion will ensure competition in the future. Apparently, knowledge of elevator purchasing prices are available to managers but are not widely available to farmers. Farmers need to know alternative paying prices if their decisions on where to sell are to be rational. Proposal 3 will also eliminate many grading problems experienced by farmers and will result in more orderly marketing. Present CCC incentives to store grain may have to be raised for farmers. Commodity Credit Corporation storage incentives to country elevators may have to be discouraged further.

The combined effect of these proposals will be to improve competition and efficiency in the industry, even though elevator numbers continue to decrease.
APPENDICES
## APPENDIX TABLE 1. PRODUCTION AND GRAIN SOLD THROUGH COUNTRY ELEVATORS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953, 1957-1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>1953 Farm</th>
<th>1957 Farm</th>
<th>1958 Farm</th>
<th>1959 Farm</th>
<th>1960 Farm</th>
<th>1961 Farm</th>
<th>1962 Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>21,360</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>11,561</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>7,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>51,147</td>
<td>19,610</td>
<td>60,125</td>
<td>19,841</td>
<td>75,238</td>
<td>26,508</td>
<td>39,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>18,967</td>
<td>36,236</td>
<td>76,956</td>
<td>57,717</td>
<td>109,704</td>
<td>86,666</td>
<td>71,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All wheat</td>
<td>97,304</td>
<td>88,012</td>
<td>119,227</td>
<td>113,448</td>
<td>117,372</td>
<td>111,822</td>
<td>97,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>3,993</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>6,275</td>
<td>2,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>2,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>19,165</td>
<td>18,008</td>
<td>19,476</td>
<td>13,539</td>
<td>19,126</td>
<td>18,614</td>
<td>10,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of elevators
- 1953: 936
- 1957: 869
- 1958: 850
- 1959: 838
- 1960: 883
- 1961: 820
- 1962: 797

### Ave. available volume per elevator
- 1953: 150,000
- 1957: 248,000
- 1958: 336,000
- 1959: 211,000
- 1960: 276,000
- 1961: 152,000
- 1962: 365,000

### Per cent purchased by elevator
- 1953: 67.8
- 1957: 73.5
- 1958: 76.8
- 1959: 75.2
- 1960: 73.8
- 1961: 76.7
- 1962: 73.5

### 3-Year average
- 1957-1959: 299,960
- 1960-1962: 290,002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3-Year average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1959</td>
<td>299,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1962</td>
<td>290,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCE:
North Dakota Crop Reporting Service.
APPENDIX TABLE 2. AVERAGE CAPACITY OF MULTI-PLANT LOCATIONS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953 AND 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of elevators per location</th>
<th>Average capacity</th>
<th>Net change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>269.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>252.0</td>
<td>1,132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>578.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>314.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>128.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>216.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Elevator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>283.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>192.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>157.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>128.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX TABLE 3. TOTAL INVESTMENT IN FIXED AND NEW EQUIPMENT FOR COUNTRY ELEVATORS, NORTH DAKOTA, 1953-1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment (dollars)</th>
<th>Total new equipment</th>
<th>Total fixed improvements</th>
<th>Total capital expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-6,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001-15,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-30,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-50,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001-100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001-160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160,001-200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001-350,001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Country elevator survey, North Dakota, 1963.
APPENDIX TABLE 4. LIQUIDITY RATIO FOR COUNTRY ELEVATORS
BY LEGAL TYPE OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATION, NORTH DAKOTA,
1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal type of business of organization</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Current assets to current liabilities ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Questionnaires
"CONFIDENTIAL"

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Enumerator: ___________________________ Date __________

Manager: ________________________________

Name of Firm: ___________________________

Address & Location: ___________________________

1. Present type of business enterprise (coop., corp., partnership, line elevator, line coop., proprietorship)

2. What is the no. of elevator plants owned by this particular elevator? ________

3. Has this elevator changed ownership or type of organization since 1954?
   No____ If yes, when __________________________ and how________________________

4. What type of hedging practices does this elevator use? Is it a normal practice
to hedge wheat? ________ Corn ________ Soybeans ________ Other ________
   If no, how does this elevator protect itself from a drop in price on consignment
   sales? Explain fully.

