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## IMTEODUCTION

## Purpose of the study

The primary purpose of this study was to analyge the operations of the 解id Cooperetive Gresmery Association from the standpoint of the cost of handine various products. A secondary purpose was to discover, in possible, the comperative efficiency in hendling the verious products and the factors contributing to the success of the firm. A three-year period wos selected for the study because it was thought that this would give a representative view of post-mar operating conditions.

## Procedure

The discussion presented in the iirst section serves as becoground for the analysis of operating costs presented in the following sections. It is based on information secured from the gnnal audits and personal interviews with the manger of the association. More deteiled anslysis wes not ettempted in this section because it would not have contributed greatly to achieving the purposes of the study. The primory reason for including this section was to indicate the size, importance, and mate of growth of the association.

The discussion of cost gllocation in the second section is based on the annual audits and expense records of the association. The association uses a general accounting pystem, and, in only a rew instances, are costs separated on a depertmental or product basis. Wor example, no record was kept of the amount of butterfat or milk used in each product during the years strudied. Since coste were not depertmentalized in the records of the association, s method had to be selected for achieving the cost allocations. Three altematives were considered. First, the so-called
"edditional cost" method which was employed by Dr. J. M. Finley and associates in a Colifornia creamery study. I/ This method involves the calculation of the costs involved in producing the primary product and allocating to other products only those additional costs involved in their production. Several reasons for not using this method in this study imediately presented themselves - (1) the firm has always produced several products, so there is no way or knowing whet costs would be necessary in the production of any single product alone; (2) several products, such as, milk, buttes, coffee crean, etc., may be considered primary products; and (3) the assigning of all joint costs to a primary product, although it has some merit, evades the question of mat costs are actumlly involved in the production of esch product and obscures the relative efficiencies of competing products. Secoad, the "ebility to pay" method, which involves the gllocation of direct costs on the besis of use, and the allocotion or indirect costs on the basis of ability to pay. The gross margin (net sales less purchases and direct expenses) is usualiy used as the measure of ability to pay. This method was not used becuse it penalizes the more efficient products and causes the more inefficient lines of production to appear more profiteble. Phird, the method based on the "principle of benefit," which holds thet each product should share each cost in proportion to the benefit that it receives from the incurring of that cost. In theory, this method is the nost logical, and it results in an accurate division of costs. Its application is of ten very difficolt, and certain assumptions must be made in order to apply it to actual costs. These assumptions are given in the second section. Whis rethod is used in this study because it seems to be the most

1 J. W. Tinley, F. F. Abbott, 0. M. Reed, and J. B. Schneider, Creanery Operating Hfficiency in California, pp. 27-29.
satinfactory for achieving the steted purposes, and beeause it con be applied, with some quaificetions, to this problen.

Both accurecy and objectivity are lost in some instances due to the leck of evailable deta. The records kept by the associetion were not entirely adequate for the purposes of this study. Since neither time, expense, nox fecilities permitted observetion sad measurement of the emon ts of verious Items entering into each product over a period of time, much of the allocation of costs had to be based on estimates made by the manager. the plant auperintendent, the office menager, and the internal auditor. These men were very cooperative in supplying needed information, but it cannot be empected that they remember, with a great deal of accurecy, details occurring in the three years concerned in this study.

The third section, which deals the operating stetements of the bssocistion, is partiy e re-combinstion of the various cost items discussed in the previous section. Sales, handing costs, and net esmings of the various products are discussed with s view to revealing the importance and the efficiency of handing each product. The products cennot be considered distinctly separate because some are primary products, some are side-line products, some are by-products, and some are surplus products, Afirm is Vexy similar to an organism, and, like an organism, when dissected, its parts may pppers distorted and useless. It ja difficult to discover the functionel efficiency of any depertiont, process, or line of production by regarding it separately. The production of a particular product, in terms of cost and income, ray appear relatively inefficient, nevertheless, the produet may contribute greatly to the overall efficiency and success of the fim. Tt may unitge fectors which vald othexwise be wested. A cost analysis of the type employed in this study has certain definite short-
comings. It is not an infallible measare of operating efficiency. A aore detailed analysis based on seasonel variations in production and costs would give 2 more accurate estime te of actul costs, but such records as are kept by the association are not readily amenoble to such an analysis.

## DEVELOPMTNT OF THE ASSOCIATION

## Organization

The Inid Cooperative Creamery Association was organized on March 11, 1933, by 375 farmers of the $\operatorname{Tnid}$, Oklahoma area. Organized during a period of general business depression, the association was destined for some difficult times before proving itself. The association managed to hold its own fairly well for the first four years, with total assets decreasing slightly during this period, and net sales, net earnings, and membership slowly increasing. Apparently, the association established a firm foundation during this period because the year 1935 marked the beginning of a period of rapid expansion which was inhibited only slightly by the war and has continued since the war. It is now one of the largest cooperative creameries in the world.

## Growth

Total Assets. Total assets, rather than net worth, was selected as a factor of growth for three reasons: First, membership, rather than the ownership of capital stock, is emphasized in cooperative organization, and net worth is not a true measure of the members' equity in the association; second, the association has operated principally on members' capital, and the current liabilities consisted mainly of accounts payable to patrons for butterfat and patronage refunds payable; and, third, the association has maintained an open membership policy. Members and non-members are treated alike.

At the end of the first year of operations, 1931, the association had total assets of $\$ 56,953$, they declined to a minimum of $\$ 37,929$ in 1934, and began an unbroken climb to $\$ 1,062,056$ in 1948 (Figure 1). The rate of

FIGURE 1
Growth in Total Assets, Net Sales, Net Barnings, and Membership, Enid Cooperative Creemery Association,
Fiscel Years Fnding November 30, 1931 through 1948.
(SOURCE: Table 7)

increase wos fairly steady throughout this period. During the last three years most of this increase wes in plant and equipment. There was also 2 large increase in cash on hand and in banks. On the liability side, most of the incresse was in capital stock issued and statutory reserve. A large increase also occurred in accounts payable to patrons.

Memberghip. The initial menbership of 375 increased slowly to 460 in 1935, then began a period of ropid increase to 4,900 members in 1940 (Figure 1). Arter 1945, menbership continued to grow rather rapidly but at a slower rate of increase. The association hed about 8,300 members in 1948, more than 22 times the original membership. This almost phenomenal growth in membership can probably be attributed to three things - the need for a cooperative creanery in the area, good mensgement or the association, and good nembership relations.

Tet gales. The increase in annual net soles somewhat paralleled the increase in membership, but the rate of increase was more uniform. Wet sales increased from $\$ 88,336$ for the fiscal year of 1931 to $\$ 5,279,615$ for the inseal year of 1948, on increase of almost 5,877 percent (pigure 1). The only year that failed to show an increase over the previous year mos 1944. Price control apparently caused the net sales in 1944 and 1945 to be lover thon they would have been otherwise. Wuch of the increase during the last three years was due to higher prices. None of the last three years equalled 1943 in butter production, however, there was a large increase in the volume of mink products sold.
 in 1948, an increase of bout 15, 875 percent (Figure 1). In no year did a net loss occur, and only two years, 1932 and 1940, showed a decrease from the previous year. In 1948 , net amings were more than one-half as great
as total assets, and they wexe about 10.1 percent of the net asles. The growth or the associetion, as revealed by these four factors, indicstes on efficient business oremization and a strong determination, on the pert of both the membere and the monegencot, to Eake the organimtion successful. A question arises as to the afreot of this rapid rate of growth on operating costs and efriciency. The anamex to this guestion may be found in the succeeding chopters.

## ALLOCATION OF COSTS

The primary objective of this study was to allocate the operating costs of the Finid Cooperative Creamery Association among the several products handled. The principle of benefit was followed as closely as possible in all cost allocations. This principle was very difficult to follow in some cases because of the joint nature of the costs involved. In such cases some arbitrary procedure was adopted because it seemed the best of the available alternatives. Two general types of costs had to be allocated operating expenses, and manufacturing and processing costs.

## Operating Bxpenses

The operating expenses were divided into five categories - distribution expense, selling expense, shop and garage expense, general and administrative expense, and provision for bad debts. Other revenue was also included with this group because, first, the costs of earning other revenue were hidden in the general expenses of the firm and there was no basis for separating those costs, and, second, other revenue was of the same nature as general and administrative expense in that it was a.ttributable to the firm as a whole. The provision for bad debts was a selling expense but it was handled separately because it applied to all products sold by the association while the remainder of the selling expense applied only to those products sold locally.

Distribution Bxpense. Distribution expense was the largest of the operating expenses of the association. The distribution expense totaled $\$ 78,639,01$ in 1946, $\$ 89,071.06$ in 1947, and $\$ 121,929.65$ in 1948 (Table 1), while the total number of units of the various products distributed locally

## TABLR 1

Allocation of Distribution Expense, Bnid Cooperative Creamery Association, Fiscal Years Tnding November 30, 2946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Print Butter |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 3,288.59 | 3,001.80 | 1,881.57 |
| Other | 2,231.29 | 1,670.69 | 2,344.85 |
| Total | 5,519.88 | 4,672.49 | 4,226.42 |
| Eggs |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 150.43 | 196.18 | 663.67 |
| Other | 148.33 | 206.57 | 1,121.69 |
| Total | 298.76 | 402.75 | 1,785.36 |
| Pasteurized Milk |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 36,998.65 | 37,330.44 | 35,880.58 |
| Storage | 22. 20 | 35.72 | 28.579.29 |
| Other | $\frac{21,924.33}{58,945 \cdot 18}$ | $\frac{21,882.66}{59.248 .82}$ | 28,579.29 |
| Totel | 58,945.18 | 59,248.82 | 64,459.87 |
| Homogenized Milk |  |  |  |
| Commissions | -- | 3,925.02 | 11,435.28 |
| S torage | -- | 3.32 | - |
| Other | -- | 2,031.48 | 12,735.67 |
| Total |  | 5,959.82 | 24,170.95 |
| Coffee Cream |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 5,095.34 | 6,024.48 | 6,269.61 |
| Other | 1,824.36 | 1,969.61 | 3,106.12 |
| Totel | 6,919.70 | $\overline{7,994.09}$ | 9,375.73 |
| Whipping Cream 69.09 |  |  |  |
| Commissions | $69.09$ |  |  |
| 0 ther Total | $\frac{17.19}{86.28}$ | $\frac{420.55}{1,745.04}$ | $\frac{661.55}{2.130 .08}$ |
| Buttermilk |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 644.19 | 949.42 | 1,130.72 |
| Other | 522.92 | 707.92 | 1,232.57 |
| Total | 1,167.11 | 1,657.34 | 2,363.29 |
| Chocolate Milk |  |  |  |
| Commissions | 404.97 | 952.58 | 1,708.13 |
| Other | 586.28 | 1,041.11 | 2,974.61 |
| Total | 991.25 | 1,993.69 | 4,682.74 |

PABLH 1 (Continued)
Allocation of Distribution Expense, Mid Cooperative Creamery Association, Fiscol Vears Ghdine Hovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Cottege Cheese |  |  |  |
| Comissions | $2,761.38$ | 3,145.61 | 3,617.04 |
| Other | 1,761.01 | 2,242.30 | 3.952 .99 |
| Total | 4,522.39 | 5.387 .91 | 7,570.03 |
| Skim Milw |  |  |  |
| Comassions | 5.39 | 8.08 | 32.09 |
| other | . 83 | 1.03 | . 16 |
| Sotal. | 6.22 | 9.11 | 12.25 |
| Oreageade | 182.24 | $\cdots$ | -- |
| Ice Gream | -- | -- | 979.41 |
| Rovelties | -- | -- | 173.52 |
| Potal |  |  |  |
| Comissions on hggs and Butter | 3,439.02 | 3,197.98 | 2,545.24 |
| Gommissions on Mils and Other Products | $45,979.01$ | 53,660.12 | 61.521 .98 |
| Storage on Milk | 22.20 | 39.04 | - |
|  | $\frac{29,198.78}{78,639.01}$ | $\frac{32,173.92}{89.071 .06}$ | $\frac{57.862 .43}{121.959 .65}$ |

Somon: Annusl Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, mnd 1948.
was $5,922,800$ in 1946, 6,111,106 in 1947, and 6,847,013 in 1948.2/ The average distribution cost was 1.33 cents per unit sold in $1946,1.46$ cents in 1947, and 1.78 cents in 1948. The net sales value of products sold locelly increased from $\$ 960,019.12$ in 1946 to $\$ 1,107,926,03$ in 1947, and $\$ 1,344,114.75$ in $1948 . \frac{3 /}{}$ The average distribution cost was 8.19 cents per dollar sold in $1946,8.04$ cents in 1947, and 9.07 eents in 1948. The greatest part of the increase in distribution costs in 1948 was in truck oper ating costs. For example, the cost of gas nad oil, tires, and insurance nore than dombled fron 1947 to 1948 , and a very large increase occurred in miscellaneous expense.

The diatribution expense applied to all products sold locally. It included such items as comissions to drivern, truck expenses, and other expenses directly attributable to distribution. In 1948, the association maintained 17 delivery routes. Twelve of the routes handled bottled products, butter, and eggs; two handled only ice crean; and three handled all of the products mentioned. Some of the routes were wholesale, some were retail, but most were mixed wholesale and retail. Records were not kept in such a maner that costs could be broken dom by routes.

The delivery mea received a commission of one-half cent per pound of butter end per dozen egrs, and a percentage of the sales value of all other products delivered. The comissions on milk and other products trere the

2 These figures vere computed from the dats in Teble 29. See also Infra, p. 13, conceming print butter and eggs sola locelly.

3 These figures were compiled from Tobles $9,10,11,12,13,14,15$, 16, 21, 26, 27, and 28. Wet seles for pasteurited milk, honogenized nilk, coffee cream, whipping cream, chocolate milk, buttermilk, and cottage cheese were gross sales less wholesale allowances; for tub butter, dried buttermilk, and dried skim milk, net soles were gross soles less freight-out; and, hor all other products, net sales and gross sales were the same.

Iargest single items of distribution expense. These items were allocted to the producte which incurred the cost (pasteurized milx, homogenized milk, coffee cream, whipping cream, buttemilk, chocolate milk, cottage cheese, and bottled skim milk), in proportion to their net seles. Mo commissions wexe shown fox ice cream because they were deducted fron sales berore the sales figure was entered in the andit. The commissions on butter nat egse mere divided at the rete of one-holf cent per dozen eggs and the belance to butter.

The other items of aistribution expense, with the exception of storage on mik, consisted of truck operating expenses and tares. In view of the maner in which the records of these expenses were kept, there was no way or sacertaining exactly hom much of each item was incurned in the delivery of each product. Two possible alternatives for effecting this sllocation were considered. pirst, the verious itens could be alloceted in proportion to the value of eech product distributed, but, since such e mide veristion existed in the per unit volue of the products, it was obvious that such a breakdom would be far from correct. The second alternstive involved the allocation of these costs in proportion to the number of units of each product distributed. This essumes that it cost the some to distribute 2 pound of buttex, a dozen eggs, or a quart of mill, and thet costs were fairly wiporm on the various routes.

It wos decided, after discussing the problem with the managenent, that a division of these expenses on per unit basis would be es nearty correct zs possible. Wot great deol of difference existed in the weight and space regurements of the various sized units, due to the fact that the containers did not vary in size and weight as much as did the contents. The distance hauled, mumber and frequency of stops per route, grount delivered st each
stop, and other similer factors probably affected the cost of handing more than did the differences in size per unit. Since no records were kept by the association regerding these various factors affecting distribution costs, they hsd to be assumed equal for each unit of product distributed. It was estimated, by the management, that soout 30 percent of the print butter was distributed locally and the balance shipped out. This estimate was used beceuse no separation betmeen local deliveries and nonlocal sales was made in the records of the fim. In the case of eggs, much the same situation existed, except that the total number of eggs sold in cartons of one-dozen and the total number of cases of 30 -dozens were recorded. Since no eggs were shipped out in cartons and very few mere sold locally in cases, the fefgures were used in effecting the breakdown between eggs sold locally and eggs sold elsewhere. These estinates on print butter and eggs distributed locally were used in the allocation of distribution expense, selling expense, and shop and garage expense.

