Dissecting the Family Farm: An Inquiry into the Prevalence of Family Farms in United States Agriculture

By Estan Sutter

12/7/2022

Section 1: Introduction

From the beginning of time people have relied heavily on small scale production of foodstuffs. All societies, including nomadic ones, have participated in and have been blessed by production of the fruit of the ground and consequently by the work it requires. It makes intuitive sense that societies with underdeveloped economies would continue to rely on more primitive means of production, having small farms that produce a wide range of crops and livestock, organized primarily around family units. Whereas more developed economies would be affected by changes incurred after the Industrial Revolution. The introduction of tractors, pesticides, fertilizers and combines have changed the scope of farming, but has it changed the structure of the industry? A natural movement away from small family farming organizational norms to an industrial managerial organization would be expected in developed economies, but that is not the case. The majority of the farms in the United States are still organized around a family structure.

Throughout the economic development of the United States, production processes in every sector have shifted and grown into highly industrialized and efficient systems. This is clearly seen in the production of cars, textiles and other commodities. These processes have clearly shifted away from a small-scale to a more large-scale production. Restaurants are a wonderful example of this. One hundred years ago the majority of restaurants were owned and run by families. Although these smaller, family-run enterprises still exist, the largest and most successful restaurants today are run and operated by people who have streamlined the processes. Family farming, however,

continues to flourish, withstanding the changes seen in the industry, making it quite unique.

The question needs to be answered. Why is it exactly that family farms have persisted as common means of organizing production in the agricultural sector? It is important to set out a clear history of the development of the farming sector in the United States and an overview of the status quo. Defining a family farm and its characteristics will allow for subsequent discussion as to why it has been so long used as a preferred organizational standard. Family farms continue to persist through external economic pressures because of managerial advantages, preferential differences, and diverse specifications. The family farm plays a crucial role in the maintenance of the American economy, the household structure, and the American ideal. Although the efficiency of family farming is not because of Luddite practices, the claims of ancient agrarians and Luddite ideals must not be ignored considering this information. Efficiency is, in part, because the farms are willing to use the technology given available to them.

Family farms, on average, tend to be smaller farms. Yet this does not mean that they neglect modern technology. They are, however, less likely to be subsidized and find themselves in a formidable fight against monocropping giants that government officials maneuver to flaunt their environmental agenda. “Despite the rhetoric of "preserving the family farm," the vast majority of farmers do not benefit from federal farm subsidy programs and most of the subsidies go to the largest and most financially secure farm operations. Small commodity farmers qualify for a mere pittance, while producers of meat, fruits, and vegetables are almost completely left out of the subsidy game”

(Database, 2022). It is impressive that despite external econometric pressures, such as subsidies in favor of large farms, that small farms continue to persist. It is insufficient to say that these farms have a disadvantage over big farms because of internal economic pressures. Governmental intervention is certainly at play.

Section 2: Background

The development of the agricultural sector within the last one hundred years has changed the farming and agricultural communities of the United States dramatically. Where there was once a substantial portion of the United States population living in the farming communities, there is now a much greater populace found in urban and metropolitan areas. Country living has been traded for city living. Along with this development, there has been a clear increase in the efficiency of production in the agricultural sector, allowing fewer people to do more with less energy and time. This change allowed people to shift out of farming and into other markets, or 'off farm jobs'. As the United States Department of Agriculture notes, in the year 1900, around 41 percent of the workforce was employed in agriculture, dwarfing the 1.9 percent in 2000 (ERS, 2018). Understandably, the amount of workers in the agricultural sector has become a small ratio in the labor economy. Yet though the sector shrunk, the supply of food increased dramatically, bringing down the price of many foodstuffs. Families, then, are liberated to dedicate a lesser percentage of household income to keeping the family fed. This revolutionized the division of labor and allowed for rapid expansion in the

United States. Along with these developments came a decrease in the amount of farms and an increase in the size of farms on average. “Since 1900, the number of farms has fallen by 63 percent, while the average farm size has risen 67 percent”(Whitt & Todd, 2022). Because of the increase in the efficiency of one unit of labor, they were able to cover a larger portion of the land which gives them less overall farms, but an increase in the size of the farms that exist.