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Did this elevator hedge in the past? ________ Why did you quit?

__________________________

__________________________

What is the trend for hedging practices in the future? Why?

__________________________
5. What is the effect of increased truck movement of grain on the operations of this elevator?

6. How is your price to farmers determined for a grain product on any given day?
   a. Is it based on a central market price? ________________ which? ________________
   b. What is the margin, aside from transportation costs? _______________________
   c. Is there another elevator in this elevator's competitive area that other elevator depend on for information on prices? ___________ Who? ___________

     Why do you think this elevator is able to influence other elevators' prices? _______________________

7. Does this elevator give premiums above the top market price for better quality grain? Why?

8. How does the manager learn about the prices offered by other elevators in his competitive area? Does he check prices with other managers? Explain fully?

9. Is the manager of a line elevator or line coop. allowed to deviate from the price set at the head office?

10. Are prices of grains changed during the day? _________ Why? _______________________

11. Where do you get the price information that causes you to change prices during the day?
12. How far do you think farmers will haul their grain in order to obtain a better price and more services? That is, if he would haul 5 miles for a certain price how much further would he haul to get a better price?

______________________________________________________________________________

13. Does this elevator emphasize a higher price or non-price services in an effort to obtain a larger volume of business?

______________________________________________________________________________

14. We want to know the maximum distance that this elevator does business with farmers. That is, how many miles do farmers travel to do business with this elevator?

50% of this elevator's business is done _________ miles from the elevator.
75% of this elevator's business is done _________ miles from the elevator.
90% of this elevator's business is done _________ miles from the elevator.
100% of this elevator's business is done _________ miles from the elevator.

15. What is the No. of elevators operating within a:

   a) 3 mile radius of this elevator

   b) 5 mile radius of this elevator

   c) 10 mile radius of this elevator

   d) 15 mile radius of this elevator

   e) 20 mile radius of this elevator

   f) 25 mile radius of this elevator

   g) 35 mile radius of this elevator

16. How many elevators is your elevator directly in competition with? _________

17. What considerations do you as a cooperative elevator _________ or as a non cooperative elevator _________ (check one) take because cooperative cash dividends in your pricing policy? That is, do you give a higher or lower price because of cash dividends?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
WHAT NON-PRICE FACTORS ARE USED?

18. Does the manager visit farms in effort to solicit business? That is, does the manager serve as a public relations man (visiting farms) in order to solicit business? ____ If yes, is this method successful? ____ If no, what, if any, other public relation practices are used in order to solicit business? Explain?


19. Are more favorable grading practices or other practices used to encourage larger farms and/or more distant farmers to trade with this elevator? ____ Explain?


20. Do you feel your competitors use any unfair business practices? ____ What practices do you consider unfair?

  1)

  2)

  3)

21. Do you feel that coopetition has forced you to use any similar practices? ____


22. Does this elevator use any advertising techniques? ____ How much is spent on advertising __________. Is this advertising used in an effort to obtain more business? ____ If yes, do you consider it to be effective? ____ If no, why does this elevator advertise? ____


23. What practices do you use to encourage patronage other than price? (Services and products at cost quick payments to farmers, quality premiums, annual picnic, Christmas presents, coop. idea, reputation, Provide fieldman to farmers.) Explain fully!!!!!
24. If this elevator is diversified; when was diversification first used.

What products are the principle means of diversification?

Why is diversification used? (to increase income, encourage patronage, better use of labor etc.)

25. Is there any firm differentiation among farmers? That is, will a farmer do business with a certain elevator even if the price and services are better from another elevator the same distance away from his farm? Why?

Or will a farmer do business with a certain type of business, such as a coop (or corp., etc.) just because it is a coop? Explain why?

26. How much of all grain received by this elevator come directly from (1962):

1. Farmers

2. Other elevators

3. Through agents, dealers, and brokers

4. CCC

5. ____________________________
27. What does this elevator charge for the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Volume (1962)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage for farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelling Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilized (spreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHANGING ROLE OF LOCAL AND CENTRAL MARKETS:

28. Are there any services provided by the more central elevator that can not be preformed by this local elevator? ____________ If yes, what are these functions or services?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Do these services add to the efficiency of the operation for this elevator?