Selling Sxpense. Sellinc expense was not as important an expense as distribution expense in any of the years studied. The total selinge expense mounted to $\$ 25,709,52$ in $1946, \$ 29,799.48$ in 1947, and $\$ 30,812.50$ in 1948 (Table 2). It mas 2.68 cents per dollax of local sales in 1946 , 2.69 cents in 1947 , and 2.29 cents in 1948 . There was 2 considerable reduction in advertising expense in 1946 , even though it included the advertising of ice cream, a product not handled in 1946 and 1947. This decrease In anvertising expense was of fat by an increase in miscellsneous expense gad the addition of two new items, donations and depreciation on ice cream cobinets, in 1948.

Selling expense had no direct connection with the handing of any particular unit, and in many coses it was not attributable to any particalar

## TABLIT 2

Allocation of Selling Expense,
Enid Cooperstive Creanery Association, Fiscal Years Fiding Movember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollers) | (Dollars) |
| Print Butter |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 4,248.21 | 5,987.60 | 3,224.76 |
| 0 thex | 2,704.29 | 2,334.60 | 2,485.03 |
| Total | 6,952.50 | 8,322.20 | 5,709.79 |
| Pasteuriged Milk |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 4,230.89 | 5,382.41 | 2,543.02 |
| other | 5,771,56 | 6,431.33 | 6.973 .99 |
| Total | 10,002.45 | 11,813.74 | 9.517 .01 |
| Homogenised Mill |  |  |  |
| Advertising | -- | 565.92 | 810.47 |
| Other | -- | 676.21 | 2,222. 64 |
| Total |  | 1,242.13 | 3.033 .11 |
| Corfee Cream |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 2,250.59 | 2,747.45 | 1,645.24 |
| Other | 794.84 | 1,037.90 | 1.218 .60 |
| Total | 3,045.43 | 3,785.35 | 2,863.84 |
| Thipping 0xem |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 30.52 | 604.03 | 385.37 |
| Other | 10.78 | 228.18 | 285.43 |
| Total | 41.30 | 832.21 | 670.80 |
| Buttermilk |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 284.53 | 432.98 | 296.72 |
| Other | 300.49 | 1.63 .57 | 219.77 |
| Total | 385.02 | 596.55 | 516.49 |
| Chocolste Milk |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 178.87 | 434.42 | 448.24 |
| Other | 63.17 | $\underline{164.11}$ | 332.00 |
| Total | 242.04 | 598.53 | 780.24 |
| Cottege Cheese |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 1,219.68 | 1,434.55 | 949.17 |
| Other | 430.76 | 541.93 | 703.03 |
| Total | 1,650.44 | 1,976.48 | 1,652.20 |

TABLI 2 (Contimued)
Allocation of Selling thpense,
Bnid Cooperative Oreamery Association,
Fiscel Years Roding Movemer 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .

| $\therefore$ | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Skim Hix |  |  |  |
| Adrextising | 2.38 | 3.69 | 3.17 |
| Other | . 54 | 1.39 | 2.35 |
| Total | $\overline{3.22}$ | 5.08 | 5.52 |
| Esge |  |  |  |
| Advertising | 326.92 | 44.36 | 910.11 |
| Other | 115.46 | 167.87 | 674.13 |
| Total | 442.38 | 612.93 | 1,584.22 |
| Lee Gream |  |  |  |
| Deprecietion | -- | -- | 982.23 |
| Advertising | -- | -- | 2,167.74 |
| other | -- | -- | 407.61 |
| fotaz |  |  | $\overline{3,577.58}$ |
| Movelties |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | -- | -- | 253.24 |
| Advertising | -- | -- | 558.88 |
| Other | -- | -- | 105.09 |
| Total |  |  | 917.21 |
| Orengesde | 2.61 | 24.98 | 5.49 |
| Potal |  |  |  |
| Advertising - Butter | 4,248.21 | 5,987.60 | 3,224.76 |
| Advertising - Mix | 4,230.89 | 5.9148 .33 | 3,353,49 |
| Advertising - Tce Creem | - -- | -- | 2,726.62 |
| Advertising - Other Products | 4.293 .49 | 6,101.48 | 4,638.02 |
| Depreciation on Ice |  |  |  |
| other | 2,994.80 | 11, 762.07 | 15,635.14 |
| Grand Total | 25.709 .52 | 29,799.48 | 30,812.50 |

[^0]product. In one cese, comissions on separetor ssles, the expense was not incurred in any pert by any of the other products, homever, it was allocated in the geme maner as the other items and later compensated for by allocating the revenue from selling trade supplies (which includes separetors) mong the verious products. A similer problem erose in regerd to sales promotion and outside selesmen. These itens iacluded the seleries of the gates manager, his assistant, and three field men whowe function vas to promote membership ad patronage rether than sales. These items were confused in the audits and the association did not have the separate figures in its records. The saleries of the fileld men should have appeared in the general and sdministretive expense. A slight bies resultec from their inclusion in the selling expense because ell of the products of the associtation benefited from the services of the field men, while only the products sold locelly benefited from the services represented in the selling expense.

Since the selling expenses were of en indirect neture, the principle of benefit in proportion to net sales was applied. This method of allocation mas based on the assumption thet the benefit from these expenditures occurced to the vaxious products in proportion to their net gales. The expease of advertising butter was given separately, so it was allocated to buttex in total. The advertising expense for milk was divided between pasteurized milk and homogenized milit in proportion to their net setes. The advertising expense of ice cream wos divided between ice cream and novelties on the same basis. Other advertising was allocated mone the remeining products in proportion to their respective net seles. Depreciation on ice crean cabinets was incurred on several ice cream cabinets Which were rented out to various retailers. This expense wes rore then
compensated for by rentel income, which is listed under "other revenue." In both cases, the items were divided in proportion to the net sales of ice cream and novelties. The remaning items of selling expense were allocated anong all of the products sold locally.

Shop and Garage Expense. This expense was incurred in servicing and repairing the motor vehicles of the association. Shop and garege expense mas compratively small in the years studied, amounting to only $\$ 4,810.36$ in 1946. $\$ 7.560 .84$ in 1947, and $\$ 8,293.31$ in 1948 (Teble 3). The increase from 1946 to 1947 resulted from an increase in lobor costs and was accomponied by a decrease in the truck repair expense item listed under distribution expense. Shop and garage expense applies to delivexy trucks, one or two collection trucks operated by the association, and several vehicles used by the management man field men. Possibly, some of the expenses of the plant shop were included in this group. It was not possible to determine how the audi tor had handled these expenses without making ano ther sudit.

About three-fourths of the vehicles serviced by the garage were used for delivery purposes, while the other one-fourth were used for general purpases. Seventy-five percent of this expense mes considered as a cost of distribution, and the remaining 25 percent was considered as general expense. The 75 percent was alloceted to the products sold locally in proportion to the number of units of each product sold, and the 25 percent was allocsted among all of the products hendled in proportion to their net sales.

General and Administrative Pxpense. The general and administrative expense was the second largest group of the operating expenses. It amoveted to $\$ 59,345.93$ in 1946, $976,251.48$ in 1947, and $\$ 84,667.17$ in

MABLE 3
Allocation of shop and Garage Expense,
Enid Cooperative Creamery Association.
Fiscal Years Mnding Moverber 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Do12ars) |
| Ders | 50.57 | 88.52 | 239.71 |
| Pasteurized Mits | 2,889.44 | 4.113 .81 | 3,307.60 |
| Homogenized Milk | -- | 385.07 | 1,444.07 |
| Confee Cream | 250.27 | 388.62 | 375.04 |
| Yuipping Cream | 2.46 | 83.24 | 80.75 |
| Chocolate Milu | 74.42 | 190.05 | 330.97 |
| Butterminx | 67.75 | 131.32 | 139.92 |
| Skim Mink | .13 | .24 | .10 |
| Qottage Oheese | 231.06 | 416.86 | 448.66 |
| Bulk Thole Mils | 25.30 | 9.89 | 6.12 |
| Bulx Suret Cream | 33.47 | 12.20 | 14.37 |
| Sub Butter | 563.31 | 1,034.35 | 1,179.77 |
| Print Butter | 557.59 | 605.44 | 531.71 |
| Dried Buttermilk | 13.84 | 22.13 | 20.82 |
| Dried Gkin Mink | 20.77 | 13.67 | 31.24 |
| Casein | -- | 14.75 | 1.14 |
| Bulk mour Crean | 7.29 | -- | -- |
| Ice Cream | -- | -- | 119.04 |
| Wovelties | -- | -- | 22.20 |
| Geed Miliz | . 10 | . 08 | --- |
| Srengeade | 22.60 | . 60 | .18 |

## TABIT 3 (Continued)

Allocation of Shop and Gerage Frpense, Thid Cooperative Cremery Association, Piscal Years Fading Rovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollaxs) | (Dollars) | (Dol2ars) |
| Total | $4,810.36$ | 7.560 .84 | 8,293.31 |

,
SOURCR: Annuel Audita of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

1948 (fable 4). It was 1.62 cents per dollar of total ate sales in 1946, 1.71 cents in 1947, ane 1.60 cents in 1948. A part of the increase in 1947 and most of the increase in 1948 resulted from increases in the office payroll. The office was located in the plent building in 1946 and most of 1947. The new office and warehouse building was completed in 1947, and the ofince was moved into it about tro months before the end of the fiscal year. Since the vacated office space was not used for productive purposes for the remander of 1947 and depreciation was figured of the new building as soon as it wen ocupied, overlapping charge for office space resulted in 1947. The general and administrative exponse included the manager's salary, office sedories, office expenses, and a number of genergl expense items. The slaries of the plant superintendent and his assistant were trensferred from manufactaring labor expense to generel and administretive expense because the functions performed by the two men were of a general administrative character. Anl of the items included in the general and administrative expense were incurred in the genergl operations of the association, ond none of them could be directly attributed to the pronuction of any single product. Fhis expense mas allocated to the various products in proportion to their net seles. This method was based on the assumption that each product was benefitted in propertion to its net seles value. Provision for Bad Debts. This provision wes not en actual expense, but a sum, set aside each year in a special reserve, to provide for anticipated uncollectible accounts. Since the expense of a bad debt was liacurred when the sale wes made, rother thon when the acount wes deterained to be xncollectible, the expected expense was cherged to the period during which the sale wes mede. Host managers use sorae rule-of-thumb to calenlate the amount to be set aside during a given period. this rule must be

## TABLA 4

Alocation of Generel and Amint strative mapense, Thid Cooperetive Creamery Associstion, Fiscel Years Fnding November 30, 1946. 1947. and 1948.

|  | 2946 | $1947$ | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollers) |
| Pgsteurized Milk | 8,982.84 | $10,367.85$ | $9,614.54$ |
| Homogentzed Mizs | $\cdots$ | 1,090.10 | 3,064.19 |
| corfee Creem | 1,236.95 | 1,673.19 | $1,680.00$ |
| Wrippisg Cream | 16.77 | 367.85 | 393.51 |
| Chocolste Milk | 98.31 | 264.56 | 457.73 |
| Buttemins | 156.38 | 263.68 | 302.99 |
| Skin milk | 1.32 | 2.24 | 3.24 |
| Cottrese Cheese | 670.36 | 873.63 | 969.22 |
| Buat Hole mins | 1,259.25 | 395.91 | 249.80 |
| Bunix Sweet Oream | 1,665.47 | 492.24 | 586.90 |
| Tub Butter | 28.032 .83 | 43.742 .88 | 48.177.62 |
| Print Butter | 24,028.24 | 12,545.23 | 11,419.76 |
| Dried Botteymilk | 688.60 | 892.87 | 350.27 |
| Dried Skim Milk | 1,033.52 | 551.43 | 1,271.58 |
| Gsgein | -- | 594.89 | 45.71 |
| Bule Sour Orem | 362.69 | - | -- |
| Toe Gream | -- | -- | 561.94 |
| Wovelties | -- | -- | 1474.88 |
| Heed MLT | 5.20 | 3.45 | -- |
| Orangesde | 4.06 | 24.15 | 7.57 |
| Tges | 2,604.25 | $2,102.33$ | $4,864.74$ |

TABLT 4 (Continued)
Alocation of Generel snd Administretive Uxpense, Tnid Cooperotive Gremexy Associetion, miscal Yeare Thaing november 39, 1946, 1947, snd 1948 .

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollers) | (Dollers) |
| Potgl | $59,845.93$ | 76,251.48 | 84,667.17 |

SOURCE: manuel Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .
revised from time to time as experience revesls that the reserge for bad debts is either less than or more than adequate. This may account for some of the wide varigtion which occurred during the jears studied. The provision for bad debts mas $\$ 2,942.12$ in $1946, \$ 14,795.54$ in 1947 , and \$1, 839.75 in 1948 (Table 5). Txpressed as a percentase of the net sales of each yest, these figures were $0.079,0.332$, and 0.034 , respectively.

The bed debts expense wes slloceted in the same manner as the general gnd administrative expense, in proportion to net sales. Wo figures mere svailable regarding the proportion of bad debt loss incurred by each of the various products, so the losses were assuned to be in proportion to sales.

Other Revenue. In adaition to such usual items as purchese discounts, interest income, refunds, gain on sales of assets, snd miscellaneous, other revenue included some mosual items, such as margin on trade supalies, rentals on ice cream eabinets, and the margin on fountain opexations. mrede supplies were carried as a service to petrons and no record of operating expenses of handing them was lept. The expense of hendling the se supplies was included in generel and administretive expense and selling expense.

A separate opereting statenent was made by the suditor for the fowtain. It incl uded only such direct expenses es purchases, labor, and suppiles, and no cherge mes mode for space, equipment, and utilities. Ead g reasonable charge been made for the latter group, it would probably have exceeded the mexgin on fountain operations, resulting in a net loss. The fountain nas maintained largely gs a service to petrons ond customens, thererore, the results of its operetions, whether gein or loss, occurred to the firmas $a$ whole. In view of the many compliceting factors, it wes decided that a cost malysis of the foutein operation moud not be worthmile.

## TABLT 5

Allocation of Provision for Bed Debts, Taid Cooperetive Creanexy Association, Hiscel Fears moing november $30,1945,2947$, end 1948.

|  | 1945 | 1947 | 1.948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (D021.ass) | (2013.2rs) | (DoLisms) |
| Pesteurszed Mink | 441.56 | $2,011.73$ | 208.92 |
| Homogenized Milus | -- | 211.52 | 66.58 |
| Corfee Crear | 60.81 | 324.66 | 36.50 |
| Lhipping Cream | . 83 | 71.38 | 8.55 |
| Chocolste Milk | 4.83 | 51.33 | 9.95 |
| Buttermils | 7.69 | 51.16 | 6.58 |
| Skitimux | . 06 | .44 | . 07 |
| Cottase Cheese | 32.96 | 169.52 | 21.06 |
| Bulk Thole Malk | 61.91 | 77.40 | 5.43 |
| Bulk Sweet Cream | 81.88 | 95.51 | 12.75 |
| tub Butter | 1,378.14 | $8,487.70$ | 1,046.86 |
| Print Butter | 689.65 | 2.434 .22 | 248.14 |
| Dried Buttermila | 33.85 | 173.25 | 18.48 |
| Dried Skin Milk | 50.81 | 107.00 | 27.63 |
| Ossein | -- | 115.43 | 1.02 |
| Buts Sour Crean | 17.83 | -- | -- |
| Ice Cream | -- | -- | 12.21 |
| Movelties | - - | --- | 3.15 |
| Reed Milk | . 26 | .67 | -- |
| Oranceade | . 20 | 4.69 | .16 |
| E5ss | 78.86 | 407.93 | 105.72 |

## TABLI 5 (Continued)

Allocation of Provistion for Bad Debts, Thid Cooperative Creanery Association, Fiscal Years hading Movemer $30,1946,1947$, and 1948 .

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Total | 2.942 .13 | 14,795.54 | 1,839.75 |

SOTRCD: Amual Audits of the Associetion, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Other revenue mounted to $12,889.64$ in $1946,69,365.66 \mathrm{nin} \mathrm{1947}$,解6,314.84 in 1945 (Teble 6). Since this revenue was earned at some expease, much of whicu wes hidden in the general and administrative expense, other revenue may be considered as a credit to that expense. With the exception of rentals on ice crean cabinets, other revenue was allocated to the various producta of the firm in proportion to their net sales. The rentals on ice arean cobinets correspond to the depreciation item listed under selling expense (Table 2). This revenue wos divided between ice cream and novelties on the basis of net sales.

