



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Monthly Demand Relationships of U.S Meat Commodities

by Kuo S. Huang*

Abstract

A set of price-dependent demand equations explains the interdependent nature of monthly demand relationships for 10 meat commodities. The analysis uses a model with a mixed structural-time series approach, the model's forecasting capability is significantly better than that of the traditional structural model used alone.

Keywords

Price-dependent demand structure, mixed structural-time series model

Introduction

The U.S. consumption expenditure for red meats and poultry accounts for approximately one-third of the consumer's food budget. Because there is limited knowledge about the interdependence of the demand relationships among meat commodities in the short run, an efficient forecasting model for monthly meat prices is difficult to obtain. Although previous studies have considered monthly demand behavior in the meat industry (3, 7),¹ few published studies have focused on the interdependent nature of these demands. This article analyzes this unexplored, yet important, facet of monthly demand and formulates a statistical model for improving the forecasting of meat prices. An inverse demand system approach is adopted for specifying the monthly demand relationships of meat commodities. In the statistical modeling, a mixed structural-time series model is applied, the results appear to have considerable potential to improve shortrun forecasting of meat prices.

Model Specification

According to the classical demand theory, the economic problem of a representative consumer is to choose commodities under a budget constraint so

that the consumer's utility function is maximized. Let q denote an n -coordinate column vector of quantities, p an n -coordinate vector of their prices, $m = p'q$ the consumer's total expenditure, and $U(q)$ the utility function. The primal function for consumer utility maximization is maximizing the following Lagrangian function.

$$\text{Maximize } L = U(q) - k(p'q - m) \quad (1)$$

q, k

The necessary conditions for an optimum are obtained as

$$U'_i(q) = k p_i, \quad i=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2)$$

and

$$p'q = m \quad (3)$$

in which $U'_i(q)$ is the marginal utility of the i th commodity. By multiplying q_i in equation (2) and summing over n to satisfy the budget constraint of (3), the Lagrangian multiplier is

$$k = \sum_{j=1}^n q_j U'_j(q) / m \quad (4)$$

Substituting equation (4) into (2) yields the Hotelling-Wold identity (5, 11):

$$p_i = m [U'_i(q) / \sum_{j=1}^n q_j U'_j(q)] \quad (5)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

*The author is an agricultural economist with the National Economics Division, ERS. He wishes to thank Richard C. Haidacher and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

¹Italicized numbers in parentheses refer to items in the References at the end of this article.

This equation represents an inverse demand system in which the variation of price is a certain function of quantities demanded and is proportional to a change in income. As indicated by Hicks (4), the Marshallian demands have two functions: one shows the amounts consumers will take at given prices, and the other shows the prices at which consumers will buy at given quantities. The latter function, "quantity into price," is essentially what the identity expresses.

The inverse demand system has considerable appeal as applied to the shortrun demand for meat commodities. For example, beef takes about 27 months from breeding until slaughter weight, and the change of market supplies tends to be rather inflexible in the short run. The aggregate quantity demanded for such a commodity becomes increasingly fixed as the time frame becomes shorter. Thus, if a monthly demand structure for meats is specified, assumptions that quantities and income are predetermined and that prices must be adjusted may be reasonable. Waugh rationalized that, in competitive markets, changes in prices are generally determined by changes in quantities marketed and changes in income, not the other way around (10). Most recently, Theil worked on a demand subsystem for beef, pork, chicken, and lamb by taking quantity changes as predetermined variables, on the justification that the role of meat prices is to insure that the market is indeed cleared (9). Thus, prices are endogenous in the demand-and-supply system.

When monthly demand relationships for U.S. meat commodities are specified, questions regarding the available data sources and the functional form of the demands are of immediate concern. The available monthly data for meat commodities are rather limited, and the defined prices and quantities do not always correspond closely. Monthly price observations, covering January 1964 to December 1979, for five beef products and four pork products are available from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. The products include sirloin steak, round steak, chuck roast, round roast, ground beef, pork chops, canned ham, bacon, and sausage. Monthly price observations for broilers and the per capita quantities for meats over the same period are available from the Economic Research Service. The quantities include beef, veal, pork, lamb, broilers, turkeys, and other chicken. These

quantities, measured in retail weight equivalents, are derived from the commercial carcass weight of various meat animals. The correspondence between the price and quantity variables, although not ideal as required by the conceptual demand relations, is about as close as can be achieved with the limited data available.