__________________________________________________________

29. What is your future outlook concerning these functions and services provided by a more central elevator? Will they increase or decrease? Explain fully.

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
30. Does this elevator perform any services for elevators that are not owned by this firm?

If yes, what services and charges do you perform?

31. Does this elevator use the services of a fieldman provided by a more central elevator? If yes, what services does he provide?

THE EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND PROGRAMS

32. How has the government storage program affected your business in the past?

33. If storage program ended, what effect would it have on other elevators?

34. Do government price support programs to farmers affect this elevator's business in any way? How?

35. How much Gross income does this elevator receive for storing government grain?
36. What major types of government regulation affect the operation of this elevator greatly?

How do they effect operations?

37. What effect will the new interstate highway system have on this elevator?

MULTIPLE PLANT FIRMS: (firms that own more than one elevator)

38. How many elevators does this firm own? _______________ (see page 1)

39. How are operation of the elevators coordinated?

40. Does a central office exist for these elevators? _______ Where? __________

__________ What functions does the central office perform for the elevators?

41. What economies of scale (or lower costs per bushel) exist because of owning and operating more than one firm? Explain????
42. Estimate the amount costs are lowered per bushel of grain handled because more than one elevator is being operated under one ownership?

43. What are the advantages of multiple plants?

44. What are the disadvantages of multiple plants?

45. Has this firm closed any elevators down in the last 10 years? How many? Why?

46. What changes would you recommend or make if more capital could be borrowed?

47. What is the major source of this elevator's credit needs?

48. Type of Structure of Elevator:

- Wood
- Concrete
- Steel

Total Capacity
THE PROGRESSIVENESS OF THE INDUSTRY --- TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES.

49.
A. What major (over $1,000) fixed improvements has this elevator invested in the last 5 years? (buildings, land, bins, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Present Debt</th>
<th>Source of credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. What major additions of new equipment during the last 5 years? (leg--capacity) (scale--length & maximum weight--) (Automatic weight stamping device) etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Previous Size</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>How Financed</th>
<th>Present Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you feel the firm's capital and credit needs are adequately met by the sources available to the firm? If no, what stops the firm from using more capital? Explain fully.
51. What would you estimate the cost of starting a new elevator in your locality today? ________________ If this new elevator used all new available technology, do you think it would be more efficient than the average elevator in this area? ________________. How much could this new elevator lower costs per bushel? ________________. 

52. What are the problems involved in ceasing the operations of elevators? 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

53. Does this elevator expect to expand by merger or buying out another elevator in this locality or in another locality in the near future? ________________ How many miles away is this elevator? ________________ miles. What volume of business has it been doing? (Estimate) ________________. Why do you plan to do this? 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

54. Do you prefer to grow by merger or internally? ____ Why? ________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

55. If this firm incorporated recently, why? ________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

56. What changes would you suggest in the marketing of grain that would increase its efficiency? 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

57. What do you consider to be the biggest changes taking place in the grain marketing industry today? Explain fully! 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________ 

__________________________________________________________________________
58. Have any larger organizations or group of people been interested in purchasing this elevator? ___________ Explain the circumstances which has led to this situation. That is, who wants to buy, & why & does this elevator think seriously about selling & why?


59. Does any processor or miller etc. have a contract or any type of agreement to buy a certain amount of grain from this elevator? ___________ If yes, Explain fully.


60. What advantages do you feel this firm has over the entry of new firms (elevator)?


61. Considering present facilities of this elevator, what volume of grain could this elevator handle without too much strain?


62. How much of this elevator's capacity is needed for working space?


63. How much over-capacity would this elevator have if no govt. storage program existed?


64. Keeping the above in mind, do you think that this elevator could lower cost per bushel of grain by increasing the volume of its grain business? ___________


65. How large a volume do you think an elevator could be in this area and still decrease per unit costs of a bushel of grain handled? ___________
66. Considering the number of elevators in this locality (15 miles radius) _______. How many; how many elevators do you think could handle the available grain most efficiently? That is, at the lowest possible cost? 