## Sanufacturing and Processing Wxpenses

Butteriet Purcheses. From the stendpoint of accounting procedure. the purchase of butterfat from patrons was a cost because it was a necessary expense in the operstion of the enterprise. Since the firm was a cooperstive producers' association, its purchses from its nembers were not a cost to the members collectively. It was very difficult to make a logical distinction between purchoses from petrons and patronage refunds to patrons, fron the stendpoint of cost. Butterfot purchases were included in the manucturing and processing expense because they were a part of the cost of seles of the firm. In the following chapter, purcheses from patrons were considered separately because they were \& distinctly different type or cost as compred to honding costs.

Both milk and cream were purchased on the basis of butterfat content alone. Although milw was purchased at a higher price thon was crean, the method of payment made no specific allorance for the value of the non-fat mily solids. Gonseguentiy, the only cost which could be distributed arong the products made from whole nill was the cost of butterfat. All purchese records were kept in terns of butterfat. This gave a somewht unrealistic

## TABLIE 6

Allocstion of Other Revenue,
Thid Cooperstive Cremery Association, Fiscal Years Roding Novernber 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

| : | 1946 | 1947 | $1948$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollers) | (Dollers) |
| Pasteurized Milk | 1,934.51 | 1,273.4.4 | 1,522.30 |
| Homogenized Milu | -- | 133.89 | 485.16 |
| Corfee Creen | 266.42 | 205.51 | 266.00 |
| Thiping Cream | 3.61 | 45.18 | 62.30 |
| Chocolate Milk | 21.17 | 32.49 | 72.47 |
| Buttemilk | 33.68 | 33.39 | 47.97 |
| Sxim mix | . 28 | . 28 | .51 |
| Cottage Cheese | 144.38 | 107.30 | 153.46 |
| Bulk Thole Milk | 271.22 | 49.00 | 39.55 |
| Bulk Sweet Cream | 358.71 | 60.46 | 92.92 |
| Tab Butter | $6,037.72$ | 5.372 .76 | 7.628 .09 |
| Print Butter | 3,021.41 | 1,540.88 | 1,808.12 |
| Dried Buttermilk | 148.31 | 109.67 | 134.63 |
|  | 222.60 | 67.73 | 201.33 |
| Casein | -- | 73.07 | 7.40 |
| Bulk Sour Oream | 78.12 | -- | -- |
| $\frac{\text { Ice }}{\text { Erean }} \frac{\text { Total }}{}$ | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 88.97 \\ \frac{2,312.95}{2,401.92} \end{array}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Tovel ties }}{\text { Mquipnent Rentels }} \underset{\text { Total }}{ }$ | -- | $\cdots$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29.94 \\ 596.32 \\ \hline 619.26 \end{array}$ |

## MABLT 6 (Continued)

Allocation of Other Revenue,
Wid Cooperative Creamery Associstion. Fiscel Xears mading November 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollers) | (Dollers) |
| Peed Milk | 1.12 | . 42 | -- |
| Orangeade | . 88 | 2.97 | 1.20 |
| Sgs | 345.50 | 258.22 | 770.25 |
| Potas | 12,889.64 | $9,365.66$ | 16,314.84 |

SOURCR: Annual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .

Wiek of costr, as far as milk purcheses and utilizetion were concerred, since the produth contained various percentages of butteriat. A wide discrepaney appeared betmeen the cost of joint-products and that part or the surplus which was disposed of on sweet cream and sour creom. This discrepancy renulted becume no credit could be given to bulk gmeet nad sour exean for the skim milk used in by-products.

Bince no record was bogt by the association of the mounts of butterfat entering into each product, these had to be computed by reducing all quatities gold to pounds and multiplying the results by the sverage butterrat content of ench product. \#stimates of the average butterfat content of esch product were mede by the management and these figures mere checked geginst some of the weekly butterfet analyses. These estimetes proved somewhet inaccurate becanse no attempt was rade to olosely standardize the products. This appeared somewhat inconsistent with the policy of purchasing milk on a butterfet basis, becsuse a loss would be incurred whenever the butteriet content of any product exceeded a certein point. In general, the estimates of butterfat content were too high. Since there Wen no way to determine mhich products were over-estinmted, the butterfat estimates for all products were adusted by the seme percentage in order to reduce the computed total amount of butterfat used to the setwal amount used.

An estingte of the average nnwal prices paid for grade "B" and grade Wg milk were obtained by taking g simple average of all of the pool prices paid during 1946, 1947, tod 1948. Bach pool price wes established semimonthly. Since the anount of mill purchosed vexied from one pool period to another, these prices had to be adjusted in order to obtain the correct anmel value of milk purchased. Only one annuel velue could be obtained
for each year, sud this figure included both gredes of milk. The only records on which they were carried separately were the individual patroass purchase receipts. The task of colculating the separate velue of each grade of milk would have been unreasonobly great. It was assumed thet esch price was in error by the same degree, so they gere both sdjusted by the percentage relationship of the actual total purchese valne to the computed totsl purchase value for each year. The estinisted average prices of grade "B" and grade "C" milk were adjusted so that when multiplied by the amount of each grade purchased the sum equaled the total cost of butterfat purchesed as mill.

All grade for milk was used in bottled wole milk. Since more milk wes used as bottled whole milk thon wos purchesed as grade "B" nilk, sone grade "O" milk was used. Of the remainder of the grado "C" milk, sone was used in other products of the milk deportment, and the surolus wes transferred to the butter department. In allocating the cost of milk, all grade "B" milk was chorged to bottled pasteurized milk and hormgenized milk. The adjusted anown of butterfat used in each product and the adjusted price of grede " 0 " milk nere used for the remainder of that used in bottled whole mink and in all of the other products.

The butterfat transferred to the butter department was assuned to be equivalent in value to premium crem. Since there wes a vide duference betreen the price of grade "O" milk and the price of promium crem on a butterfat basis, a discrepancy arose which had to be accomted for. The value of the butterfat transferred to the butter department was not as
 This loss in value could not be justifiably charged to butter becouse the milk was bought for the milk department. The loss was incurred by the milk
department, and it was logieal that the primery products of that department should share the loss. This adjustment in butterfat cost mas made to bottled pasteurized milk, homogenized milk, coffee crean, whipping creem, bottled buttermilk, chocolate mik, and cottage cheese. It wes allocated in proportion to the pounds of butterfat used in each of these products. Wone of the loss was cherged to by-products or surplus products. Sour cream, sweet eream, and whole milk sold in bulk were regarded as surplus products. Skim milk, both bottled and dried, wes regarded as 2 by-product. Cottage cheese was largely a by-product, but it had some sweet cream added to it, and to the extent of its butterfet content it was not regarded as a by-product. No charge was made for the skim milk used in casein production because casein contained no apprecieble mount of butterfat. A separete operating statement for ice crean wes made by the auditor, in which jce crean mas charged for the butterfot used in its production.

The following figures for coffee cream produced in 1946 illustrate the method used in making the cost of butterfat allocations:

|  | Coffee Cream | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sub-total } \\ \text { for all hilk } \\ \text { Products } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total <br> or 21 M 絧 <br> Purchesed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weight of Product (pounds) | 340,785.91 |  |  |
| Weight of Buttersat (pounds) | 68,157.18 | 459,252.70 |  |
| Adjusted lleight (pounds) | 58.347 .04 | 393,150.60 | 740,684.50 |
| Adjusted for Butteriat long | (1bs.) $57,733.83$ | 389,018.69 | 732,900.10 |
| Computed Velue (dollars) | 49,640.28 | 363.987 .72 | 659.661 .34 |
| Adjusted for Loss to Butter (dollers) | 53,697.17 | 391,098.50 | 659,661.34 |

The first adjustment in weight made was from the $459,252.70$ pounds computed for all milk products to the $393,150.60$ pounds show in the 1946
audit as the total weight of butterfat used in all milk products. The adjustment for butterfat long resulted from the error made by the associention in testing milk. Both djustments were made by taking the percentage relationships of the figures for 211 milk products combined and applying ther to the figures for coffee cream. In making the adjustment for the loss to buttex, the difference between the value of the butterfat frensferred as premium cresm and its purchase cost as grade " 0 " milk was added to the computed value for all milk products. The loss ves divided by the totai adjusted weight of butterfat used in all milk products to detemmine the loss per pound of butterfat used in milk products. This unit loss was then multiplied by the adjusted weight of butterfot used in coffee cresm, and the result added to the computed value of butterfat used in coffee crean.

To grades of crean were purchased by the association, premium and standard. A two-cent premiun per pound of butteriat was paid for high quelity cream. The cream department made both sweet cream and sour crean butter, however, they were both made from mixed premium and standard cream. Both types of butter were sold in prints and in tubs. The cost of cream was sllocated to tub butter, print butter, and dried buttermilk. The cost of premium cream, standard cresm, and butterfet transferred from the milk departneat wos totaled and an average price computed. The anome or butterfat xetained in aried buttermilk was computed and multiplied by the averge price of butterfet to obtain the value of the butterfat used in the dried buttemilk. The remainder of the butterfot cost was divided between print butter and tub butter in proportion to the amount of each kind. produced.

Other Purcheses. Other purchases included eggs ron petrons, chocolate milk materials, purchsses of iced novelties, moterials used in ice cream, and salt, suger, colors, and flavors. These were listed by groups in the auaits. The cost of sugar, color, sad flavors wes divided smong butter, ormgeede, and bottled buttermilk, on estimetes nede by the plant superintendent and the internal aditor. Wovelties and ice crean materiels were recorded separately by the association. Most of the cost of other purchases was for eggs.

Packing Supplies. This group of expenses included the cost of pockages for butter, cheese, dried buttermilk and dried skim nilk, snd milk cases and bottles. The totel was an important iten of cost in each of the years studied. Detailed records of purchsses and inventories of pecking supplies were zept by the association. These were used to determine the cost of packing supplies fox each product. The cost of milk cases and bottles was silocated among the various botiled products in proportion to the number of units bottled.

Manufacturing and Processing Labor. The allacation of labor costs was vexy difficult because the division of Iabor made ia the audits was not adequate for the purposes of this study. A payroll ilst for each of the three years studied was secured. These lists included the names of all employees and the totel tages for each, by celendar years. The plant superintendent indicsted the department in which each morker was employed and the function performed by each. This job wes complicated by the inclusion of a lerge number of construction workers and other temporery employees on the payroll lists. Some adjustments were necessary, in summarizing the data, to make the totals agree with the total wage bills of the corresponding fiscal years.

The payroll 1ist for each year was sumotriged by functions and groups of functions. A detailed breakdown of lebor costs to esch indivicual function performed wes not possible. Sor the seve of convenience, these group of functions will be referred to as departnents. There were twelve of these departments - ice cresm, milk receiving, milk processing, botting, wilk cooling and loading, cheese, butter, butter printing, cssein, dried milk, eges, and general plant. The egg department wes treated seperetely. She actual volume of esch product processed in exch deportment was determined, insofar ss possible, sndestimetes were made in cases where the actual volume mas not recorded. The total labor cost in each department was silocsted, to the products which passed through it, in proportion to the volume of the product in the form in which it was processed in each depertment. Al. labor costs in the ice crean, cheese, and casein depertments were slloceted to their reapective produets. Milk receiving costs were allocsted to the various milk products and by-products in proportion to the wown of butterat used in each. The only record of the volume of milk received was in texns of powns of butterfet.

General milk processing included separation, pesteurisation, homogenization, sad storege in bulk. Most of the products were processed here in thelr finsl form. The fingl weight of the product was used as the basis of zllocation. An exception wes made in the case of products sold in bulk; it was estimeted thet bulk whole milk wes handled only one-third as much. By volume, 2 the products which passed through all of the processes, and an estimate of two-thitrds, on the seme volume basis, mes used in the case of bulk crean. Bottling costs were allacated in proportion to the number of mints of esch product battled. It wes sasumed that it cost approximaty the same to process each anit regardless of the size of the wait.

Milk cooling and loading included storage in the cooling roon, lowding on delivery trucks, and the mioading of empty bottles. This cost wes alloeated to bottled products and cottage cheese, in proportion to the total weight or each.

The cream department was divided into three parts - butter making, which included creem receiving, storage, pasteurization, churning, and a paxt of the packaging; the print room where print butter vas printed and
 cated to tub butter, print butter, end dried buttermilk, using pounds of butter produced and pounds of butteriat retained in buttermink es the basis of allocation. This besis wes chosen because buttermilk did not pass through all of the function pexformed in butter-moling. All Printing costs were allocated to print butter. Wo lebor cost was charged to butter storage.

The costs of the dried milk department were divided between dried buttermilis and dried skin milk in proportion to the weight of each product. The general plant labor included workers in the test room and jenitors. Whis cost was allocated anong all of the products in proportion to valume produced, for mant of a better basis of allocation. Since eggs were not handed in the plant, none of these processes applied to eggs.

Social security taxes were allocsted among the various products in proportion to the labor cost allocated to that product. The salaries of the plant foremn and his assistant were transferred to general and administrative expense because they conld not be attributed to the production of any perticular product.

Henufecturing and Processing Overhead. These expenses are the lest to be considered. the most difficult job of allocetion in this problem was in overhead expenses. All of these expenses were indirect. In oxder
to fecilitate the sllocation, the se expenses were divided into three groups wtilities and taxes, rachiaery depreciation, and spoce costs. The utilities included fuel, light, heet, power, and water. Laundry and plont supplies wexe added to this group because the basis for allocation was the some. Whe plont superintendent astimeted thet these expense items mere incurred roughly in proportion to the pound of each product produced. Insurance ad ed valoren taxes posed s. special problem becuse they applied to mochinexy, builaings, ad finished goods. For want of a rore suiteble alternative, these were elso added to the utilities, and the total allocated to the various products in proportion to pounds produced.

Spaee cost was composed of three item - building depreciation, maintenence materiai, and maintenance labor. In 1947, a special item was included, a paving sssesment. Sone of these itens were obviousiy capital expenditures and not true expenses because they resulted in increases in the velue of assets, however, the se items were treated as expenses by the association and there was little choice but to accegt theri as such. A floor plan of the plant building showing the snount of space used by each departmeat was coastructed. Space costs were then slloceted to the departments discussed mader labor costs in proportion to the amount of spoce used.

Wachinery deprectetion was also alloceted to the functions or depart ments. Wo itenized record of mehinery deprecistion existed for mehinery purchased prior to 1946. The machinery purchased in 1946 and later was Inted on a deprecietion schedule maintained by the auditor. A total figure was kept rox 21 of the old rechinery which was not itemized. The plant superintendent estimated the cost of the major pieces of machinery which were not itemized on the depreciation schedule. The machinexy which
covid be accounted for wes alloceted to the departments on the basis of function. The remainder of the deprecistion expense had to be congidered a general plant expense.
spece cost and mechinery depreciation were addea together by departments and allocated to the verious products on the same basis as were lebor costs. The cost of the space used by the office in 1946 and 1947 was transferred to generol and administrative expense.

## AMMSTS OF OMRATOTE

The cost of handing s product does not, in itself, reveal much regoving the efficiency of hending the product. The interreletions eximting anong handing costh, purehase costt, net emmings, and net sales give a better indication of the erficlency of handing. This study ars not concemed whth techumen expiciency. except as it is reveeled in handlug costs gha not eamings. Whe term inet hoading costs, " ws used herein, refers to thtal operating costs less the cost of purchases from patrons. Likewise, "net camingre" refers to net sales lesw total opereting conts.