On the choice of functional form for the empirical fitting, the loglinear approximation of the Hotelling-Wold identity is used in this article largely for practical reasons. The estimated demand parameters represent demand flexibilities which are easily interpreted. The specification provides a convenient form for further elaboration in specifying the residual structure and in improving forecasting capability of the model.

The statistical model for the i th price equation in terms of n quantities demanded and an autoregressive process of residuals lagged up to k months follow:

$$\log(p_{it}/m_t) = \alpha_{i0} + \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} \log q_{jt} + \sum_{j=1}^{11} \gamma_{ij} d_{jt} + u_{it} \quad (6)$$

and:

$$u_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_{ij} u_{i,t-j} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (7)$$

where variables at time t are p_{it} (price of i th commodity), m_t (per capita income), q_{jt} (quantity demanded for j th commodity), and d_{jt} s (dummy variables assigned for sequential months from February to December to reflect the effects of monthly shifts), u_{it} and ϵ_{it} are respectively random disturbances in which ϵ_{it} is assumed to be normal and independently distributed, $N(0, \sigma^2 I)$.

In addition to the use of quantities as explanatory variables in equation (6), including monthly dummy variables in the equation reflects the possibility of seasonal variation in the demand for particular meat cuts, the possibility of seasonal difference in production costs, and the number of different graded meat animals being marketed. Shepherd and Futrell give some detailed explanations about the latter possibility (8). For instance, there is a rather inflexible supply of potential hog processing and marketing services during the short run in terms of

plant facilities and labor supply. A dwindling seasonal supply of hogs causes sharply increased buying competition among packers and forces the packers to take a lower margin for their processing and wholesaling services. Consequently, the meat price in that season may not be as high as would be expected because of quantity change.

Furthermore, the residual specification of equation (7) reflects a suggestion by Muth that there is little empirical interest in assuming that the disturbance term in a structural model is completely unpredictable (6). It is desirable to assume that part of the disturbance may be predicted based on past observations. Because the expected values of the disturbance could be related to economic conditions prevailing in the past months, we may assume that the disturbance is not independent over time but follows an autoregressive process. Accordingly, the model has some practical advantages for improving forecasting capability. The structural component may provide forecasts for identifying the turning points of historical observations, whereas the time series component provides predictive information for the movements of random disturbance.

Estimation Procedures

The proposed statistical model on monthly demand relationships for meat commodities can be viewed as a mixed structural-time series model. The model not only provides a structural explanation of meat prices in equation (6), but also replicates the past behavior of residuals by specifying an autoregressive process in equation (7). To estimate the model, one needs a three-step estimation procedure because the disturbance terms in the autoregressive process are not observable. First, some preliminary estimates of the structural parameters in equation (6) are obtained from ordinary least squares. Within the context of serial autocorrelated errors, these estimates are known to be unbiased but inefficient, and thus a further re-estimate is required. Second, the estimated residuals from the first step are used to fit the autoregressive process in equation (7). In this stage, the choice of lag order in the process can be determined by the significance of estimated coefficients in the equation. Given an appropriate order for the lags, one can obtain the autoregressive coefficients in a particular

equation by solving the so-called Yule-Walker equations (1). Third, based on the estimated autoregressive structure in equation (7), the structural parameters are reestimated by the application of an Aitken estimation procedure suggested by Gallant and Goebel (2).

Estimation Results

Table 1 summarizes the estimation results. The values in each column express the price of a meat commodity as a function of seven meat quantities consumed, "other goods," a set of monthly dummy variables, and an autoregressive residual series. The "other goods" in the consumer budget is defined as per capita a nonfood expenditure measured in constant 1967 prices. Because each equation expresses price as a function of quantities in logarithmic form, the response coefficients can be called "flexibilities."