Now that the background has been discussed, we can analyze the specifics of the technological improvements that led to the increase in the productivity of the farming industry. “From complete reliance on animal power in 1900, farmers rapidly embraced mechanical power. Tractors had essentially replaced animal power by 1970, and mechanical harvesting of crops (sugar beets, cotton, and tomatoes, for example) became routine by the late 1960s”(Whitt & Todd, 2022). By increasing efficiency, tractors allowed for a large increase in the amount of hours that could be spent on other production. The majority of farm work was done by animals at the beginning of the 1900s. When compared to the the 1960s, the decline is blatant. In those 60 years, the amount of work animals went from 21.6 million to only 3 million. This decline was balanced by the rise in tractors, reaching 4.7 million in 1960. 4

Though defined simply above, the nuances of the family farm remain ambiguous, prompting both literary and scholastic interpretation. But thanks to Elizabeth Garner and Ana Paula de la O Campos, who have methodized a clear and working definition of the family farm, it is easier to understand the successfulness of family farms. The definition provided is “Family farming is characterized by small farms that are family-operated and

make no or limited use of non-family hired labor" (Garner, Campos, 2014). There are two clear facets of the family farm that distinguish them from other forms of production. The first is that the farm is owned and operated by the family that owns the land. The majority of the farms are small. This is imperative, because it allows a small staff—otherwise incapable of operating large-scale agricultural production—to manage and complete a wide range of tasks. Their other distinguishing factor is that the majority of the labor is not outsourced to outside workers, meaning that the most productive people are within the families themselves. The labor is overseen and performed by the people closely related to the land itself. This is a pivotal pillar in the efficiency of family farms. Physical and personal proximity to the farm allows a family to specialize its organizational structure and work pattern in order to increase managerial efficiency.

Furthermore, clarity when referring to differing types of organization is important so that there is less confusion in the discussion. When discussing the organization of the agricultural markets and production processes, it will be clearly pitted against and compared to industrial forms of production. These types of production structures are highly mechanized and specialized. Contrary to the diverse number of tasks that the majority of workers on farms participate in industrial farmers can specialized to a degree that is impossible with the farming industry. For example, as steel worker is incredibly efficient at moving steel from one place to another and being able to spot imperfections in the steel that require more treatment. The reason being that, if agriculture where similar to industrial production then it would look more like many different people being hired from different places and being paid to do specific tasks, rather than what is clearly

seen in agricultural sector. The fact that there is such a high percentage of family farms necessitates that the industry itself looks almost entirely different than that of a more industrial production process. This is clearly identified by Reinhardt and Barlett “In industry, mechanization reorganizes the work process on a continuous flow basis and thereby allows for the deskilling of labor, the separation of management and labor and an increase in task specialization”(Nola & Barlett, 1989). The thing listed previously are all of the things that are required for an industrial management and the organization of labor. These things are difficult to achieve on the farm, as will be shown later in the paper.

Understanding the background to the question is important because it shapes the landscape and the analysis that will be done for the entirety of the paper. It is necessary to assume the knowledge of the developments and the agricultural scene so understand a little bit more about the organization of the farms in the United States. It will be then clear that even with the increase in the amount of technology that farms are able to use, even with the decrease in the amount of farms in the United States, and with the increase in size of the farms in the United States, family farms are the dominate form of managerial organization for many reasons that will be outlined in the coming pages of this paper.

Section 3: The Breakdown of the Family Farm

The data must be plainly laid out in order to fully understand the empirics behind the family farm in the United States. Without a complete understanding of the data it is impossible to fully analyze the argument as it is presented. All of the following data is

from a report by United States Department of Agriculture referencing data from Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS), an annual survey conducted by USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) and ERS. This report is a revised edition in 2019 of a form of the report from 2018.