Gomperetive gandyis of Costo and Rfficiency, by Individuel Products
Bottled Psstearized hilk. The volume of pesteurized milk produced decrossed from 1946 to 1947 , however, this decrease nas pccomponied by the addition of a new form of product, homogenized milk, wh the combined voldine of the two forms of botbled milk increased during the three-year period. The cost or butterist used in bottled milk was comperatively high because 21 grode ${ }^{2}$ gilm mas used for bottled whole milk. The following date Were gumarized from mable 9:

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : Cents : Per : ganet | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Met } \\ \text { Seles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gents } \\ & \text { Per } \\ & \text { Quert } \end{aligned}$ | ```Percent of inet Sales``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { Quert } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of पet } \\ \text { Sales } \end{gathered}$ |
| Wet gales | 13.41 | 100.00 | 15.79 | 100.00 | 17.80 | 100.00 |
| Butterdat Purchased | 7.66 | 57.12 | 10.80 | 68.37 | 11.92 | 66.96 |
| Met Hendising Cost | 3.19 | 26.06 | 4.13 | 26.17 | 4.55 | 25.57 |
| Wet mamings | 2.26 | 16.82 | . 86 | 5.46 | 1.33 | 7.47 |

The per unit $f$ ignes on net gales, butteriet coet, and net handiane cost increasen during the three-sear period. the perceatmee reletionships of
the various factors reveal more than do the comparative per unit figures. Both butterfat costs and net emmings nuctusted widely in relation to net sales, in contrast, hondling costs remained fairly constant for the three years. The buttertat costs plus the net eamings were axprominetely 73.5 percent of the net seles value of the product during each of the three years. Wet eamings avereged neany 10 percent of net sales fox the threeyear period, slighty below the average for all products. Banding costs averaged slighty higher than the averege for all milk products.

Bottled Homogenized MIK. The production of homogenized milk was begun in 1947. The characteristics of this product were similan to those of pasteurized milk, except that homogenized milk apparently was preirerred in the restaurant trede while pasteurized milk was preferred in householas. The following data were summarized from Table 10 :


In terms of cents per quert, handing costs of homogenized milk were not significantly higher than those of pasteurized milk. In 1947, net earnings were higher for homogenized milk, but, in 1948, they increased for pasteurized milk and decreased to a net loss for homogenized milk. The arerage pxice received for honogeniged milk in 1948 was lower than that of pasteurized milk. In 1946, 211 homogenized milk was soid in quexts, but much of
it wes sold in one-half piat bottles in 1948, indicating that a large part of it was sold tholesple. The fact thet homogenisad milk was sold wholesele at a lower sverage price than pasteurized milt sold retall accounts for the direrence in net sales. The data indicate that honogenized milx mas sold wholesale at less than coat, or the cost allocations were in error, or both. In the allocetion of digtribution exponse, it was assumed that about the same percentage of each product was sold wholesale and that it cost sboat the same to handle different sized units. This assumption wes obviouny in error in this particular case, but, due to the lack of a more adequate besis Ror allocation, no adustment was possible.

Considering pricing as a factor of handing efficiency, the date indicate thot homogenised milik probably mas not handled as efficientiy os pasteurized mils. Higher wholesale prices may not correct this situation. Whe diferential cost of handing homogenized milk probebly was much lower then the cost allocsted to the product, therefore, 2 reduction in volume handied cond concelvaly result in a reduction in the total net earnings of the essociation.

Bottled Coffee Crean. The following date were sumarized from Table 11:

|  | 1946 |  | 2947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents : per : Pint | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cents per <br> Pint | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Net } \\ & \text { Sales } \end{aligned}$ | Cents per Pint | Percent of Net seles |
| Met Sales | 23.61 | 100.00 | 29.62 | 100.00 | 32.82 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Pur chases | 16.61 | 70.33 | 21.96 | 74.16 | 23.88 | 72.75 |
| Wet Handing Cost | 4.88 | 20.68 | 5.84 | 19.71 | 6.15 | 18.74 |
| Met Rarmings | 2.12 | 8.99 | 1.82 | 6.13 | 2.79 | 8.51 |

Whe average price received for corfee crean increased over the three-gear period sum was acompanied by s similer increase in outberfat costs. While hending costs incressed in cents per unit, they deeressed relative to net soles. Both handing coste and net eamings were groportionately lower than those of the products previously discussed. The cost of butteriat was relstively higher beceuse of the higher butterfet content of the product ond the fact that no velue ves assigned to skimmilk. Ti the value of the skim mill removed by separation were credited to coffee cream, the product would appear more profitable. Coffee cream apparently wes handled more efifeienty then bottled milk, bat the asture of the denond for cospee cream limits the profiteble expension of its production. The reletively steady volume sold during the three-year period indicates that there was Little response to price changes.

Bottled Whipping Gresm. Vexy Iittle whipping cream was sole in 1946, but a fairly large volume wes sold in 2947 and in 1948 . The following data present a good wiew of the 1947 and 1948 operetions but a bady distorted view of the 1946 operations (frble 12):

|  | 1946 |  | $1947$ |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents : per Holf $\rightarrow$ pint: | Percent: of Tet: Sales :Ha | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents : } \\ \text { per }: \\ \text { alf-pint: } \end{gathered}$ | Percent: of 型et: Sales:H | Cents : per Half-pint: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Het } \\ & \text { sales } \end{aligned}$ |
| Met Seles | 24.69 | 100.00 | 25.64 | 100.00 | 29.36 | 100.00 |
| Butteriat Purchased | ed 14.73 | 59.67 | 19.49 | 76.01 | 21.18 | 72.14 |
| Wet Fianding Cost | (-.20) | (-.82) | 4.83 | 18.83 | 5.07 | 17.28 |
| Wet Mamings | 10.16 | 41.15 | 1.32 | 5.16 | 3.11 | 10.58 |

The error in cost allocation in 1946 resulted from the use of volune sold rather then volume of production $2 s$ the basis of cost allocation. Tolume
sold wes used becase data on volume produced were not availsble. In most cases this bosis of allocation did not seriously affect the results because beginning and ending inventories were about the seme size. In the case of whipping crean, there was no beginning inventory in 1946, but the ending inventory was very large in comprison to the net sales for the year.

Thus, the figures for this product in 1946 have no significonce, homever, this did not seriously affect the figures for other products becauge of the mosll volume of whipping cream hendled. The results for 1947 and 1948 are similar to those for coffee crean. Fionding efficiency was almost as high as that of coffee crem.

Bothed Chocolate Milx. The volune of chocolate mils sold ineressed approximately 250 percent from 1946 to 1948 . A large part or this increase resulted from sales to the governmental school lunch progrem in 1948. Wxcept in the case of chocolatemilk sold for school lunches, this product averaged ondy one-hali of the butterfat content of bottled whole milk. The costs of chocolate mink meterials were higher than the butterfat costs in 1946, but somewhat lower then butterfat costs in 1947 mad 1946. The high cost of matexisis other than butterfat resulted in comparatively high handing costs for chocolate milk. The following deta vere summazed from Table 13:

| : | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents per Quar 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Het } \\ \text { Seles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents } \\ \text { per } \end{gathered}$ Quart | Percent of liet Sales | Cents per Quart | Percent of Net Sales |
| Wet Seles | 13.73 | 100.00 | 16.60 | 100.00 | 18.19 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchasea | 3.39 | 24.70 | 4.49 | 27.03 | 6.09 | 33.51 |
| Det Handinc Cost | 10.33 | 75.25 | 9.52 | 57.32 | 9.95 | 54.68 |
| Wet marnings | . 01 | .05 | 2.59 | 15.65 | 2.15 | 11.81 |

The greet veriation in net eamings and hending costs were Iargely ceused by price changes. There was not a large anount of wariation in per uait honding costs, bat the variation which did exist was difefcult to account for. Per unit handing costs for chocolate milk decressed from 1946 to 1947 and increased slightly from 1947 to $194 \%$, while the handing costs for most of the other products increased from 1946 to 1948 . The increase in butterfat cost in 1948 resulted from a higher sverage butterfat content of the chocolate milk sold. It was difficult to drow any conclusions regarding the hending efficiency of this product. For the three year period, chocolate milk was handled less efficiently then pasterrized milk, and it wes comparatively inefficient in the utilization of skim milk as compared with the mill by-products.

Bottled Buttermilk. This product was not, an its name implies a byproduct of butter-making. It was a fluid milk product containing approximetely one percent butterfat. The volune of buttemink sold wes comparatively large in all of the years studied, and it wes exceeded by chocolete riak production only in 1948. The following data show buttermilk production to be very profitable (Table 14):

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents : } \\ \text { per : } \\ \text { guert: } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents : } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { quart: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Iet } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cents per guert | Percent Sales |
| Het Eales | 9.10 | 100.00 | 11.46 | 200.00 | 12.95 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchased | 1.70 | 18.70 | 2.25 | 19.64 | 2.45 | 1.8 .89 |
| Het Hending Cost | 3.23 | 35.50 | 3.74 | 32.60 | 4.22 | 32.57 |
| Wet Sernings | 4.17 | 45.80 | 5.47 | 47.76 | 6.28 | 48.54 |

The net eamings on buttermilk were higher than those of any product
previously discussed. The charges for butterfat were comparatively smell because of the low butterfat content of the product. Had a charge been mede for skim milk, the product would not have appeered to be so profisable. The handing costs relative to net sales were above the average, but they were less then those of chocolate milk. The average ratio of handing costs to the value added by handing wes very high, indicating a high degree of handing efficiency.

Cottage Cheese. Alarge volume of cottage cheese was produced in each of the years studied. The manuiacture of this product wes one of the chief means of utilizing skim mijk. Cottage cheese was not strictly a byproduct because it contained about ive pexcent butterfat. Although it was an importent source of income, cottage cheese was not as efricient in the utilization of skim as were some of the other by-products. The following data were sumarized from mable 16:

|  | 1946 : |  | $1947 \quad:$ |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents: } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { pound: } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Net: } \\ & \text { Seles } \end{aligned}$ | Cents : per Yound | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Wet: } \\ & \text { Seles } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cexts : } \\ \text { per : } \\ \text { Bound : } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of } 1 \mathrm{let} \\ & \text { Soles } \end{aligned}$ |
| Met Sales | 12.58 | 100.00 | 11.99 | 100.00 | 12.92 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchased. | 3.94 | 34.01 | 5.21 | 43.48 | 5.67 | 43.84 |
| Net Handling Cost | 4.76 | 41.11 | 4.83 | 40.24 | 5.23 | 40.50 |
| Wet Sarnings | 2.88 | 24.88 | 1.95 | 16.28 | 2.02 | 15.66 |

Wet earnings decreased in relation to net seles from 1946 to 1948, howm ever, the decrease was balanced by an increase in retums to producers for butterfat. Net haxding costs remained fairly constant, preraging about 40.5 percent of net sales. This percentege was relatively high compored to the other products hendled. The hendling of cottage cheese, although
profstable, wes inefficient relative to the other products.

Bottled glim Lijk. The volume of liquid skim milk sold was not bignificent. Geme of it wes bottled but raxge pert was sold in butk. The following dsta, sumenged rom mble 15 , indicate thet the rolume probsbly could not be procitcoly expanded:

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents: } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { Gellon: } \end{aligned}$ | percent or Wet Sales | Cents: per: Grilon: | Percent of Het Seles | Conts: per Gellon: | Percent of Wet smles |
| Vet Sales | 26.31 | 100.00 | 13.85 | 100.00 | 28.29 | 200.00 |
| Sutbersat Purchosed | . 19 | .42 | . 2 ? | 1.62 | . 26 | . 90 |
| Ret Exaling Cost | 7.04 | 26.76 | 6.43 | 46.41 | 7.98 | 28.21 |
|  | 19.08 | 72.52 | 7.20 | 52.96 | 20.05 | 70.89 |

The net eamings in 2946 and 1946 were very high, hovever, there whs a sighiflcat decrease in both net exmangs and net seles in 1947 . This decrease wes accompated by, but not necessarily a reath of an increase fan volume sold. Ta no year did the volume suld exceed 1,00 gellons (Table 99). The handing costs wefe significhntly higher thon those of dried gkim milk。

Dried ghim gilk. The muerace volume of dried gkim milk sold wes Lager than thet of cottge theese ma fhe net sales mere somewhet higher. As in the case of the other by-products, the lack of a charge for nommet milk solids resut bed in e high rgte of net eamings. mhe cost of handing aryed skim milk wes compreftyely mmell, but the lack of on gdequete bsinis

 Lowng date, sumathyed from male 23. indicete that the production of
dried gkim milk was both profitable gnd efficient:

|  | $1946$ |  | $1947$ |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents pex Povera | Percent of Net scles | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { Bomen } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { sejes } \end{gathered}$ | Gents per Pourad | Pascent Of Met <br>  |
| Get Soles | 16.87 | 100.00 | 9.97 | 100.00 | 13.40 | 100.00 |
| Buttertet purchased | .73 | 4.32 | .87 | 9.62 | .99 | 7.39 |
| Wet Honaling Cost | 2.75 | 16.33 | 2.13 | 23.49 | 2.56 | 19.10 |
| Wet tomazngs | 13.39 | 79.35 | 6.07 | 66.89 | 9.85 | 73.51 |

The consideretion of giom mink products aport from the buttertet produces produced rom the same mink is somewhot unreghistre the joint costs inrolved in their mroduction can be divided ond by eroitrarey means. Fialid comparisone can be mede only nong attemative uges of the same row prode uet. The dets indteate thet dxying was the most exticient method of prom cessing skim milit. If a chare hed been made for the simm milk used in the vorious by-products, the resulta probsbly woul have been dircerent bectuse of the difeerent anountr of liquid skim mink reanired to mate s pound of the finashed groduets.

Ugsein. Gasein was not producea in sny lorge guantity execptin 1947 . The following dete were summerined from Table 24 :


Tho valla comprisons can be obtaned from the data beceuse of the variation in volurse sold. Wo charge was made for butterfat because casein contains no appreciable smount of fat. The cost of handing casein in 1947 whas lowex than thet of dxied skim milk. The higher averege cost in 1948 was partily the result of the effect of fixed costs on the small volume sold. The profitability of expending casein production is lexgely dependent upon the msmat outhets for the product. Since no data were obtained regarding the amomit of gixim nilk required to produce a pound or casein os compered to a pound of dried skim milk, it wes difficult to determine their relafive effuciencies in the atilization of skim milk.

Peed Milk. This product, like liquid skim milk, wes insignificant from the standpoint of wolume sold. Feed milk wes composed of weste products of the milk department. No data were available regarding either the volume sold or the composition of the product, therefore, no charge was mede fox buttexfet or manuf scturing expense. The opersting expenses amounted to only about 1.5 percent of the net sales in 1946 and 1947 , and no feed milk was sold in $194 \%$ (Table 17).

Bulk Whole Milk. The handing of this product, ss indicated by the Pollowing figures, wes compratively efficient (Mable 18):

|  | : 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : Cents : : per : : Pound: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Net } \\ & \text { Seles } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Net: } \\ & \text { Seles } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Gents } \\ \text { per : } \\ \text { pound : } \end{array}$ | Percent or yet Sales |
| 2et seles | 103.63 | 100.00 | 127.46 | 100.00 | 124.67 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchased | 85.08 | 82.10 | 89.21 | 69.99 | 100.61 | 50.70 |
| Het Handiing Cost | 5.73 | 5.52 | 9.31 | 7.31 | 9.62 | 7.72 |
| Met ${ }^{\text {Wernings }}$ | 12.82 | 12.38 | 28.94 | 22.70 | 14.44 | 11.58 |

The preceding per unit figures vere based on pounds of butterfge sold as whole milk in bulk. Nost of the product wes sold in the same form in which it wes received and only a small part of it wes pesteurized. This resulted in very low handing costs but the hanaling added but little to the value of the milk. In comprison to bottled milk, this type of maret outlet was more profitable in 1947 and 1948 and less profiteble in 1946 . The handing efficiency, as measured by the ratio of handing costs to value edded to the product, was very high in comprison to the other milk prodwets.

Bulk Sweet Crean. The volume of sweet crean sold in bulk was considerably greater than thet of whole milk, in terms of pounds of butterfat. The market outlet for sweet cream was not as profiteble ss that of Whole milk. The following data were sumarized from table 19:

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | :Cents : $:$ per $:$ Pound : | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \end{array}$ | Cents. per Pound | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of vet } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cents per pound | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sgles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Het Sales | 78.91 | 100.00 | 95.42 | 100.00 | 101.22 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchssed | 85.08 | 107.82 | 89.21 | 93.48 | 100.61 | 99.39 |
| Net Handing Cost | 2.60 | 3.30 | 4.77 | 5.00 | 4.38 | 4.33 |
| Met Marnings (Loss) | (-8.77) | (-11.12) | 1.44 | 1.52 | (-3.77) | (-3.72) |

The handing of this product resulted in a net loss in 1946 and 1948 and a small net earning in 1947. Apparentiy, this was one of the least profitable outlets used $\mathfrak{f o r}$ surplus butterfat. Fod this product been credited with the value of the skim milk taken from it, and been charged the price paid for butteriat at the time the product was sold rather than the average annol price, the resulting figures may heve shown net earnings for
each of the three yeers. Compared to mhole milk sold in bulk, this produet ves not handled very efficiently.