According to the estimation results, the direct-price flexibility between the price of sirloin steak and the quantity of beef is -0.342, which indicates that if consumers make a 1-percent decrease in quantity of beef purchased, the price of sirloin steak will increase about 0.3 percent. Similar interpretation is given to the direct-price flexibility of other items. The estimated direct-price flexibilities of monthly demand for various meat cuts are less than 1 in each case. They are round steak (-0.377), chuck roast (-0.508), round roast (-0.332), ground beef (-0.418), pork chops (-0.581), canned ham (-0.207), bacon (-0.845), sausage (-0.457), and broilers (-0.410). The prices of round steak, chuck roast, round roast, and ground beef are functions of all beef, the prices of pork chops, canned ham, bacon, and sausage are functions of all pork.

Special caution should be taken in interpreting cross-price flexibilities as the conventional view of substitution and complement between two goods. Hicks distinguished the substitution relationship in the inverse demand system as q-substitutes from that in the ordinary demand system as p-substitutes; he said that "X and Y are q-substitutes when a rise in the quantity of X diminishes the marginal valuation of Y (or the price at which a fixed quantity of Y would be purchased) when the quantities of all commodities other than X are fixed, saving the

Table 1—Estimated shortrun flexibilities for meat commodities

Independent variable	Price of—									
	Sirloin steak	Round steak	Chuck roast	Round roast	Ground beef	Pork chops	Canned ham	Bacon	Sausage	Broilers
Quantity										
Beef	- 0 342 (067)	- 0 377 (072)	- 0 508 (094)	- 0 332 (067)	- 0 418 (088)	0 101 (082)	0 115 (063)	0 375 (115)	0 100 (092)	0 100 (133)
Veal	- 006 (010)	- 008 (011)	- 012 (015)	- 012 (011)	- 040 (014)	- 011 (014)	- 001 (009)	008 (018)	002 (014)	008 (022)
Pork	- 004 (049)	- 027 (052)	- 030 (067)	- 035 (048)	073 (063)	- 581 (059)	- 207 (047)	- 845 (084)	- 457 (067)	- 363 (094)
Lamb and mutton	- 004 (010)	001 (011)	- 009 (014)	001 (010)	- 001 (014)	- 015 (014)	- 007 (008)	- 010 (018)	- 010 (014)	- 002 (020)
Broilers	155 (064)	143 (070)	210 (091)	140 (065)	168 (087)	286 (084)	096 (056)	247 (110)	219 (087)	- 410 (132)
Turkeys	- 006 (017)	012 (017)	003 (023)	009 (016)	014 (022)	046 (022)	011 (015)	033 (030)	009 (023)	033 (033)
Other chicken	045 (022)	064 (024)	075 (031)	062 (022)	031 (030)	060 (030)	- 021 (019)	044 (038)	005 (030)	095 (044)
Other goods	- 602 (088)	- 645 (098)	- 531 (125)	- 749 (091)	- 505 (118)	- 1 188 (111)	- 614 (091)	- 1 020 (150)	- 387 (122)	- 868 (179)
Monthly dummy										
Constant term	2 099	2 634	1 955	3 347	1 345	6 639	1 554	5 201	177	3 166
February	- 020	- 013	- 005	- 013	- 012	- 004	- 005	- 008	- 014	- 030
March	- 012	- 003	017	- 003	- 001	026	005	047	026	- 047
April	- 024	- 020	- 017	- 022	- 023	- 027	- 015	011	001	020
May	- 006	- 009	- 009	- 014	- 012	- 073	- 043	- 042	- 037	060
June	032	007	007	003	002	- 064	- 065	- 064	- 043	074
July	044	011	021	006	004	- 039	- 082	- 076	- 048	077
August	041	011	026	005	007	- 024	- 065	- 024	- 016	068
September	048	008	026	005	006	- 007	- 051	022	015	011
October	022	- 006	018	- 007	- 002	- 024	- 034	026	023	- 033
November	012	- 024	001	- 021	- 030	- 026	- 017	028	044	- 132
December	- 008	- 034	- 013	- 028	- 040	- 038	- 009	020	024	- 117
Residual										
Lag 1 month	467	328	346	345	286	264	618	491	471	267
Lag 2 months	115	179	131	150	168	070	060	- 066	029	129
Lag 3 months	131	247	240	262	254	274	149	237	232	342

Note The figures in parentheses are the estimated standard errors. All income flexibilities are constrained to unitary values on the basis of equation (4).