67. What trends do you expect in the number and size of elevators in this locality in the future? Explain fully.

68. In looking at elevator growth in the future, how do you expect this growth to take place; internal or external. Why?

69. What sort of margin does this elevator try to maintain between the price paid to farmers and the price received for grain per bushel of:

- Wheat
- Barley
- Oats
- Corn
- Soybeans
- Flax
- Rye

70. What volume of grain sold from this elevator falls into the following classification?

1. To arrive
2. On track
3. On consignment
4. Farmers
5. Others

TOTAL VOLUME HANDLED———
71. When this elevator sells grain products, who are these products sold to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAINS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BUYERS COMPETING FOR GRAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF BUYERS COMPETING FOR GRAIN** -- What is the number of firms that are actively competing for this elevator's grain for the particular product.

72. What is the name or names of commission firms you do business with?


73. **VOLUME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| ELEVATOR DEPARTMENT | :--: | :--: | :--: | :--: |
| Gross Profits |  |  |  |  |
| Net Income |  |  |  |  |
| Total Current Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Total Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Total Current Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Total Long-Term Liabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Total Capital & Surplus |  |  |  |  |
| Other Departments |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Sales |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Profits |  |  |  |  |
| Net Income |  |  |  |  |
| Other Departments |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Sales |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Profits |  |  |  |  |
| Net Income |  |  |  |  |

**SIDELINE OPERATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sideline Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sideline Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning &amp; Treating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer (Selling &amp; Spreading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray &amp; Spraying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO LINE ELEVATOR

Enumerator: ________________________________  CONFIDENTIAL  Date ____________

Interviewee ____________________________________________

Official Position _______________________________________

Name of Firm _________________________________________

Address and Location ___________________________________

1. The number of elevators owned by your firm? _________________

2. The number of elevators owned in North Dakota? _________________

3. How many elevators has your firm sold in North Dakota in the last 10 years? ___
   Why? ___________________________________________________

4. What are the major problems your firm faces in terminating the operation of elevators?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. How many elevators have been purchased by your firm in North Dakota in the last 10 years? _________
   Why? ________________________________________________________

6. What are the major problems your firm faces in starting a new elevator? _________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
7. Does this firm prefer to grow by merger or internally? ____________________________________________
   Why? __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

8. How are the operations of your elevators coordinated? Explain fully?
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

9. What functions or services does your central office perform for its line elevators?
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

10. What do you consider the trend to be for these types of services or additional services to be in the future?
    ______________________________________________
    Why? __________________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________________

11. What economies of scale (or lower costs per bushel) exist because of owning and operating more than one firm? Explain
    __________________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________________

12. Estimate the amount costs are lowered per bushel of grain handled because of owning more than one elevator?
    __________________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________________

13. Explain how these costs are lowered?
    __________________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________________
14. List the advantages of owning multiple plants?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

15. List the disadvantages of owning multiple plants?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

16. How has the fact that more and more grain is being shipped by truck affected the operations of your line elevators?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

17. What percent of the grain handled by your line elevators was shipped by truck in North Dakota in 1962?

____________________________________________________________________________________

18. What changes would you suggest to improve the marketing of barley?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

19. What changes would you suggest in the marketing of all grains that would increase its efficiency (lower costs)?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

20. What are the important changes taking place in the grain marketing industry today? Explain fully!

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
21. Does any processor or miller etc. have a contract of any type of agreement to buy a certain amount of grain from your firm? If yes, explain fully.

22. What is the future trend for these types of agreements?

23. What is the trend concerning the number of buyers competing for grains? (increasing, decreasing, or the same) Why?

24. Why are commission firms merging?

25. Is this firm diversified? That is, does this firm do business in other areas other than line elevators?

26. What are the other lines of business?

27. Are these means of diversification complementary? That is, does one part of the business help lower costs for the others?

28. If not, why is this firm diversified?

29. How many other firms does this firm compete with in each of its separate areas of business?
30. Why doesn't this firm continue to diversify into related fields of business?

THE CHANGING ROLE OF LOCAL AND CENTRAL MARKETS

31. Does your firm own any elevators in North Dakota that perform any services for elevators that are not owned by your firm?

If yes, what services and charges do they perform?

32. What is your future outlook concerning these functions or services provided by a more central elevator? (increase, decrease, etc.) Why?