Bulk Sour Cream. Sour crean was sold in 1946 only. Handling costs were slightly lower than those of sweet crean in the same year. A 34.6 percent loss was incurred in the sele of sour creom. It wes sold for 65 cent par pound of butteriat, while the average annual cost of butterfat purchssed was 85.08 cents (Table 25). The same criticism of charging an average naval price for butterfat can be made here as was made in the case of sweet crean, however, the price received for sour crean probebly was lower than the price paid for it as whole milk.

Ice Gream. The production of ice cream was begun in 1948. The costs incurred before getting into production caused a net loss for the yeer. Lost of the extre cost charged to ice cream was in depreciation and advertising. The average sales price fox ice crean was $\$ 1.40$ per gellon as compred to 67 cents for butterfat and $\$ 1.10$ for net handing cost per gallon (Table 26). A net loss of 37.4 cents per gellon wes incurred in ice cream production. It was difficult to detemine whether or not the addition of the ice cream department added to the total net earnings of the fim, although much of the cost charged to ice crean would have been incurred regardless of production. Included in the ice crem department was the bonding of iced novelties, such as ice crem bars, fudge bars, popsickles, drua sticks, etc. liost of these were purchesed from another firm and handed as a side-line of the ice crean deparment. A net earning of 21.6 pexcent was made on the sales of novelties. No conclusions regarding the efficiency of the ice cream department can be dram from the limited data.

Fub Butter. Tub butter was the mejor product and the mojor source of
income for the association. The product contributed slightly less than one-haly of the total net sales and net earnings of the firm in 1945, sad more than one-half of each in 1947 snd 1948 (Tables 20 and 8). The forlowing figures were abstracted from Trble 20:

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Cents: } \\ \text { per : } \\ \text { Pound: } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Not } \\ \text { Sales } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents : } \\ \text { per : } \\ \text { Pound : } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Soles } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents : } \\ \text { per }: \\ \text { Pound : } \end{gathered}$ | Percent of Met Sales |
| Wet seles | 58.35 | 100.00 | 64.98 | 100.00 | 74.52 | 100.00 |
| Butteriet Purchased | 48.58 | 83.25 | 54.05 | 83.17 | 61.83 | 82.97 |
| Wet Hending Cost | 3.40 | 5.82 | 3.94 | 6.07 | 4.58 | 6.15 |
| Met daraings | 6.37 | 10.93 | 6.11 | 10.76 | 8.11 | 10.88 |

Wet handing costs were much lower and net earnings averaged slightly lomer thon in the coso of milk products. The genergl upara trend in average net sales was accompenied by similar increases in prices paid for butberfat and in aet handing cost. This resulted in approximetely constant percentage relationchips in each of the three years. Fub butter production was very efricient from the standpoint of handing costs relative to value added by hondling. A very high percentage of the net sales velue wes paid for butterfat and the result was lower not earnings than would be expected by compering honding costs with net sales.

Priat Butter. A one-third reduction in the voiume of print butter occurred from 1945 to 1948 . The major differences betmeen trb butter and print butter vere in the form and maner in which they were sold. Both sour crean butter and sweet cream butter were sold in both forms. The cost of butteriat and butter-making was the same in each ease, homever, print butter incurred the expenses of printing and wrapping, 10021 distribution and selling. The following dats reveal significantly hifher
average handing costs than were incurred by tub butter (Table 21):

|  | $\cdots \quad 1946$ |  | 1947 |  | 2948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents <br> per <br> Pound | ```Percent of liet Sales``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { Pound } \end{aligned}$ | Percent or Met Soles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { Pound } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Met } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Het Seles | 57.39 | 100.00 | 69.30 | 200.00 | 76.99 | 100.00 |
| Butbextat Purchased | 48.51 | 84.52 | 53.94 | 77.83 | 61.75 | 80.20 |
| Wet Manding Cost | 5.15 | 8.99 | 7.97 | 11.52 | 8.75 | 11.37 |
| Net mamings | 3.73 | 6.49 | 7.39 | 10.66 | 6.49 | 8.43 |

The average cost of handing print butter was 3.32 cents higher than that of tub butter for the three-year poriod, and in 1947 and 1948 the dirferm ence in heniling costs was more then four cents per pound. The average net sales of print butter was 2.21 cents per pound higher then that of tub butter for the three-year period, athough it was lower in 1946. Print butter was hendled much less efficiently than tub butter.

Bried Buttermilk. a laxge volune of dried buttermilk wes sold in each of the years studied, especially in 1947. Since o corresponding variation did not occur in the total volume of butter produced, the veriation must be largely attributed to the large corry-overs at the end of 1946 and 1948 and the purchese of a sman arount of aried buttemilk in 1947. Here again, as in the case of whipping crean, a serious bias was introduced by alloceting costs in proportion to the volume sold, and, as in the case of whipping cream, the bias dia not become obvious until the final results were compared. The inventories vere not so large in dollar Folume, hovever, the finished goods inventories vere usually made at a wery conservative cost estimate, frequently resulting in failures to carry forward to the new accounting period values as great as the actuel costs
incurred, The followiag date were sumarized from reble 22 :

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : Cents : : per : Pound : | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents } \\ \text { pex } \\ \text { Pound } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cents per Pound | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Het } \\ \text { sales } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Net Seles | 10.83 | 100.00 | 6.61 | 100.00 | 10.04 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchased | 3.03 | 27.96 | 3.42 | 51.58 | 3.90 | 36.81 |
| Wet Fanding Cost | 2.02 | 18.63 | 2.20 | 33.32 | 1.59 | 15.82 |
| Wet Gomings | 5.76 | 53.41 | 1.00 | 15.09 | 4.55 | 45.37 |

Not all of the veriations in the percentage reletionghips can be attributed to the bias mentioned above because the average net salos in 1947 was only 61 percent of the 1946 price. Both the bias in cost allocation and the decrease in sales price hed an adverse effect on the net eamings figure in 1947. Ret handing costs in 1.946 and 1948 were about the same as those of aried skim milis. The production of dried buttermilx was an important source of revenue to the association becense it utilized a by-uroduct which would have been lost othernise.

Orengesde. Orangeade was a minor source of income during the years studied. Wuch of the orengeade produced wes used at the annual mombers ${ }^{4}$ picnics and similar functions. Only a small part of the total wolume produced was sold. No orangeade wes bottled after 1946 and no records of volume produced or sold were kept. On the basis of such cost allocetions as were possible, orangeade production resulted in a net loss in 1046 and net earnings in 1947 and 1948 (Table 27).

Megs. The association handled a lerge volune of eggs in each of the years studied. The volume handled in 1948 mas more then two and one-holr times as greet as that of 1946. The following data were obstracted from

Table 28:

|  | $: 1946$ |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : Conts: : per: : Dozen : | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Tet } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Snles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Gonts per Dozen | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of wet } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| yot seles | 36.86 | 100.00 | 40.30 | 100.00 | 43.66 | 100.00 |
| Fge Purchases | 31.17 | 84. 59 | 36.90 | 91.58 | 38.47 | 88.10 |
| Net Hondling Cost | 3.40 | 9.21 | 2.62 | 6.51 | 4.33 | 9.95 |
| Wet Damings | 2.29 | 6.20 | . 78 | 1.91 | . 86 | 1.95 |

The handing margin on eggs was comparatively small, averaging 4.76 cents per dozen for the three-yoar period. Handling costs relative to the handing margin were high. There was no basis for comparison as far as handing efficiency was concerned.

Comprative Anelysis of Costs and Frificienct, by Mojor Departnents This onalysia was primarily concemed with fuid milk products as compered to crean products. The egg departhent, discussed above, raquired Iittie further anclyois. These products were brought together by grougs because the comprison of individual products, especially in the oeses of joint products, did not fully reven the signisiceace of operating costs gat efficiency. The problea of joint coste was not so serious in the comparison of departments as it pes in the comprisons of individuel products.

GILk Depertment. In this section, the milk department represented the combinstion of all lluid milk protucts - pasteurized milk, homogenized milk, cofee cream, whipping crean, chocolate milk, buttermilk, skim milk, cottoge chesse, dried skim milk, osein, feed milk, buik whole milk, bulk sweet cream, bulk soux crem, and ice crean. The data for all of these
were corbined as follows:

|  | 1946 |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \text { Pound } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cents: per : pound: | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of yet } \\ \text { Sales } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents: } \\ & \text { per : } \\ & \text { pound: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ \text { of Net } \\ \text { Sqles } \end{gathered}$ |
| Wet Sales | 152.65 | 100.00 | 187.24 | 100.00 | 205.51 | 100.00 |
| Butterfat Purchased | 95.02 | 62.25 | 217.33 | 62.26 | 127.46 | 62.02 |
| Net Mandling Cost | 32.61 | 21.36 | 46.59 | 24.88 | 55.93 | 27.22 |
| Wet wamings | 25.02 | 16.39 | 23.32 | 12.46 | 22.12 | 10.76 |
| Patronage Refunds 4 | 7.00 |  | 10.00 |  | 10.40 |  |

The per unit figures were besed on pounds of butterfet used in milk prodwets. The cost of butterfet, which included the loss on butterigt trensrerred to the crean department, averaged slightly more than 62 percent of the net sales value during each of the Jears studied. Both net honding costs and net earnings were high for the milk department. The ratio of handing costs to value added by handing averoged 1:1.52 for tite threeyear period. This efficiency retio was relatively iow in comparison to the crean department. The average net eamings were 23.49 cents per pound, while the svergege of the patronage refunds wes only 9.13 cents, a diferm ence of 14.36 cents per pound. The mill producexs collectively received approximetely 67.5 percent of the total net sales of the milk depertment during the three-year period.

Gream Department. The crean department, as reperred to in this section, included dried buttermilk as woll as tub and piont butter, all being products of erean. The data for these products were combined in the
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|  | $1946 \quad:$ |  | 1947 |  | 1948 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents: } \\ \text { per }: \\ \vdots \text { Pound. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of net: } \\ & \text { Gales : } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cents : } \\ & \text { per : } \\ & \text { Pound : } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { of Het } \\ & \text { Sales } \end{aligned}$ | ```Cents: Pound :``` | Percent <br> of Net <br> seles |
| Het Sales | 73.17 | 100.00 | 83.67 | 100.00 | 95.86 | 100.00 |
| Buttextat Eurchased | 60.57 | 82.78 | 68.20 | 81.51 | 78.44 | g2. 83 |
| Wet Handing Cost | 5.17 | 7.06 | 6.43 | 7.69 | 6.94 | 7.27 |
| Wet maraings | 7.43 | 10.16 | 9.04 | 10.80 | 10.45 | 10.90 |
| Betronage Refunds ${ }^{5 /}$ | 7.00 |  | 10.00 |  | 10.40 |  |

These unit figures were also based on pounds of butterfot used. Honding costs in the crean department were comparatively low. The average ratio, for the three-year period, of net handing cost to value added by handling was 1:2.45 for the crean department as compared to $1: 1.52$ for the milk degartment, indicating that the operations of the cream department were more efficient than those of the milk department. the value added to crean by handing pas comparatively low, resulting in low net earnings in spite of the low hading costs. The average aet esmings of the cresm department for the three-yeer pexiod were approximately 8.97 cents per pound of butterfat, while the patronge refunds averaged 9.13 cents. The net earaings per pound of butterfat were slightly higher than the refunds woid in 1946 and 2948, but they were considerably lower than the refunds in 1947.

對 Degartment. The patronage refunds to ege pstrons were based on the gumtities of grode in egss purchesed. During the three-year period,
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the total net earuings made on egge were \$14, 411.71, and the total refmats on eggs were 924,914.36. 6 The totol renuna excected the tothat net returas by $\$ 10,502.65$.
petronage Refunds. A though operating effictency was higher in the crean department,, difference arose in the pament of patronge refunds. The patronage refunds were besed on the pounds of butterfat received from each patron, sad the same rate was paid to both crean producexs and milk producers. During the three-year period, totel refunds to crem producers amounted to $8980,702.62$, and the refunds to milk producers amonted to Q239,226.62. Duxing this some period, the net ammings of the crean department were $\$ 1,039,896.67$, including $\$ 79,269.72$ enmed on butterfat transferred from the milk department. The total net ecmings of the mile department were $408,894.42$. Anter making an adustment on the butterfat trensfersed, the total net eamings from milk were $\$ 488,163.93$ and those ITon crean woxe $9960,626.95$. Whe recmas to exean producers were $\% 20,075,67$ more than the total net eamings made on crean, while the milk producers received $\$ 248,937.3$ less than the totel net earnings mede on milk. In other words, the milk producers received less then one-half of the get eaminge made on milk. Of the $⿻$ (248,937.31 belance, $\$ 20,075.67$ were diverbed to cream patrons as refunds, $\$ 10,502.65$ were diverted to egg producers, and the bolance was added to the reserves of the fimm.

If patronege reiunds are considered a cost to the firm, both crean and eggs were hardled at a d loss for the three years combined. Whether or not these refonds are considered an costs, sone of the net earnings made on milk were shifted to the cream and egg producers.

6 Anmul mudita of the sssociation, 1946,1947 , and 1948.

Several solutions to this problen are possible. The most obvious solution is to make an adustment in the relative prices paid formilk and crean. This solution might create a worse problen by changing the relative quantities of milk and cream received. the problem of seasonal surpluses in milk production could easily be intensified. Another solution is to esteblish a price for the value of skim aill or non-iat milk solids. All butterfat in milk could be purchosed at the same price as preainn crean and a differential paid for the value of the skim milk based upon total meight of the milk, weight of the liquid skim milk, or the weight of the non-fot milt solids. To illustrate this method, the pool prices paid from December 1 to 15,2949 , were 60 cents per pound of butterfat for pemiun cream, 58 cents for standord crean, $\$ 1.18$ for grode "B" milk, and 75 cents for grade "C" milk. I/ Assuming the average butterfat content of both types of milk to be four percent, a price of 60 cents per pound of butterist in milk could be peid, plus $\$ 2.32$ per hundredweight for grade "B" milk, or, in the case of grade $0^{\prime \prime}$ milk, plus 60 cents per hundredweight. Using either method, the grade "Bly mile producer would receive $\$ 4.72$ per hondredwetght for four-percent milk, and the grode " O " milk producer would receive $\$ 3.00$ per hourredveight for four-percent milk. The producer of five-percent milk would not be paid fore than its actual value to the firm, and the producer of three-percent milk wowld receive the Iull value of the non-fat portion of his milk. At the end of the fiscal year a patronage refrund based on pounds of butterfat could be declared, plus a refund besed on the non-fet portion of milk. Since the present system of basing refunds on weight of butterfat tends to encourege seasonal production.

7 Gold spot Tewr, IX (Jonuary, 1950), Mo. 1.
the use of velue as the basis for refonds would be more equitable to the steady producer. Thethex or not refunds should be paid on value rather than weight depends Iargely on the pettem of seasonel verietion in milk and cream production and the seriousness of the problem. The seasonal factor mas not invegtigated in this stady.

The detemmination of the reletive reiunds to be paid on butberiat ma non-tat milk would necessitete the omployment of cost accounting system Which would determine the costs end eamings of the mill department and cream depertment separately. The problem of refunds on eggs coald be solved in the seme mamer. It might be profitable to the association ta extend the cost accounting to individunl products. The results would be very valuable in making price and production decisions.

The present accounting system, adopted when the fim wes comperatively smoll, has become inedequate for the purposes of the association. It might be well for the management to investigate the possibilities of adopting a cost accounting system. Such a system might involve only a division of costs between the three rajor departments, or it might involve a feirly complete breakdown of costs among indiviawl products to determine the relative cost and efliciency of producing esch product. The expense of using a cost accounting system should be compared with the possibilities of improving operating efficiency and establishing a better basis for the division of net eeraings thong petrons.