The definition that is used to collect the data is similar to the one presented previously, "focuses primarily on the "family farm," or any farm where the majority of the business is owned by the principal operator—the person who is most responsible for making day-to-day decisions for the farm—and by individuals who are related to the principal operator"(Whitt & Todd, 2022). Because the two definitions are so closely connected we can draw conclusions about the analysis and the rest of the paper based on the data presented by National Agricultural Statistics Services.

The report mentioned divides the farms in the United States into four buckets: small family farms, midsized family farms, large-scale family farms, and nonfamily farms. There are a couple different data points that were observed such as, land operated, value of production, and number of farms. Small family farms operate 47.7 percent of the land in the United States, they produce 21.1 percent of the value of production, and take up 89.7 percent of the number of farms. Midsized family farms operate 21.0 percent of the land in the United States, they produce 20.6 percent of the value of production, and take up 5.5 percent of the number of farms. Large-scale family farms operate 19.6 percent of the land in the United States, they produce 45.9 percent of the value of production, and take up 2.7 percent of the number of farms. Nonfamily farms operate 11.7 percent of the land in the United States, they produce 12.4 percent of the value of

production, and take up 2.1 percent of the number of farms. (Whitt & Todd, 2022) The data provided above it's helpful in understanding the question previously asked. That is why our family farms the most prevalent form of organization in the United States agriculture?

Before movement is made into the rest of the argument there is some more information that is helpful regarding the make up of the farming industry as a whole, this includes the type of crops that are grown by different farms in the United States, what kind of livestock that they produce and other important factors that need to be taken account into while analyzing the question at hand. “Large-scale family farms account for over two-thirds of dairy production, while large-scale family farms and nonfamily farms produce over 80 percent of high-value crops such as fruits and vegetables. Midsize and large-scale family farms dominate production of cotton (82 percent of production), cash grains/soybeans (74 percent), and hogs (66 percent). Small and large-scale farms together account for 69 percent of beef production. Small farms generally have cow/calf operations, while large-scale farms are more likely to operate feedlots. Small farms produce 56 percent of U.S. poultry and egg output and 50 percent of hay. Much of poultry production is done under production contracts, with a contractor paying a fee to a farmer who raises poultry to maturity”(Whitt & Todd, 2020). While the data presented above is seemingly overwhelming, it is important to have in mind while analyzing the rest of the research. This information cannot be ignored, but should influence our understanding of the nature of the topic as a whole. Most importantly to note is that's

small farms specialize in a wide variety of production. So, Small farmers have their hands in many productive farming practices.

Section 4: The Argument for the Family Farm

Family farms persist in the United States because they provide superior managerial efficiency and meet the needs of the people working them far better than other industries. Now, if someone is doing a job or participating in an occupation then they will clearly be maximizing preferences as best as they can. The argument is clear and as follows, in order for farms to be able to achieve the ends that they need they must be able to efficiently organize the capital goods that they own. This is where the organization of the farm comes into play, when farms that exist to maximize monetary profits organize themselves, it is in the form of a family farm. 98% of the farms in the United States are organized under this structure. So, there must be something about the family structure that allows for this sort of structure to be efficient and also be the dominating from or organization.

A systematic outline the reasons that the family farms persist in the United States will be presented, it should be noted however that there is no perfect way to disintegrate the reasons from one another, but it will be done with some caution. The persistence of the family farms has to do with many features that affect the organizational composition of the farm itself. Through the biological nature of the production process, calculational advantages, managerial efficiency, topographical efficiency compared to other countries, and the difficulty for farms to achieve economies of scale, ambiguity will be discarded

and clarity will show that the family form of organization is superior. The family farms is continually proven as the most effective form of organizational management.