33. How do these services add to the efficiency of the operation of local elevators?

34. Does this firm have a fieldman that helps facilitate the operations of its line elevators? If yes, what services are provided? Explain!

35. Subterminal elevators have been established in several grain marketing states. What do you consider the trend for subterminal elevators in North Dakota?
36. Does this firm have any subterminal elevators in North Dakota? ____________

37. Does this firm plan to establish subterminal elevators in North Dakota? Explain: ____________________________________________________________________________________

38. If the government storage program ended, what effect would it have on the operations of this firm's elevators?
___________________________________________________________________________________________

39. What will be the effect if the program continues? ______________________________________________________________________________________

40. What effect will the new interstate highway system have on the operations of this firm's elevators?
___________________________________________________________________________________________

41. What percent of this line elevators total grain products handled in North Dakota falls into the following classification?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To arrive or net track</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On track</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On consignment</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL VOLUME HANDLED IN NORTH DAKOTA: ________

42. Why has more grain been moving by to-arrive in recent years? _______________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
43. What do you consider the trend for hedging and to arrive sales in the future? Explain fully.

44. Does this firm plan to increase or decrease the amount of sidelines handled by its line elevators?

45. What sidelines?

46. What percent are sidelines of total Net Income.

47. How is grain that is not sold to arrive or hedged protected from a drop in price.

48. What levels of grain merchandising does your firm control?

49. How many elevators do you service besides your own?
"CONFIDENTIAL"

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COMMISSION FIRMS

Enumerator ___________________________ Date _____________________

Interviewee ____________________________

Official Position ________________________

Name of Firm ___________________________

Address and Location _________________________

1. How many commission firms are operating in North Dakota today? ________
   How many were operating separately 10 years ago? ________ Why
   are these changes taking place? ________________________

2. How many commission firms do you expect there to be 5 to 10 years from now? _____

3. How many elevators is the Commission Company servicing in North Dakota? ______

4. Do any of these elevators do business with other commission firms? _______
   If yes, how many ________ and what percent of the total volume? ________

5. What are elevators charged for commission firm services? ______________________

6. Do these charges vary per elevator? If yes, on what basis? ________________

7. Does any processor or miller etc. have a contract or any type of agreement to
   buy a certain amount of grain from this firm? _______. If yes explain fully!
8. What is the future trend concerning these types of agreements? __________
   Why?

9. What has been the trend concerning the number of buyers competing for grain
   (increasing, decreasing, or the same) Explain why and by how much?

10. What percent of the volume of grain handled from N. Dak. is shipped by truck?
    __________

11. How has the fact that more grain is being shipped by truck affected commission
    firms?

12. Does this commission company own any elevators? __________ How many
    How many are in North Dakota? __________

13. Have any elevators been purchased in the last 10 years? __________ How many

14. Have any elevators been sold in the last 10 years? __________ How many

15. Is the operation of a commission firm complimentary with owning and operating
    country elevators? __________ If yes, HOW?

16. The trend is towards fewer and larger elevators. How does this effect the
    operations of this firm?

17. Does it lower the cost of operations? __________ Have charges to
    elevators been lowered?

18. What functions or services does this commission firm perform for local elevators?
19. Has the number of these services increased over the past 10 years?  
If yes, what new services have been added recently (the last 10 years) and Why?


20. What percent of the grain handled by this firm is not sold to arrive or is not hedged?


21. How is grain that is not sold to arrive or hedged protected from price drops?


22. What changes would you suggest to improve the marketing of barley  


23. What change would you suggest to increase the efficiency (lower costs) of marketing all grains?


24. What do you consider to be the biggest changes and trends taking place in the grain marketing industry today?
25. What percent of the volume of grain handled by your firm from N. Dak. fall into the following classification?

1. To arrive or on track

2. On track

3. On consignment

4. Other

TOTAL VOLUME OF GRAIN HANDLED FROM N. DAK.

26. Why has more grain been moving by to arrive in recent years?

27. What do you consider the trend for hedging and to arrive sales in the future?

Explain fully!

28. What % of your total volume is:

Wheat
Durum
Flax
Rye
Soybeans
Corn
Oats

29. Who are the main buyers for wheat?

Type of processing

Barley

Type of processing
Oats

Flax
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