One general conclusion moy be dram from the snalysis of operations. the operating efficiency of the fimm as a whole was very high. It can elso be concluded that some profitable adjustrants could probebly be made mang the primary products which compete for mole milk and buttertrat, ano anong by products which compete for skim milk. Al though the cost of handing
a product is only one of the factors to be considered in meking production decisions, it is en important qactor.

## SUMMAT AND COLCLUSTONS

Since its organigation in 1931, the Faid Cooperative Cxemery Association hss grown rapidly in size, volume of sales, net eamings, and mombexship. Ropid growth in a business firm often lends to inerensing inefficiencies, but the dots discussed indicated thst the association wes opereted efficiently during the three years studied despite its repid growth.

The hondling costs of the various products mere detexmined in this study. Mony of the costs were of such an indirect ngture that they had to be allocated arbitrexily. Inadequate records vere kept of many of the expenses, especially of the depreciation of plont machinery and equipment. Many of the cost allocations mere based on estimates of the menagement and wexe subject to some degree of subjective erxor. The greetest problem involved the sllocetion of joint costs. At best, the cost allocations mere good estimetes of the actusi costa involved in the production of each product; at worst, most of the allocetions resulted in ressonsbly close estimatef of gctual costs. A few bidses which seriously sfected the rem sutis of the anslysis were noted, but, unfortunately, there mes no opportunity to correct them.

The policy of purchasing milk on the basis of its butterfat content made no allownce for the value of the non-fat portion of the milk. This ceused some of the milk products containing a high percentege of butterfet to appear less proiftable and efficient then they getually were. In the case of milk by-products, the failure to assign 3 velue to skim milk made them appesx more profitable thon they actually were.

In the comperison of the cream and milk deperments, it wes concluded thet the cream department wes opereted more efficiently on the basis of
the comparison of handling costs with added volue. The hoading costs of the cream department vere relatively lower than those of the milk department, however, the milk department bed a higher rote of net esmings becanse of the wide margin between butteriat costs and net seles. The cream producers were paid a higher percentage of the net sales velue of cream products thea the milk producers were of milk products, however, the basis of paying patronage rectund was the same in each case.

The crean producers received more in patronage refuds than was earned on crean during the three-year period. The milk producers received less thon one-hals of the net eamings of the milk department as patronoge reAunds.

The egg department opereted on a very narrow handing margin, thus, a high rate of net earaings was impossible. During the three years studied, the egg producers received in potronge refunds an anount almost twice as great as the net eamings of the egg depsrtment.

The management of the association might consider the possibility of paying patronage refuncs in proportion to the net eamings made on each type of product purchased from petrons.

In generil, the operations of the association were both efficient and profitable during the period studied. The management fight consider the possibility of adopting a cost accounting system to further improve operating efficiency and net eamings.
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ABEDDIK

## TABLT 7

Growth in Total Assets, Get Sales, Met Ramings, and Merbership, Fnid Cooperctive Gremery Associetion, Tiscel Years Rading Movembex 30, 1931 through 1948.

| Year | Totel Assets | Met seles | Net Namings | Membership |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Number) |
| 1931 | 56.953 .07 | 588,336.01 | 3,430.58 | 375 |
| 1932 | 50.990 .22 | 103,638.81 | 3,351.68 | 392 |
| 2935 | 46,388.43 | 105.909.92 | 3.634 .84 | 392 |
| 1934 | 37.929 .04 | 126,794.95 | 10,701.51 | 433 |
| 1935 | 38,405.79 | 279,777.12 | 12.325.56 | 460 |
| 1936 | 49.755 .65 | 242.908 .17 | 18,812.58 | 676 |
| 1937 | 79,817.29 | 354,566.85 | 20,953.90 | 1,005 |
| 1938 | 129.658.63 | 554,815.22 | 34,428.75 | 2,736 |
| 1939 | 172.357.28 | 949,084.04 | 68,790.21 | 4,044 |
| 1940 | 203,216.67 | 1,042,584.85 | 65.439 .53 | 4,900 |
| 1941 | 295,529.12 | 2,680,927.80 | 124.438.75 | 5,894 |
| 1942 | 406.407.07 | 2,389,143.19 | 187.991 .93 | 6,600 |
| 2943 | 473,992.87 | 3,339,140.69 | 219,271.55 | 7,000 |
| 1944 | $499,276.91$ | 3,122,744.28 | 233,239.38 | 7.000 |
| 1915 | 568,640.38 | 3,125,930.81 | 285,073.25 | 7,257 |
| 2946 | 832,058.01 | 3,693,761.15 | 430,318.11 | 7,400 |
| 1947 | 981,377.36 | 4,455,412.58 | 487,843.69 | 7,900 |
| 1945 | 1,062,055.66 | 5,279,615.13 | $547,999.07$ | 8,300 |

Gourct: Anmual Audits and Rembershin Records of the Assocastion, 1932 through 1948 .

MABTI. \&
Combined Opereting Statement of the Rind Cooperetive Creamery Association, Fiscei Years Kading Movember $30,1946,1947$, and 1948.

|  | $\begin{array}{r} \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percentage } \\ & \text { of potsl } \\ & \text { Met sales } \end{aligned}$ | $1947$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percentege } \\ & \text { of Total } \\ & \text { Het Sales } \end{aligned}$ | $: 1948$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percentage } \\ & \text { of Total } \\ & \text { Pet Soles } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Percent) | (Dollars) | (Rexcent) | (Dollars) | (percent) |
| Geles - Milu Department | 865,231.62 |  | 936,326.58 |  | 1,089,345.73 |  |
| Less: Tholestale Allomace | 15,466.69 |  | 13,258.72 |  | - $0,2866.81$ |  |
| Net seles | 869,764.93 | 23.55 | 923,067.86 | 20.72 | 1,080,158.92 | 20.46 |
| Gales - Butter Department | 2,613,881.89 |  | 3,307,065.73 |  | 3,739,763.78 |  |
| Less: Preight-Cut | 17,823.02 |  | 18,123.98 |  | 23,431.64 |  |
| Net sales | 2,596,058.87 | 70.28 | 3,288,941.75 | 73.82 | 3,716,331.14 | 70.39 |
| Seles - Other Products | 228.128.39 |  | 244.794.26 |  | 483.273 .54 |  |
| Eess: Freight-Out | 191.04 |  | 1,391.29 |  | 148.47 |  |
| Met Sales | 227.937 .35 | 6.17 | 243.402 .97 | 5.46 | 483.3 .25 .07 | 9.15 |
| Sotel Ret sales | 3,693.761.15 | 100.00 | 4,455,412.58 | 100.00 | 5,279,615.13 | 100.00 |
| Cost of Seles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 2 | 16,136.22 |  | 33,594.81 |  | 44.998 .70 |  |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buttertet | 2.859,739.16 | 77.42 | 3,430,568.89 | 77.00 | 3.919.332.82 | 74.24 |
| Other Raterials | 84,400.53 |  | 121,145.48 |  | 286,464.31 |  |
| 2fge Houling | 160.74 |  | 149.83 |  | 2,193.54 |  |
| Iabor | 68,920.99 |  | $81,442.59$ |  | 101,553.12 |  |
| Packing tupailes | 56,412.82 |  | 53,885.35 |  | 74,472.62 |  |
| Overhead. | 52,152.21 |  | 83.668.89 |  | 103,747.06 |  |
| Total | 3,240.922.67 |  | 3.804.454.85 |  | 4,533,202.17 |  |
| Inventory, Wov. 30 Cost of Goods sold | $\frac{33.594 .81}{3.107 .327 .86}$ | 84.12 | $\frac{44.998 .70}{3.759,456.15}$ | 84.38 | $\frac{32,814.65}{4.500,387.52}$ | 85.24 |

TABET 8 (continued)
Combined operating Statment of the nid Coopentive Creamery Associaton, Tiscal Years Monco Wovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .

| : | 1946 | $\begin{gathered} \text { percentage } \\ \text { of potal } \\ \text { Tet gales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2947 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percentare: } \\ & \text { of potal } \\ & \text { Met } 5 \text { nles } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1948 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Bercentage } \\ & \text { of Totel } \\ & \therefore \text { Het Sales } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Percent) | (Dollars) | (Percont) | (0011ers) | (percent) |
| Gross Mercin | $586,433.29$ | 15.88 | 695.956 .43 | 15.62 | 779,277.61 | 14.76 |
| Operatine Sxpences |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expense | 78,639.01 |  | 89,071.06 |  | 121,929.65 |  |
| Selling Txpense | 22,767.39 |  | 29.799 .48 |  | 30,823.50 |  |
| Shop and Gerage Expense | 4,810.36 |  | 7,560.84 |  | 8,293.31 |  |
| Generel and Adm. Expense | 59.845 .93 |  | 76.251.48 |  | 64,667.17 |  |
| Erovision for Bad Debts fotal | $\frac{2.942 .13}{169,004.6 ?}$ | 4.58 | $\frac{14,795.54}{217,478.40}$ | 4.88 | $\frac{1,839.75}{247,543.38}$ | 4.69 |
| Met Operatine Mergin | 417.428 .47 | 11.30 | 478,478.03 | 10.74 | 531.684.23 | 10.07 |
| Other Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase Discounts | 1,826.15 |  | 1.479 .20 |  | 2,595.54 |  |
| Interest Incone and Rerunds | 1,009.10 |  | 517.69 |  | 764.92 |  |
| Equipment Eontels |  |  |  |  | 2,909.27 |  |
| Gain on Seles of Assets |  |  | 1,912.62 |  | 1.905.44 |  |
| Mergin on Fowntain Sales |  |  |  |  | 130.78 |  |
| Margin on Trede Supplies | 6,452.58 |  | 2,063.20 |  | 5.829.65 |  |
| Miscellaneons <br> Total | $\frac{3,611.81}{12,689.64}$ | 0.35 | $\frac{3.392 .95}{9.365 .60}$ | 0.21 | $\frac{2,179.24}{16,314.64}$ | 0.32 |
| 39t marminge | 430,318.11 | 12.65 | 487.843 .69 | 20.95 | 547.999 .07 | 10.38 |

Sounch: Amual Audits of the Assoctition, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

TABLIT 9
Combined Operating statement for Bottled Pasteuxized mink,
Thid Cooperative Creomery Assoctation, Piscal Xears Eading Iovember 30, 1946, 1947, sad 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollers) | (1001ars) |
| Cross Seles | 566.816 .77 | 615,023.15 | 604.895 .79 |
| Tess: Wholessle Gredits | 12,447.28 | $2,225.26$ | $5.358 .94$ |
| Net Seles | $554,369.49$ | 605,797.89 | $599.536 .85$ |
| Cost of Seles |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. I | 1.931.02 | 1,364.10 | 1.480 .27 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butteriet | 316,653.86 | 414,204.99 | 401,456.49 |
| Isbor | 1.8,277.85 | 21.956 .71 | 19,516.99 |
| Packing Supplies | 22,470.53 | 15.352.98 | 13,841.03 |
| Overbesd | $23,834.37$ | 35,042.89 | 34,247.06 |
| Totel | 383,167.63 | 467.951 .67 | 470.541 .84 |
| Inventory, Nov. 30 | 1,364.10 | 2,480.27 | 1,357.11 |
| Cost of Goods Sold | 381.803 .53 | 486,471.40 | 469,184.73 |
| Gross Moxpin on Sales | 173,565.96 | 119,326.49 | 130.352 .12 |
| Opexeting Trpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution Txpense | 58.945 .18 | $59,248.82$ | 64,459.87 |
| Selling Fxpense | 10,002.45 | 11, 213.74 | 9.517 .01 |
| Shop and Garege Mxpense | $2,889.44$ | 4, 113.81 | 3.307 .60 |
| Genexal ma Aom. Expense | 8,981.84 | $10,367.85$ | 9.614 .54 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | 1411.56 | 2,011.73 | 208.42 |
| Total | 81.260 .47 | 87.555 .95 | 87,107.94 |
| Met Operating Margin | 91.305 .49 | 31.770 .54 | $43,244.18$ |
| Other Revenue | 1,934.51 | 1.273 .144 | 1.522.30 |
| Het Samines | 93,240.00 | $33,043.98$ | $44,766.48$ |
| Het Fondiling Cost |  |  |  |
| Per guart Sold | .0349 | .0413 | .0455 |

gources: Anmual Andits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Combined Operating stetement for Bottled Homogenined Milk, Waid Cooperetive Oreomery Associstion. Wiscel Teers mading Wovember 30,2947 and 1948.

|  | $2947$ | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (nollars) | (Dollars) |
| Gross 3ates | $64,665.10$ | 192,782.61 |
| Tess: Vholesale Oreatts | -969.97 | 1,707.92 |
| Wet Seles | $63,695.13$ | 191.074 .69 |
| Cost of Ssies |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | -- | 328.44 |
| cost of Goods: |  |  |
| Butterfat | 14,661.85 | 235,960. 35 |
| rebor | 2,189.99 | $6,840.00$ |
| pecking supplies | 1,428.08 | 6,167.92 |
| Orerhead | 3.972 .96 | 12,455.85 |
| Total | 49,252.88 | 161,752.56 |
| Inventoxy, Mos. 30 | 328.44 | $1,010.03$ |
| Cost of Coods Sola | 48.924.44 | 160,742.53 |
| Gross Mergir on Soles | 14,770.69 | $30,332.16$ |
| Operating smenses |  |  |
| matribution 3xpense | 5.959 .82 | 24,170.95 |
| Gelling Wxpense | 1,242.13 | $3,033.11$ |
| Ghop ma Caxsge nxpense | 385.07 | $1,444.07$ |
| Cenexal onc Adm. Bxpense | 2.090 .10 | 3.064 .19 |
| Provieton fox Bad Debbs | 211.5? | -66.58 |
| gotel | 8,888.64 | 31.778 .90 |
| Met Operating Maxgin (Losg) | $5,882.05$ | $(-1,446.74)$ |
| Other Hevenue | 133.89 | 485.16 |
| Net Semings (Loss) | 6,015.94 | $(-961.53)$ |
| ```Met manding Cost %otal Per Quert Sold``` | $\begin{array}{r} 16,017.34 \\ .0415 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56,075.92 \\ .0491 \end{array}$ |

Sourca: Annwal Audits of the ssocistion, 1947 and 1948.