Section 5: Technology and the Family Farm

Development of foodstuffs production technology allowed for an increase in the amount of family farms. Where there were previously large amounts of outsourced labor to increase the quantity of the production, employment of farm hands became no longer necessary. Historically, those who came to aid in the harvesting of crops were known as threshers; these seasonal workers would assist mainly in harvest times and contribute to the labor-intensive tasks for this season of farming.

Even more recently, there would be teams of men that would go around during harvest time and be paid for the services of harvesting the grain. This is what would be identified as outsourced labor, but, after the introduction of the tractor, this was completely unnecessary. This technological innovation actually led to an increase in the amount of labor done by family members. It should also be noted that when the combine came into popular use, there was an decrease in outsourcing of labor. The increase in the length of production allowed for the default more efficient form of management. “The combine extended the growing operation into the harvest stage because it generated problems with the timing of harvest. When the number of tasks fell to one, eliminating the gains from specialization, the appropriate farm organization was the family farm” (Allen & Dueck, 2003). This is the fact that Allen has landed upon in his econometric research. When there is less to do on the farm people tend to organize themselves into

family units. Consequently, the development of agricultural practices allows for an increase in the amount of family farms because it allows for despecialization of labor. The family farm has the ability to diversify the number of crops that are being produced, as well as the sorts of crops, they can also mix with raising livestock depending on the market pressures. (Buttel & Gillespie, 1984) In general, the ability to adjust to external factors of production are easier for smaller farms to do.

Conversely, farms can also ultra-specialize. While the existence of farming techniques and combines have lent themselves to more family farms, there is a dangerous line. An increase in the amount of equipment, both bought and used, calls for mono-efficiency—also know as an increase in capital intensiveness of the production stages. Mono-efficiency refers to a producer who is single faceted or has 'all of their eggs in one basket'. This subjects them to market fluctuations and increases the risk that they are taking upon themselves by investing in one crop over others. In order to use the factors of production efficiently, they must engage in mono-cropping: some papers refer to it as specialized commodity production. "The specialized unit foregoes benefits from the use of by-products, such as feed crop residues to livestock or the application of livestock manure to crops. The specialized farm is also exposed to greater risks from crop failure due to pests, disease, or bad weather and faces greater risk from price fluctuations in the market for its crop" (Nola & Barlett, 1989). It is clear then that the increase in the amount of technology has a limit. Ultra-specialization in the farming sector subjects the producer to uncontrollable risks that a small family farm would not be susceptible to. The commonality of ultra-specialization increased after the United States Federal Government

increased the number of subsidies for mono-cropping farms. Subsidized industries are almost exclusively large farms. The increase in risk is directly correlated to increase in insurance. Large farms can decrease their risk by implementing insurance for potential failed crops and consequently allow for more specialization of crops and an increase in mono-cropping. Small family farms are unable to account for this risk without governmental subsidies, and, thus, this technological advancement for the small family is unreasonable.

Additionally, technology cannot decrease the time intervals between production. Brewster argues that the mechanization of the farm does not give a large farm an advantage over small family farms because the time intervals of seasonal agriculture are unchanged both before and after the mechanization of a farm (Brewster, 1950). This argument clearly identifies the intrinsic quality of the farming industry itself and the incredible difficulty of efficiently mechanizing the production of crops, especially in the United States.

The technology of the family farm comes with the benefits to the production of the crops and with disadvantages to the production of crops. The most interesting thing to note is the fact that both of these things lend themselves to the family management style as opposed to a style that is completely dissimilar and industrial. The amount of technology can be inversely related with the specific efficiency of the process. These sorts of processes are most commonly benefit smaller innovative producers of foodstuffs in the form of small family farms. Technology has a good and bad impact on the organization of farms in the United States.