quantity of money, which is adjusted so as to maintain indifference" (4)

To illustrate, considering a demand system with only two substitutable goods, we can present the system in elasticity matrix form in which the direct-price elasticities are negative and the cross-price elasticities are positive:

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -e_{11} & e_{12} \\ e_{21} & -e_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for positive } e_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, 2$$

where p_i and q_i are, respectively, nominal price and quantity for i th goods expressed in logarithms, and where e_{ij} 's are the absolute value of demand elasticities. One can derive the inverse demand system by inverting the elasticity matrix and obtaining

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -e_{22}/D & -e_{12}/D \\ -e_{21}/D & -e_{11}/D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $D = e_{11}e_{22} - e_{12}e_{21}$. Because the direct-price flexibilities ($-e_{22}/D$ and $-e_{11}/D$) are negative for utility maximization, the value of D should be positive. Consequently, the cross-price flexibilities (e_{12}/D and $-e_{21}/D$) are negative for the case of substitutable goods. In other words, a marginal increase of the quantity of one good may have a substitution effect on the other goods, and the price of other goods should be lower to induce consumers to purchase the same quantity of the other goods.

The relationships of substitution and complement depend on the compensated cross-price flexibilities in which the level of consumer utility is fixed. Thus, in the absence of assuming a fixed utility level, the estimated cross-price flexibilities of table 1 may roughly reflect substitution of the negative sign and complement of the positive sign. For example, the figure in the last column for the price of broilers associated with the quantity of pork is -0.363 which implies that the two commodities are substitutable. A marginal 1-percent increase in the quantity of pork is associated with a -0.363-percent decrease in the price of broilers to induce consumers to purchase the same quantity of broilers. In the same column, the figure related to the quantity of other

chicken is 0.095, which may be complementary to broilers. An increase in the quantity of other chicken will cause the price for other chicken to fall. Because of the complementary relationship, if the demand for broilers is to be kept constant, the price of broilers must rise.

Similar interpretations can be applied to other estimated cross-price flexibilities. In particular, all the cross-price flexibilities of "other goods" are negative and have relatively larger absolute values than any other flexibilities in each equation. These results indicate strong substitution relationships with meats, and a marginal 1-percent increase in the "other goods" consumption induces a much larger reduction in any given meat price to keep the quantity of meats purchased constant. Although some other cross-price flexibilities may not be consistent with conventional wisdom, these estimates nevertheless reflect the monthly interdependent relationships for various meat cuts that are not explored in other empirical studies.

The middle section of each column in table 1 presents the effects of monthly price shifts on the various meat types. The seasonal shifting pattern of meat prices is similar for commodities in the same category (for example, beef) but significantly different among categories. The seasonal price pattern for beef commodities typically reaches a peak during July-August and decreases sharply in December and again in April. In contrast to beef prices, pork prices typically peak in March and then bottom-out between May-July. Broiler prices peak in July and are lowest in November. Moreover, the estimated autoregressive process, lagged up to 3 months, is significant in all cases. These results are listed at the bottom of each column.

Finally, the statistical modeling in this study combines both the structural equation approach and time series analysis of residuals. The mixed model, which combines the advantages of both approaches, should improve its forecasting ability. To verify the forecasting performance of a model, one may conduct *ex post facto* simulation or may compare the simulated values outside the sample period with actual available data. This study considers the former approach only. Because the observation of a dependent variable is stochastic, even though a model predicts perfectly well its mean value, we

might risk drawing a conclusion of inefficient forecasting if a particular sample point chosen outside the sample period is far away from its mean value. Two *ex post facto* simulations are evaluated; one follows the traditional approach of using the estimated structural model obtained from the estimation in the first step, and the other uses the final results from the estimation of the mixed model. The ratio of the root-mean-square error of forecasts to the sample mean, expressed in percentage terms, is presented in the first two columns of table 2 for each case. In the mixed model, the forecasting errors are less than 1.7 percent of the sample mean and are uniformly lower than the other model. Thus, the forecasting efficiency (shown in the last column of the table) indicates that the mixed model is relatively more efficient for all monthly meat price forecasts. This evidence strongly suggests that the mixed structural-time series model has greater potential for forecasting.