TABLTM 11

Combined Operating Statement for Bottled Coffee Cream, Enid Cooperstive Oreamery Association, Fiscel Years Thang Movember $30,1946,1947$, ond 1948 .

| : | 2946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollars) | (Dollaxs) |
| Gross Sales | 78,060.25 | 99,254.07 | 105,696.85 |
| Lese: Wholesala Credits | 1,714.21 | 1,488.80 | 936.40 |
| Net sales | 76,346.04 | 97.765.27 | 104,760.45 |
| Cost of Sales |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | 792.38 | 552.40 | 624.65 |
| Cost of goots: |  |  |  |
| Butteriat | 53,697.17 | 72,498.48 | 76,214.47 |
| Lebor | 1,232.83 | 1,936.85 | 1,925.49 |
| Packing Supplies | 1,869.81. | 1,384.59 | 1,504.31 |
| Overhead | 1,200.50 | 2,064.23 | 2,068.22 |
| Total | 58,792.69 | 78.436.55 | 82,337.74 |
| Inventory, Nov. 30 | -552.40 | 624.65 | 556.55 |
| Cost of Goods soid | 58,240.29 | 77,811.90 | 82.780 .59 |
| Gross Margin on Seles | 18,105.75 | 19.953.37 | 22,979.86 |
| Operating Expanzes |  |  |  |
| Distribution Rxpense | 6,929.70 | 7.994.09 | 9,375.73 |
| Selling tupense | 3,045.43 | 3.785 .35 | 2,863.84 |
| Shop and Garage Txpense | 250.27 | 388.62 | 375.04 |
| General and Adm. Expense | 1,236.95 | 1,673.19 | 1,680.00 |
| Provision for Bed Debts | 60.81 | 324.66 | 36.50 |
| Total | 11,513.16 | 14.165.91 | 14,331.11 |
| Het Operating Marin | 6,592.59 | 5,787.46 | $8,648.75$ |
| Other Revenue | 266.42 | 205.51 | 266.00 |
| Met Eomings | 6,859.01 | 5,992.97 | 8,914.75 |
| Met Hending Cost |  |  |  |
| Per Pint Sold | -5,789 | 19,273.8584 | 19,631.0615 |

SOURCR: Annuel Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

TABL 12
Combined Operating Statement for Bottled Whipping Crean,
Fid Cooperative Cremery Association. Fiscal Years Roding November 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

| : | 1946 : | 2947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Dollers | (Dollars) |
| Gross Sales | 1,058.43 | 21,821.09 | 24,757.38 |
| Less: Wholesale Credits | 23.24 | 327.31 | $\underline{219.33}$ |
| Net sales | 1,035.19 | 21,493.78 | 24,538.05 |
| Cost or Sales |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | -- | 190.80 | 207.00 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butterfat | 617.65 | 16,337.90 | 17,702.47 |
| Labor | 11.21 | 374.42 | 383.00 |
| Packing Supplies | 17.62 | 295.64 | 320.39 |
| Overhead | 9.45 | 337.71 | 331.06 |
| Total | 655.93 | 17,536.47 | $\overline{18,943.92}$ |
| Inventory, Mov. 30 | 190.80 | 207.00 | 223.80 |
| Cost of Goods 301d | 465.13 | 17,329.47 | 18,720.12 |
| Gross Margin on Sales | 570.06 | 4,164.31 | 5,817.93 |
| Opersting Hxpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution Txpense | 86.28 | 1,745.04 | 2,130.08 |
| Selling Expense | 41.30 | 832.21 | 670.80 |
| Shop and Garage mxpense | 2.46 | 83.24 | 80.75 |
| General and Adm. Expense | 16.77 | 367.85 | 393.51 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | $.83$ | $71.38$ | $8.55$ |
| Tots 1 | $147.64$ | $3.099 .72$ | $3,283.69$ |
| Net Operating Margin | 422.42 | 1,064.59 | 2,534.24 |
| Other Revenue | 3.61 | 45.18 | 62.30 |
| Net Marmings | 426.03 | 1,109.77 | 2,596.54 |
| Bet Hendling Cost |  |  |  |
| Per Half-pint sold | (-.0020) | . 0483 | .0507 |

SOURCI: Annual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Combined Operating statement for Bottled Ohocolate Milk, Bid Cooperative Oreamery Asmociation. Tiscal Years Tnding Wovember 30, 1945, 1947, and 1948.

| : | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (3011ars) | (D011.ers) | (Dollars) |
| Gross sales | 6,204.12 | 15,693.90 | 28.796 .65 |
| Jess: Wholesple Credits | 136.24 | -235.41 | 255.12 |
| Net selea | 6,067.88 | 15.458.49 | 28.541.53 |
| Cost of Gales |  |  |  |
| Inventory: Dec. 1 | 35.02 | 36.57 | 161.20 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butteriat | 1.499 .00 | 4,178.31 | 9.564 .86 |
| Onocolete Mink Materials | 2,075.99 | 3.785 .15 | 5,386.83 |
| Sabor | 219.20 | 520.84 | 944.54 |
| Racking Supplies | 600.89 | 731.88 | 1,440.61 |
| overheed | 281.67 | 882.38 | 1,684.56 |
| Total | 4,711.76 | 10,135.13 | 19,182.60 |
| Inventory, $\mathrm{Tov}$. | 36.57 | 161.20 | 200.94 |
| Cost of coods Sold | 4.675 .19 | 9.973 .93 | 18,981.66 |
| Gross Herpin on Soles | 1,392.69 | 5,484.56 | 9,559.67 |
| Operetias Txpenges |  |  |  |
| Distritution Expense | 991.25 | 1,993.69 | 4,682.74 |
| Selling hxpense | 242.04 | 598.53 | 780.24 |
| Ghow and Garage txpense | 74.41 | 190.05 | 330.97 |
| Genetal and Adm. Brpense | 98.31 | 264.56 | 457.71 |
| Provision for Bad Debta | 4.83 | 51.33 | 9.95 |
| Totel | 1,910.84 | 3.098 .16 | 6,261.61 |
| Net Operating - 2 Sn (Loss) | $(-18.45)$ | 2,386.40 | 3.298 .26 |
| Other Revenue | 21.17 | 32.49 | 72.47 |
| Net Waxnings | 3.02 | 2,418.89 | $3,370.73$ |
| Tet Fomat ing 00st |  |  |  |
| Eer quert Sola | . 1033 | . 095 ? | . 0995 |

SOUMGE: Annuel Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, end 1948.

TABLE 24
Combined Operating statement for Bottled Buttermilk, Thid Cooperabive Creanery Association: Wiscel Yeare Enaing Hovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

| . | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Do11ars) | (Dollars) |
| Gross Seles | 9,868.88 | 15,641.75 | 19.062 .28 |
| Tess: Wholesele Credtts | 216.72 | -234.62 | -168.85 |
| Net seles | $9,652.16$ | 15.407.13 | 18,893.40 |
| Cost of Seles |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | 110.65 | 72.27 | 122.20 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Buttextat | 1,805.05 | 3.006 .92 | 3,568.888 |
| Other Weterialm | 106.07 | 134.46 | 145.85 |
| fobor | 41.00 | 620.33 | 686.77 |
| Packing Supplies | 535.94 | 497.65 | 596.93 |
| Overhesd | 585.01 | 2,152.30 | 1, 1126.23 |
| Totel | 3.553 .72 | 5,503.93 | 6.546 .86 |
| Tuventory, Mow. 30 | -72.27 | 122.20 | 105.30 |
| Cost of Goods Sold | 3,481.45 | $5,381.73$ | $6,1012.56$ |
| Grose Mexgin on geles | 6,170.71 | 10.025.40 | 12,451.84 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution fxpense | 1,167.11 | 1,657.34 | 2.363 .29 |
| Seluing Jxpense | 365.02 | 596.55 | 516.49 |
| Shop and Garage Expense | 67.75 | 131.32 | 139.92 |
| Genersi and Adm. Trpense | 256.38 | 263.68 | 302.99 |
| Proviswon tow Bad Debts | 7.69 | .51.16 | 6.58 |
| Total | 1.783 .95 | 2.700 .05 | 3.329 .27 |
| Wet Operating Mergin | 4.386 .76 | 7.325 .35 | 9.122 .57 |
| Othex Revenue | 33.68 | 32.39 | 47.97 |
| Wet Teraings | $4,420.44$ | 7.357 .74 | 9.170 .54 |
| Met Foadins Oost |  |  |  |
| Motel | $\begin{gathered} 3.426 .67 \\ .0323 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.022 .47 \\ .0374 \end{array}$ | $6,153.98$ <br> .0422 |

[^1]
## TABLT 15

Combined Operating statement for Bottled Skim filk,
Znid Cooperative Creanery Ansocistion, riscal Years Fhding Novenber 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

| $:$ | 1946 : | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Yet Seles | 80.76 | 231.13 | 201.98 |
| Gost of geles |  |  |  |
| Buttextet | . 58 | 2.13 | 1.82 |
| Espor | 3.96 | 14.06 | 10.60 |
| Pactine Supplies | . 85 | . 72 | . 08 |
| Ovecheed | 6.14 | 29.25 | 25.63 |
| Totel | 11.53 | 46.16 | 38.13 |
| Gross Margia on Seles | 69.23 | 84.97 | 163.85 |
| Operating Sxpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution gxpense | 6.22 | 9.11 | 12.25 |
| Selling trpense | 3.22 | 5.08 | 5.52 |
| Shop and Garage Expense | . 13 | . 24 | . 10 |
| General and Ada. Trpense | 1.31 | 2.24 | 3.24 |
| Provision for Bed Debts | $\underline{.06}$ | . 41 | . 07 |
| Totel | 70.94 | 17.11 | 21.18 |
| Met Opersting Margin | 58.29 | 67.86 | 142.67 |
| Qther Ferenue | . 28 | . 28 | . 51 |
| Wet Baminge | 58.57 | 68.14 | 243.18 |
| Wet Eancling Cost |  |  |  |
| Ber Gallon sold | . 0704 | . 0643 | . 0798 |

Source fanual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.
mabut 16
Combined Opereting Statement for Cottage Oheese, Dnia Cooperative Oreamery Associstion, Fiscel Xeers mindine Tovember 30, 1946,1947 , and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 3947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollers) | (monere |
| Gross Rgies | 42,304.24 | 51.824.20 | 60,978.14 |
| Less: Wholesale Credits | -929.00 | -771.35 | 50.94.22 |
| Met Sales | 41,375.24 | 51,046.85 | 60.437 .92 |
| Cost of gales |  |  |  |
| Butterfet | 14,071.28 | 22,193.50 | 26,494.99 |
| Eebo: | 3.636 .54 | 4,273.92 | 4,236.06 |
| Racking Supplies | 4,325.87 | 3,867.59 | 5,896.09 |
| Orexhead | 2,082.90 | 3,685.24 | 3,84).74 |
| sotel | 24,116.59 | 34.020 .25 | 40.1467 .86 |
| Gross Maxgin on seles | 16,258.55 | 17,026.60 | 19,970.04 |
| Operatine Expenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution mxpense | 4,522.39 | 5,387.91 | 7.570 .03 |
| Selling Ixpense | 2,650.44 | 1,976.48 | 1,652.20 |
| Shop and Gerage Mxpense | 231.06 | 416.86 | 448.66 |
| General and Adm. Trpense | 670.36 | 873.63 | 969.22 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | 32.96 | 169.52 | 21.06 |
| Total | $\overline{7,107.21}$ | 8,824.40 | 10,661.17 |
| Wet Coerating Mexgin | 10,151.34 | 8.202 .20 | 9.308 .87 |
| Other Kevenue | 1.44 .38 | 107.30 | 153.46 |
| Het Hemings | 10,295.72 | $8,309.50$ | 9,462.33 |
| $\frac{\text { Met Hondling cost }}{\text { Potal }} \text { Ber Eound sold }$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,008.14 \\ .0476 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20,543.85 \\ .0483 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24,480.60 \\ .0523 \end{array}$ |

SOURCE: Annual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1946.

## TABL 17

Combined Onereting Statenent for peed Milk, Thid Cooperative Creamery Association. Fisen Leers mading Tovenber 30,1946 and 1947 .

|  | 1946 | 1947 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Do11exs) | (Do11.ars) |
| Wet Sajes | 320.68 | 201.74 |
| Cost os Soles ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  |
| Grose 405 gan | 320.68 | 202.74 |
| Qeroting Bxpenses |  |  |
| Show and norage mxpense | .30 | . 08 |
| Gexeral rnd Adm. Wrpense | 5.20 | 3.45 |
| provision for Brd Debts | . 26 | . 67 |
| Totel | $\overline{5.56}$ | 4.20 |
| Met Opexeting texgin | 315.12 | 197.54 |
| Other Hevenue | 1.12 | .42 |
| Wet marnings | 326.24 | 197.96 |
| met Manding 0ost | 4.44 | 3.78 |

Wheed milk wes composed of weste products and no record wes mede of the volwwe rola. To allocations of cost of seles were possible.

SoUrOt: Amad Andits of the Association, 1945 and $194 \%$.

TABIT 18

Combined Opersting stetement for Buk Thole milx. Tnid Cooperative Oreamery Asmocistion, Tiscal Years Bnding Hovember $30,1946,1947$, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Het Seles | 77.722 .41 | 23,308.68 | 15.576 .74 |
| Cost of Sales |  |  |  |
| Buttersat | 63, 810.34 | 16,313.22 | 12.570.23 |
| Lebor | 1.271.57 | 510.79 | 374.79 |
| Overhead | 1,946.67 | 755.85 | 616.23 |
| Total | 67.028.58 | 17,579.86 | 13.551 .25 |
| Gross Margin on sales | 10,693.83 | 5,728.82 | 2,025.49 |
| Opersting impenses |  |  |  |
| Shop and Garage Fxpense | 25.30 | 9.89 | 6.12 |
| General and Adm. Expense | 1,259.25 | 398.81 | 249.80 |
| Provision for Bed Debts | $\underline{61.91}$ | 77.40 | 5.43 |
| Total | 1,346.46 | 486.20 | 261.35 |
| Wet Operating Margin | 9,347.37 | 5.242 .62 | 1,764.14 |
| Other Revenue | 271.22 | 49.00 | 39.55 |
| Met Bomings | 9.618 .59 | 5.291 .62 | 1,803.69 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Per Pound of Butteriat Sold | . 0573 | . 0931 | .0962 |

SOUROT: Annumi Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

TABLT 19
Combined Operating Stetement for Bulk Smeet Cream, \#nid Cooperative Creanery Association,
Fiscal: Years Thdiag Wovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollers) | (Dollars) |
| Wet Sales | 102,795.28 | 28.761 .77 | 36,597.31 |
| $\frac{\cos t}{B n t} \frac{\operatorname{sen}}{\tan } \frac{\cos }{}$ | 110,832.04 | 26,888.43 | 36.2 |
| Lesbor | 1,189.27 | 537.91 | 662.44 |
| Overhesd | 782.78 | 359.96 | 402.34 |
| Total | 112,804.09 | 27,786.30 | 37.439 .47 |
| Gross Wargin on Seles (woss) ( | $(-10,008.91)$ | 975.47 | (-842.16) |
| Opereting Expenses |  |  |  |
| Shop and Berage Rxpense | 33.47 | 12.20 | 14.37 |
| Ceneral and Adar Mxpense | 1,665.47 | 492.24 | 586.90 |
| Provision for Bed Debts | 81.85 | 95.51 | 12.75 |
| Total | $\overline{1.780 .82}$ | 599.95 | 614.02 |
| Wet operating Margin (Moss) | $(-11,789.73)$ | 375.52 | $(-1,456.18)$ |
| Other Revenue | 358.71 | 60.46 | 92.92 |
| Het Hemings (Loss) | $(-11,431.02)$ | 435.98 | $(-1,363.26)$ |
| $\frac{\frac{\text { Bet Eanding }}{\text { Total }}}{\text { Per Pound of Butterrat sold }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,394.16 \\ .0260 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,437.36 \\ .0477 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,585.88 \\ .0438 \end{array}$ |

gounct: Amual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

## TABLTM 20

Combined Opereting statement for Trob Buttor, Did Cooperetive Greamery Associetion. Fiscol Years Dnding Noveriber $30,1946,1947$, and 1948.

| : | 1945 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (3011593) | (Donders) | (2011ens) |
| Gross soles | 2,748,042.16 | 2,574,042.33 | 3,027.657.32 |
| Less: Freight-Out | 17.823.02 | 18,123.98 | $23,431.64$ |
| Met Sales | 1,730,219.14 | 2,555,918.35 | 3,004,225.68 |
| Costof Sgles |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | $6,239.43$ | 13,642.85 | $23,239.68$ |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butterfat | 1.493.883.71 | 2,194,341.36 | 2,568,288.25 |
| Othes Motertatu | 871.59 | 1,283.36 | $3,303.25$ |
| Jebor | 16,820.41 | $21,459.78$ | 20.609 .18 |
| Packing Supplies | 3,358.33 | 6,689.96 | 10,992.13 |
| Overhead | 9,790.00 | $18,844.33$ | 21.574 .95 |
| Total | 1,530,863.47 | 2,256,261.62 | 2,647.907.44 |
| Inventory, Mov. 30 | 13.642 .85 | -23.239.68 | 13.263.25 |
| Gost of coods Sold | 1.517.220.02 | 2,233,021.94 | 2,634.644.19 |
| Gross Mergin on Seles | 212,998.52 | $322,896.41$ | $369,581.49$ |
| Opereting Mrpenses |  |  |  |
| Shop shd Cerege Bxpense | 563.31 | 1.084.35 | 1,179.77 |
| General and Adm. Hxpense | 28,032.83 | 43.742 .88 | $48,177.62$ |
| Provision for Bad Debts | 1,378.14 | $8,487.70$ | 1.046 .86 |
| Total. | 29,974.28 | 53.314 .93 | 50.404 .25 |
| Wet Operating Masgin | 183,024.24 | 269,58..48 | 319,177.24 |
| Other Revenue | $6,037.72$ | 5.372 .76 | 7.628 .09 |
| Wet Harninss | 189.061.96 | 274.954 .24 | 326.805 .33 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100,652.15 | 155,182.69 | 184,749.31 |
| Per Pound Said | . 03 | . | . 4 |

SOUROM: Anmual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .

TABLE 21

Combined Operating Statement for Print Butter, Enid Cooperative Creamery Association, Fiscal Years Ending Wovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

| : | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Met Sales | $865,839.73$ | 733.023 .40 | 412,105.46 |
| Cost of seles |  |  |  |
| Cost or Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butterfet | 758.931.92 | 588.910.61 | 588,418.61 |
| Other Materials | 442.79 | 344.43 | 756.84 |
| tabor | 15,896.84 | 25,148.03 | 18, 885.46 |
| Pecking Supplies | 14,396.99 | 18,257.05 | 12,606.04 |
| Overhesd | $5,617.18$ | 6,097.37 | 5.983 .44 |
| Total | 800,558.02 | 644,331.13 | 643.170.31 |
| Inventory, Nov. 30 | 15,673.64 | 16,519.92 | $11,438.35$ |
| Cost of Goods Sold | 784.884.38 | 627,811.21 | 632,731.96 |
| Cross Maxgin on Sales | $80,955.35$ | 105.212.19 | $80,373.50$ |
| Opereting trpeases |  |  |  |
| Distribution Rxpense | 5,519.88 | 4,672.49 | 4,226.42 |
| Selline 3xpense | 6,952.50 | 8,322.20 | 5,709.79 |
| Bhop and Carase Jxpenso | - 557.59 | . 605.44 | $531.71$ |
| Genexah and Adm. Expense | 14,028.24 | 12.545 .23 | 11,41.9.76 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | $689.65$ | $2,434.22$ | 248.14 |
| Total | $27.747 .86$ | $28.579 .58$ | 22,135.82 |
| Wet Operating Margin | 53,207.49 | 76,632.61 | 58,237.68 |
| Other Bevenus | 3,021.41 | 1,540.88 | 1,808.12 |
| Net Tarnings | 56,228.90 | $78,172.49$ | $60,045.80$ |
| Wet Hending Cost |  |  |  |
| Per Pound Sola | . 0515 | .0797 | . 0875 |

SOURCN: Annual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

TABLE 22

Combined Operating Statement for Dried Buttermilk, Dinid Cooperative Greanery Hssocietion, Fiscal Years Rndine Noveuber 30, 1946, 1947. and 1948.

| : | 1946 : | $1947 \quad:$ | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Doilars) | (Dollars) |
| Gross Soles | 42,598.31 | 53,130.38 | 53,090.52 |
| Less: Freight-Out | 97.28 | -959.53 | -70.02 |
| Net Soles | $42,501.03$ | 53,170.35 | 53,020.50 |
| Cost of Sales |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. I | 360.19 | 1,200.00 | 98.00 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butteriat | 11,682.18 | 26,912.01 | 20,577.82 |
| Dried Buttermilk | -- | 2,907.10 |  |
| Labor | 2,765.34 | 4,325.24 | 2,980.77 |
| Packing Supplies | 2,564.99 | 1,689.65 | 1,365.89 |
| Overhead | 2,840.03 | 6,382.91 | 4,379.81 |
| Total | 20,412.73 | 43,416.91 | 29,402.29 |
|  | 1,200.00 | 98.00 | 2.190.00 |
| Cost of Goods Sold | $\overline{19.12 .75}$ | 43.318 .91 | 28.212.29 |
| Gross Margin on Seles | 23,288.30 | 8.852 .94 | 24,808.21 |
| Operatinc Expenses |  |  |  |
| Shop and Carsge txpense | 13.84 | 22.13 | 20.82 |
| General and Ada. Frpense | 685.60 | 892.87 | 850.27 |
|  | $\frac{33.85}{71}$ | 173.35 | 18.48 |
| Total | $736.29$ | 1,088.25 | 889.57 |
| Wet Operating Margin | 22,552.01 | 7.763 .69 | 23.918 .64 |
| Other Revenue | 148.31 | 109.67 | 134.63 |
| Net Earnings | 22,700. 32 | 7.973.36 | 24,053.27 |
| Net Hendine Cost |  |  |  |
| Per Pound Sold | . 0202 | . 0220 | . 0159 |

SOURCR: Annual Audits of the Associstion, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Combined Operating Statenent for Dried Skim Milk, Finid Cooperative Cremery Association, Fiscal Years Thaing November 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollers) | (Doliars) | (Dollars) |
| Gross Sales | 63,883.64 | 32,652.36 | 79,370.73 |
| Less: Freight-out | -93.76 | -431.76 | +78.45 |
| Net Soles | 63,789.88 | 32.220.59 | 79,292.28 |
| Cost of Sales |  |  |  |
| Inventory, Dec. 1 | 872.15 | 430.00 | 580.00 |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Butterfat | 2,753.91 | 3,099.18 | 5,859.78 |
| Lebor | 2,783.76 | 2,112.32 | 3,668.67 |
| Packing Supplies | 3,479.22 | 1,937.86 | 5.281.44 |
| Overhead | 2,827.74 | 3,064.25 | 5,182.41 |
| Total | 12,716.78 | 10,643.61 | 20.572 .30 |
| Inventory, Nov. 30 | 430.00 | 580.00 | 700.00 |
| Cost of Goods Sold | 12,286.78 | 10,063.61 | 19,872.30 |
| Gxoss Margin on sales | 51,503.10 | 22,156.98 | 59,429.98 |
| Operating Hxpenses |  |  |  |
| Shop and Garage Expense | 20.77 | 13.67 | 31.14 |
| General and Adm. Expense | 1,033.52 | 551.43 | 1.271.58 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | . 50.81 | 107.00 | -27.63 |
| Totel | 1,105.10 | 672.10 | 1.330. 35 |
| Wet Operating Margin | 50,398.00 | 21,484.88 | 58,089.63 |
| Other Revenue | 222.60 | 67.73 | 201.33 |
| Met Mernings | 50,620.60 | 21.552.61 | 58,290.96 |
| Net Handling Cost |  |  |  |
| potal per pound Sold | $\begin{array}{r} 10,415.37 \\ .0275 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7,568.80 \\ .0213 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15,141.54 \\ .0256 \end{gathered}$ |

SOUROE: Annuel Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

## TABLT 24

Combined Operating Stetement for Casein， Rnid Cooperative Creamexy Associatio．． Piscal Yeers Unding November 30， 1947 and 1948.

|  | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | （Dollars） | （Dollars） |
| Wet Sales | 34.759 .94 | 2，913．00 |
| Cost of 管逃边 |  |  |
| Cost of Goods： |  |  |
| Lebor | 1，668．40 | 289.01 |
| Overheed | 997.28 | 463.09 |
| rotal | 2，665．68 | 836.10 |
| Inventory，Mov． 30 | －84．00 | － |
| Cost of Coods sold | 2，581．68 | 836.10 |
| Gross Margin on Seles | 32，178．26 | 2，076．90 |
| Operating Mrpenses |  |  |
| Shop and Carage mpense | 14.75 |  |
| General mad Adra．Crpense | 594.89 | 46.71 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | $\frac{115.43}{725.07}$ | $\frac{1.02}{48.37}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Met Operating Margin | 31，453．19 | 2，028．03 |
| Other Revenue | 73.07 | 7.40 |
| Met Gemincs | 31.526 .26 | 2.035 .43 |
| Bet Mandiac Cost |  |  |
| Totel <br> Per Pound 5old | $\begin{array}{r} 3,233.68 \\ .0174 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 877.57 \\ .0586 \end{array}$ |

SOUROE：Annual Audits of the Association， 1947 and 1948.

TABLT 25
Operating Statement for Bulk Sour Crem, \#nia Cooperative Oreamery Association, Fiscal Year Thdine November $30,1946$.

|  | (Dollars) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Wet Seles | 22,385.80 |
| Cost of Seles |  |
| Butterfat | 29,300.47 |
| Labor | 314.40 |
| Overhead | 206.94 |
| Totel | 29,821.81 |
| Gross Loss | 7,436.01 |
| Operating Expenses |  |
| Shop and Garage Expense | 7.29 |
| General and Adm. Thxpense | 362.69 |
| Provis ion for Bad Debts | 17.83 |
| Wotal | 387.81 |
| Het Operating Lass | 7,823.82 |
| Other Revenue | 78.12 |
| Wet Loss | 7.745 .70 |
| Wet Handling Cost |  |
| Per Pound of Butterfat Sold | . 0241 |

SOURC\%: Anmual Audit of the Association, 1946.

## TABL』 26

Operating Statement fox the Ice Cream Depertment, Enid Cooperctive Creamery Association, Fiscal Tear Tinding November 30, 1948.

| $:$ | Ice Cream | Movelties | Potel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollers) | (Dollers) |
| Met Sales | 35.040 .93 | 9.034 .14 | 44.075 .07 |
| Cost of Seles $\quad 16.879 .11$ ( 16.879 .19 |  |  |  |
| Butterfat | 16,879.11 |  | 16,879.11 |
| Other Meterials | 3.043 .93 |  | 3.043 .93 |
| Novelty Purcheses |  | $6,437.58$ | 6,437.58 |
| Labor | 7,402.98 |  | 7,402.98 |
| Packing Supplies | 5,159.65 |  | 5.159 .65 |
| Overhead | 9,065.44 |  | 9,065.44 |
| Total | 41.551 .11 | 6,437.58 | 47.988 .69 |
| Gross Margin on Sales (Loss) | $(-6,510.18)$ | $2,596.56$ | $(-3.912 .62)$ |
| Opereting Mxpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expense | 979.41 | 173.52 | 1,152.93 |
| Selling Expense | 3,557.58 | 917.21 | $4,474.79$ |
| Shop and Garage Mxpense | 119.04 | 22.20 | 242.24 |
| General and Adm. Drpense | 561.94 | 144.83 | 706.82 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | 12.21 | 3.15 | 15.36 |
| Total | 5.230 .18 | 1,260.96 | 6,491.14 |
| Met Operating Margin (Loss) | $(-11,740.36)$ | $1,335.60$ | $(-10,404.76)$ |
| Other Revenue |  |  |  |
| Squipment Eentals | 2.312.95 | 596.32 | 2,909.27 |
| Other | 88.97 | 22.94 | 111.91 |
| Total | 2,401.92 | 619.26 | 3.021 .18 |
| Wet Ramings (Loss) | $(-9,338.44)$ | $1,954.86$ | $(-7.383 .58)$ |
| Net Handiing Cost |  |  |  |
| Total <br> Per Gallon sold | $\begin{array}{r} 27,500.26 \\ 1.1026 \end{array}$ | 7,079.28 | 34.579 .54 |

SOURCE: Annual Audit of the Association, 1948.

TABLIE 27
Combined Operating Statement for Orangeade, Enid Cooperative Creamery Association, Fiscal Years Ending Novenber 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollars) |
| Wet Soles | 250.47 | 1,411.23 | 471.94 |
| Cost of geles |  |  |  |
| Ress Materials | 157.83 | 195.81 | 133.99 |
| Lebor | 50.71 | --* | * |
| Packing Supplies | 186.77 | --* | --* |
| Overhead | 140.63 | -*******) | --* |
| Total | 535.94 | 195.81 | $\overline{133.99}$ |
| Gross harcin on Sales (Loss) | (-285.47) | 1,215.42 | 337.92 |
| Operating gxpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expense | 182.24 | --- | -- |
| Selling Expense | 2.61 | 14.98 | 5.49 |
| Shop and Carage Mxpense | 22.60 | . 60 | . 18 |
| General and Adm. Expense | 4.06 | 24.15 | 7.57 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | . 20 | 4.69 | . 16 |
| Total | 211.71 | 44.42 | 13.40 |
| Het Opereting Margin (Loss) | (-497.18) | 1,171.00 | 324.55 |
| Other Revenue | . 88 | 2.97 | 1.20 |
| Wet Hermines (Loss) | (-496.30 | 1,173.97 | 325.75 |
| Wet Handling Cost | 746.77 | 237.26 | 146.19 |

 of cost of sales were possible, with the exception of raw noterials.
gounct: Annugl Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947 , end 1948 .

Combined Operating Statement for megs, Finid Cooperative Cromery Association, Fiscal Years Whding November 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 : | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Dollars) | (Dollars) | (Dollers) |
| Wet soles | 99,010.17 | 122,840.36 | 303,352.28 |
| Cost of Seles |  |  |  |
| Cost of Goods: |  |  |  |
| Egs Purchases | $83,746.26$ | 112,495.17 | 267,256.04 |
| Labor | 4,036.10 | 3,792.00 | 12,146.37 |
| Packing Supplies | 2,605.01 | 1,821.71 | 9,240.11 |
| Hauling | 160.74 | 149.83 | 2,193.54 |
| overhead Total | 91,171.40* | 118,690.89 | $\overline{292,389.40}^{*}$ |
| Inventory, Nov. 30 | 432.18 | 1,553.34 | 2,769.32 |
| Cost of Goods sold | 90,739.22 | 117,137.55 | 289,620.08 |
| Gross Maxgin on Seles | $8,270.95$ | 5,702.81 | 13,732.20 |
| Operating mxpenses |  |  |  |
| Distribution Sxpense | 298.76 | 402.75 | 1,785.36 |
| Selling txpense | 442.38 | 612.23 | 1,584.22 |
| Shop and Garage Hxpense | 50.57 | 88.52 | 239.71 |
| Genersl and Adn. Expense | 1,604.15 | 2,102.33 | 4,864.74 |
| Provision for Bad Debts | -78.86 | 407.93 | 105.71 |
| Totel | 2,474.72 | 3,613.76 | 8,579.74 |
| Net Operating Mergin | 5,796.23 | 2,089.05 | 5,152.46 |
| Other Fevenue | 345.50 | 258.22 | 770.25 |
| Iet Remings | 6,141.73 | 2,347.27 | 5,922.71 |
| Wet Handing Cost |  |  |  |
| Per Dozen Sold | $.0340$ | $.92$ | $.0433$ |

SOURCR: AMnual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Combined Quantity Anelysis of Seles, Whid Cooperative Creamery Association, Fiscal Years Thaing Wovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948 .


MABLT 29 (Continued)
Combined Quantity Analysis of Sales,期d Cooperative Greamery Association, Tiscal Years Waing Wovember 30, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

|  | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Bulk }}{\text { Pounds }} \text { Ofeen Butteriat }$ | 130,271.65 | 30,141.60 | 36,154.64 |
| $\frac{\text { sub }}{\text { Putter }}$ | 2,965,335 | 3,933,297 | 4,031,610 |
| $\frac{\text { Brint Butter }}{\text { Pounds }}$ | 1,508,677.75 | 1,057,768 | 924,907 |
| $\frac{\text { Bried Buttermilut }}{\text { Pounds }}$ | 392,347 | 789,213 | 528,223 |
| $\frac{\text { Dried Sein hille }}{\text { Powns }}$ | 378,318 | 355,119 | 591,861 |
| $\frac{\text { Cosein }}{\text { Pounds }}$ | - | 185,650 | 14,980 |
| $\frac{\text { Bulk Sour }}{\text { Bounds }} \frac{\text { Cream }}{\text { of Butterfet }}$ | 34,439.69 | - | - |
| Ice Oreag |  |  |  |
| Gellons | - | - | 9,247.75 |
| Heli-Galions | - | - | 6,299,00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pints } \\ & \text { Wotal in Gallons } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | $\frac{100,349.62}{24,940.97}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Goyelties (Ice Grean, etc.) }}{\text { Dozens }}$ | - | - | 20,532.61 |
| Qrangesde |  |  |  |
| Gallons | 135 | - | - |
| Quarts | 34,103 | - | - |
| Helf-Pints <br> Totsi in Quexts | $\frac{2,863}{35,361}$ | - | - |
| Hegs <br> Cases <br> Dozens Total in Dozens | $\begin{array}{r} 7,952 \\ 30,087 \\ \hline 268,647 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,853 \\ 39,236 \\ \hline 304,826 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,735 \\ \frac{132,733}{694,783} \end{array}$ |

SOURC是: Anmal Mudits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Typist: Herold A. Coonred


[^0]:    SOUROR: Annual Audits of the Associstion, 1946, 1947, ma 1948.

[^1]:    SOURCN: Annual Audits of the Association, 1946, 1947, and 1944.