Section 6: Seasonality of the Family Farm

One of the main features of agricultural production that distinguishes it from industrial production is the nature of the trade. When producing crops and meats there is no streamlining processes. By this, functionally you cannot have a concentrated amount of specialization because if that were to happen, the laborer would only be valued for two weeks of the year. In order for a worker and a manager to be efficient at allocating resources, they must be able to perform a multitude of tasks efficiently. This is what is meant by using the seemingly oxymoronic term "diverse-specialization." The term clearly indicates that there is a certain amount of specialization is efficient. Doug Allen points this out when he says, "Production stages in farming tend to be short, infrequent, and require few distinct tasks, thus limiting the benefits of specialization and making age labor especially costly to monitor" (Allen & Lueck, 2003). This has been understood by agricultural economists for a long time.

If there is a short production stage, then it is difficult to be able to maximize returns on specializing in harvesting when that is something that happens for a couple of weeks a year.

> "The most fundamental one [reason] is the peculiar seasonal nature of agricultural production and the consequent lack of continuous operations. Almost every line of endeavor on the farm must depend either upon the swing of the seasons or upon the periodic nature of some biological process. There are seed times and harvest times with their specific tasks which, in the main, are of short duration.

> There is also the case of livestock at the different stages of their development. In no case can a man be put to a single specific task and be kept at it uninterruptedly for a month or a year as is true in the factory" (Holmes, 1928).

Douglas Allen also describes the fact that economies of scale could only be achieved if seasonality could be ignored. This is impossible, however, because of the nature of farming. "It simply would not pay to invest in highly specialized, largescale capital unless seasonal forces were so lacking that highly specialized wage labor could effectively be employed" (Allen & Lueck, 2003). This is clearly impossible, which explains the fact that small family farms are more highly favored in the organizational structure.

In his econometric treatment of the Nature of the Farm, Douglas Allen digs into what types of features and aspects of the farm make them more or less likely to be a family farm or not. He notes that the seasonality of the crop is one of the main things that contributes to this, "Seasonality in this environment severely limits the gains of specialization and accordingly places a premium on a type of organization that squelches moral hazard." He is referring to the family farm. Because of the way family farms are operated with low amounts of labor costs in outsourcing and incredibly low managerial costs, seasonal problems can be overcome by the family farm more easily than one that is not organized in such a way.

The small farm can be clearly efficient in production, and there is econometric and empirical treatment that indicates that small-scale production can be competitive

economically. (Doner & Kanel, 1971) The size of the farm is not indicative of the efficiency of production that the farm is able to output. “The biological conditions of agricultural production limit the ability of the capitalist agriculture to develop and capture the sources of scale economies.” (Reinhart, 1988) So, it is characteristics that are intrinsic in the nature of the agricultural sector and not in the nature of the development of the economy that effect the organization of the farms.

Section 7: Managing the Family Farm

It has been noted that small family farms have an easier time managing the labor and are therefore more efficient at the allocation of resources. There are a couple of reasons why this is the case. The preexistence of family connections allows for a thwarting of moral hazard. These sorts of preexisting relationships decrease the cost of management because of certain trust that has been built over years of working on the farm.

Another aspect of the family relationship is that training has been happening for a long period of time. Presumably in most family farms the young family workers have been participating in the happenings of the farm for many years, so by the time that they are ‘hired’ to work on the farm, they have a high level of experience and are more valuable than other workers. Such a situation allows for the manager of the farm to know what type of work is being done, and so he is able to ensure the quality of the work. This is implied by the existence of the many hours that have been spent doing the tasks around the farm from childhood until adulthood. Because of this, that the hiring process is

significantly more risky and costly to a farmer because they have to deal with problems that they have already dealt with by nature of having a child. This has been the role of children in farming for almost the entirety of history. A landowner would run the farm and raise their children to be able to take over the farm after they would pass away or were rendered incapable of managing the farm.

There are not just benefits of labor efficiencies to the farms that are small and family oriented, there are significant problems with the increase in size that is required for industrial farming. With this comes a lot of inefficiencies and problems with large farms that have a difficult time being able to appropriately account for diverse-specialization. “Hired labor efficiency can also suffer from farm size expansion. Uneven topography, the height and density of a crop, or the dispersed nature of farms plots over a wide area, all render labor supervision more difficult” (Nola & Barlett, 1989).