Table 2—Ratio of root mean-square-error to sample mean for meat price forecasts

Commodity	Structural model estimated by OLS (1)	Mixed structure-time series model (2)	Relative efficiency (2)/(1)x100
	Percent		
Sirloin steak	1.43	0.90	62.9
Round steak	1.66	.98	59.2
Chuck roast	2.07	1.30	62.6
Round roast	1.58	.90	57.2
Ground beef	2.07	1.23	59.5
Pork chops	1.56	1.23	78.4
Canned ham	1.80	.80	44.3
Bacon	2.37	1.62	68.4
Sausage	2.15	1.27	59.0
Broilers	1.86	1.31	70.4

Note: The ratio of root mean square error to sample mean is calculated by

$$\left[\sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - \hat{y}_t)^2 / T \right]^{1/2} / \bar{y} \times 100,$$

in which y_t is the nominal price in the demand equation, and its predicted value and sample mean are \hat{y}_t and \bar{y} respectively.

Conclusions

I have estimated a set of price-dependent demand equations for highly disaggregated meat commodities, including five beef cuts, four pork items, and broilers. The commodity classifications closely reflect the consumer's demand in the retail market. The equations depict the interrelatedness of monthly demand for meats, an area for which we have limited knowledge and an area that few empirical studies have explored.

All the estimated direct-price flexibilities for these meat commodities are statistically significant and less than 1 in absolute value. The estimated cross-price flexibilities demonstrate a certain economic interdependence for specific meat products and "other goods" in the short run. The significance of estimated cross-price flexibilities emphasizes the importance of interdependent relationships of meat demands and underscores the possible error of ignoring these relationships.

In terms of statistical modeling, a mixed structural-time series model provides both a structural explanation of meat prices and improved forecasting capability. Based on empirical results, the forecasting capability of the model is significantly better than that of the traditional structural equation approach.

References

- (1) Box, G. E. P., and G. M. Jenkins. *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*. San Francisco: Holden Day, Inc., 1970.
- (2) Gallant, A. R., and J. J. Goebel. "Nonlinear Regression with Autocorrelation Errors," *Journal of American Statistical Association*, Vol. 71, 1976, pp. 961-67.
- (3) Hayenga, M. L., and D. Hacklander. "Monthly Supply-Demand Relationships for Fed Cattle and Hogs," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 52, 1970, pp. 535-44.
- (4) Hicks, J. R. *A Revision of Demand Theory*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956.

- (5) Hotelling, H. "Demand Functions with Limited Budgets," *Econometrica*, Vol. 3, 1935, pp. 66-78.
- (6) Muth, J F. "Rational Expectations and Theory of Price Movements," *Econometrica*, Vol. 29, 1961, pp. 315-35
- (7) Myers, L.H , J. Havlicek, and P L Henderson *Short Term Price Structure of the Hog-Pork Sector of the US* Bulletin No. 855 Lafayette, IN: Purdue Univ. Agricultural Experiment Station, 1970.
- (8) Shepherd, G S , and G.A. Futrell. *Marketing Farm Products* 7th ed. Ames, IA: Iowa State Univ. Press, 1982.
- (9) Theil, H *Theory and Measurements of Consumer Demand*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam. North-Holland, 1976
- (10) Waugh, F V *Demand and Price Analysis* TB-1316. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ Res. Serv , 1964
- (11) Wold, H. "A Synthesis of Pure Demand Analysis, III," *Skandinaviske Akquavietidskrift*, Vol. 27, 1944, pp. 60-120.

In Earlier Issues

For many types of assets in most manufacturing processes both the salvage value and the use interval are known and the decision-makers have little difficulty in using net investment data to calculate the rate of return needed for proposed investments. For other types of business, particularly single proprietorships, the use interval is uncertain because of the operator's incomplete knowledge of his future willingness or ability to operate the firm for as long as implied by the specified planning period. In such instances, he needs to form estimates on the value of the asset at interim time intervals because of the possibility that he may cease to operate the firm and that the value of the asset may at that time be subject to test on the market.

Gordon E Rodewald, Jr , and C.B. Baker
 April 1969, Vol. 21, No 2