Another problem that arises when managing a large farm is that it has to deal with an increase in the wear and tear on the equipment in use. Where running a family farm would only require the equipment travelling short distances, the large industrial farm makes it so that the travel time and cost is a lot larger. (Nola & Barlett, 1989) Think for a second about the distance that can exist between different farms that are owned by a large corporation. This adds to wear and tear on the tractors that does not get added to factors of production that are used by small farmers.

The management of the family farms is also bound by different goals than just monetary incentives. Where hiring someone outside of the farmers family would require

money and wages, there might be shared values that the father and son have that are not restrained merely by the monetary calculation. This sort of calculation gives the family farm a clear advantage over the industrial farms because it allows for them to be constrained by far less than just monetary constraints. This is why there is a larger prevalence of family farms as opposed to industrial farms.

Section 8: Maintaining the Family Farm

It is understandable that it is difficult for farms to achieve economies of scale, but the question still exists as to why would they not do their best to achieve economies of scale and then reap the benefits of an increase in size. The things that prevent them from growing so monstrous and maintains their size is something called diseconomies of scale. There has been little research or comment on the existence of diseconomies of scale. "Diseconomies of scale in industry derive principally from rising per-unit managerial costs as operations become more complex" (Nola & Barlett, 1989). The idea of diseconomies of scale is that when there is an increase in the size, the efficiency of the production would decrease. This is essentially the opposite of economies of scale, which has been noted is incredibly difficult to achieve in the farming industry. "Such disadvantages to large industrial farm units stem from the complexity of ecological information that must be processed, the rapid pace of biological processes and the need for timely decisions to respond to these complex processes" (Nola & Barlett, 1989). The sort of specialization that is required to achieve high volumes of production necessitates the ignorance of the land that is being farmed upon. So, microenvironments are ignored for the sake of production scale. This leads to decrease in the efficiency of the specific

land that is being farmed. Such decrease can be avoided clearly by the use of smaller farms which gives them an advantage over larger producers of the same commodities.

The diseconomies of scale requires that there is a certain size that would inhibit the ability to efficiently produce the products. It is clear that the size of the farm, especially that of the family farm, allows for this sort of managerial efficiency. This understanding of diseconomies of scale explains why the family farms have been the dominant form of production in the agricultural sector. It is one of the main reasons that the majority of the number of farms in the United States are small family farms. “Land, weather and biological processes pose obstacles to the development of controlled, continuous production processes characterized by stable labor requirements, finely developed task specialization and highly refined mechanism for labor supervision and control” (Nola & Barlett, 1989).

Section 9: Preferences of the Family Farm

The main thing that allows for the family farm to enjoy an advantage over the large scale more industrial type farms is that they can calculate utility without the constraints of profit maximizing incentives. “The goal of production is determined by the consumption needs of the household (dependent on its demographic structure) rather than by the desire for profit” (Nola & Barlett, 1989). This analysis is then not fully done until it is understood that the small family farms are bound not only by monetary incentives but by other desires and preferences of the producers themselves. Now it is incredibly difficult to tell what type of farms fall under this category, but it is safe to say that at least

12.4 percent of the farms in America fall under this category. “Small farms whose principal operators report having retired, though continuing to farm on a small scale.” This is about 250,289 farms in the United States according to data from 2020. (Whitt & Todd, 2022) This category of farms are people who have retired from profit farming and have continued to operate the farms that they used to work on at a smaller scale. These types of farms obviously fall into this category. They are farming for the sake of farming, not necessarily the rate of returns that can be derived from farming.

It is important to note that there is a difference in the calculation of family farms that is different from the industrial calculations. “…this accounting method is not an error in farmers’ calculations nor a failure to recognize market forces or realities. Instead it is “a reflection of the fact that… [family farms] … have opportunities to value dimensions of intangible wealth that are denied workers in non-proprietary businesses”(Raup)… These dimensions include pride of ownership, continuity of family, freedom of choice in work time and pace, and the ability to identify effort and reward, all of which are part of the family farmers calculations’ about livelihood and profit” (Nola & Barlett, 1989). He notes quite clearly that the thing that distinguishes these farms is the family farmers calculations, such as the quality of life for the people that are living with him, the legacy of the land, the passing on of traditions and family land. All of these things play a huge role in the calculations of the family farms and could be the reason that so many of the farms in the United States are comprised of retirement farms. It is impossible to tear these sorts of calculations apart from the monetary calculations.

In short, “The calculus of the family farm allows it to cut costs, by accepting a lower marginal return to family labor, more effectively than the capitalist unit, which must continue to meet payrolls or lose skilled labor.” (Buttel & Gillespie, 1984) Overall, the preferences of the family farm allow for them to be able to be more adaptable than any other sort of organization.

The existence of hobby farms, retirement farms, and incredibly small farms shows that there is a place for this sort of organization in the modern industrial economy of the United States and is not merely a nod to the past forms of organization,

Section 10: Conclusion

In conclusion, there have been a large number of reasons that the family farm is the main organizational arrangement used in the agricultural sector. The farms of the past were not in existence merely because of ‘primitive’ or ‘barbaric’ realities but because they are the most efficient form of organization. The data clearly indicates that the United States is filled with family farms. The bend towards industrialism in other sectors has not had as great of an effect on the farms in the United States for reasons that have been seen.

It is clear then that the persistence of family farms in United States agriculture is because of their ability to adapt to specific factors that are unique to the places in which they inhabit. Larger farms are hindered by the existence of biological processes making specialization more costly. It has been made clear that family farms continue to persist through external economic pressures because of managerial advantages, preferences differences, and diverse specification. The small family farms of the United States

provide efficient outcomes for production and consequently for the utility of the consumer as a whole.

Since the beginning of time economies have found themselves relying on what some describe as the yeoman farmer. Now, the farmer and his techniques have changed dramatically, the relation to the family structure as an efficient allocator of resources and employment is clearly seen. Where horses were once used, now there are tractors and combines, but the thing that makes them efficient is the family structure of allocation. Through a dissection of the family farm in the United States, there is no doubt that this form of production will continue to exist.

References

Database, EWG's Farm Subsidy. “EWG's Farm Subsidy Database.” EWG Farm Subsidy Database || What are Farm Subsidy Payments? Accessed December 7, 2022. https://farm.ewg.org/subsidyprimer.php.

Elizabeth Garner and Ana Paula de la O Campos. 2014. Identifying the “family farm”: an informal discussion of the concepts and definitions. ESA Working Paper No. 14-10. Rome, FAO.

Allen, Douglas W., and Dean Lueck. “The Nature of the Farm,” 2003. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/4883.001.0001.

Christine Whitt, Jessica E. Todd. “America's Diverse Family Farms: 2020 Edition.” USDA ERS, 2020. https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=100011.

Compiled by Economic Research Service, USDA, using data from Census of Agriculture and Census of the United States.

REINHARDT, NOLA, and PEGGY BARLETT. “The Persistence of Family Farms in United States Agriculture.” Sociologia Ruralis 29, no. 3-4 (1989): 203–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.1989.tb00367.x.

Holmes, C. L. Economics of Farm Organization and Management. Boston: Heath & Co., 1928. (Holmes, 1928)

Doner, P. and D. Kanel, The economic case for land reform: employment, income distribution, and productivity, 1971

Brewster, J. M., The machine process in agriculture and industry, *Journal of Farm Economics*, 1950

Reinhart, N, *Our Daily Bread: The Peasant Question and Family Farming in the Colombian Andes* (Berkely California: University of California Press) 1988

Buttel, F. H. and G. W. Gillespie, The sexual division of farm household labor: An exploratory study of the structure of on-farm and off-farm labor allocation among farm men and women, *Rural Sociology*, 1984