



**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](mailto: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.*

G.52

GIANNINI FOUNDATION OF  
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
LIBRARY

Report No.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

FARM ECONOMICS BRANCH, KING'S COLLEGE  
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE



PIG MANAGEMENT SURVEY -  
OUTPUT and COSTS

---

Final Report

---

A.W. Tansey B.Sc. (Agric.)

W. Baldwin, Dip. Agric.

---

The Department thanks the co-operating farmers who provided the detailed information on which this report is based.

Comments and inquiries concerning the contents should be addressed to:-

The Provincial Agricultural Economist,  
Department of Agricultural Economics,  
King's College,  
8, Kensington Terrace,  
Newcastle upon Tyne, 2.

July 1956

Tel. N/c 29727

SCOPE and AIMS The Pigs Management Survey carried out by this Department was begun in 1953 and continued during 1954 and 1955. It was undertaken after a general survey of pig-keeping in Northumberland and Durham\*, which disclosed, amongst other things, that

- (i) By 1952, in line with the national trend, pigs had rapidly assumed a prominent place in the farming of the two counties, the increase in pig numbers being especially marked from 1947 onwards.
- (ii) More than half the pig-keeping farmers consulted in 1953 had only become commercially interested in this branch of husbandry during the post-war years, in response to price and other inducements then offered to encourage expansion in pig-keeping.
- (iii) There was considerable diversity between farms in such matters as the numbers, breeds and crosses of pigs kept; in the type of pigs being sold; in methods of housing, and of feeding.
- (iv) In a pronounced majority of the cases surveyed, pig-keeping had been undertaken as a supplementary farm enterprise, with a minimum of disturbance to general farming systems, and without substantial capital outlay on pig accommodation and other equipment.

It was also noted at that time (1953) that, while the rapid growth in pig-keeping had occurred under conditions of guaranteed (fixed) prices and assured markets, with the Government as first buyer, future prospects were becoming more speculative because of (a) changes in the methods of pricing pigs and in marketing arrangements, (b) the downward trend in world markets for coarse grains and derived feeds, (c) consumer resistance to high prices for bacon and pork, and (d) the highly competitive prices at which overseas bacon was procurable.

Altogether, this changing situation strongly emphasized the importance of achieving economic efficiency in home pig-meat production.

The Pigs Management Survey was therefore undertaken in the hope that it would provide reliable data on the achievements of typical commercial pig-keepers on those aspects of management on which economically successful, i.e. financially profitable pig production depends. Comparisons provided by these surveys are one way of 'looking over the neighbour's fence'.

Within the scope of individual management, the factors mainly responsible for profit levels are well enough known. Approximately 70-80% of the cost of a bacon pig is accounted for by feeds. At the same time, the output of saleable pigs must carry the overheads of maintaining the breeding herd of sows and boars. Labour is a relatively light element in total costs, given a well-arranged layout of farrowing and feeding accommodation, and particularly where the scale of pig-keeping is fitted to the general work programme on the farm.

It follows therefore, that the principal matters on which information should be sought are the numbers of pigs produced per litter and the frequency of farrowing; the amounts and costs of feed consumed in relation to growth rates (food conversion ratios) and details of such additional costs as labour, capital charges and miscellaneous items.

---

\* Reported in bulletin G 45, Pigs in Northumberland and Durham.

Getting reliable factual information on these matters from farms where pigs are only one of a farmer's interests, has not been as successful as was hoped.

At the outset of the Survey, plans were made to enlist the co-operation of about sixty farmers commercially interested in pig-keeping, concentrating as far as possible on those either feeding in-bought weaners or store pigs to bacon weights, or running breeding sows whose progeny were fed on the farm. The information to be collected from each farm comprised:-

- (i) Inventories and valuations of (a) breeding stock and (b) fattening stock, at the beginning and end of the accounting years.
- (ii) Weekly (or monthly) records of (a) numbers, prices, and weights of pigs bought, sold, or transferred between breeding and fattening stock,
  - (b) births and deaths of pigs,
  - (c) weight, kinds and costs of food fed to
    - (i) breeding stock, (ii) fattening stock,
- (iii) Records of labour charges and miscellaneous expenses such as veterinary services, medicines, water, electricity, and rental and grazing charges where applicable.

Accurate recording of these details would seem to be too difficult on most farms, and many of those originally enrolled in the Survey withdrew after a short period. Further withdrawals, for one reason and another, during the investigation finally reduced the numbers of useable records to less than 30 farms, distributed as follows:-

TABLE 1. NUMBERS OF PARTICIPATING FARMS

	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>
Northumberland	9	5
Durham	5	3
Cumberland	9	19
Westmorland	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	<u>24</u>	<u>28</u>

Over the whole sample, the useable records were not sufficiently detailed to make it possible to determine an average cost, or a farm to farm range of cost, "per baconer", "per porker", "per weaner", or "per sow". To get such figures it is necessary to know the movements and transfers of pigs between the separate categories and to keep correct details of the feeding and other costs attributable to the different groups of pigs. Admittedly this is not an easy matter on farms where pigs are housed in various places around the steading. The weighing of foods is not normal routine and, particularly where pigs and other stock are fed from a common supply, the quantities fed to the pigs are often rather loosely estimated. Periodic weighing of the pigs themselves is quite uncommon. Although most pig-keepers tend to concentrate on a particular line of production such as baconers, or porkers, or weaners, or a simple combination of two or more of these categories, it is common experience to find changes of policy occurring, in

the short run, in response to changes in market prices, either of fat or store pigs, and of pig feeds. The result is that over a period of accounting, the output of the pig enterprise as a whole can only be described as "mixed".

To compare results from enterprises which varied greatly in size, as well as in composition of output, the basis used is "COSTS INCURRED PER £100 OUTPUT". This output\*, divided into £100 units, will have a different make-up on every farm. On one farm, for example, it may consist almost wholly of bacon pigs; on another it may be partly baconers and partly porkers; on another it may include weaners, store pigs, baconers and porkers, and so on. Later in the report (pages 8 and 9) it has been possible to include figures from smaller groups of farms on which straightforward fattening of weaners was costed. The results from these smaller samples are given on a "per pig" basis, but because of the limited number of farms concerned it would be unwise to regard the results as anything more than suggestive of the general level of profitability per baconer.

GENERAL RESULTS For convenience of presentation the costs incurred in producing £100 output have been averaged over all farms in the sample (Table 2). It will be shown later that there was a wide range round the average and the average itself has therefore little significance as a guide to the efficiency of management of particular pig enterprises. At the same time it gives a broad indication of the general level of profitability of "pig production" during the period covered by the Survey. Extracts from similar surveys in other parts of the country are quoted later to show that the results achieved by this sample of north country pig feeders were closely in line with those obtained in other areas.

TABLE 2.

AVERAGE COSTS INCURRED IN PRODUCING £100 OUTPUT

		24 Farms in 1954		28 Farms in 1955	
				<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>
				£. s.	£. s.
FOODS: Home-grown:	Cereals			25.17.	13.16.
	Others			2. 2.	12.
Bought:	Concentrates			43. 5.	55. 0.
	Other			<u>13.</u>	<u>1. 1.</u>
Total Foods				71.17.	70. 9.
LABOUR	... ..			7.15.	8.14.
OTHER COSTS	... ..			<u>2. 8.</u>	<u>2.16.</u>
TOTAL COSTS	... ..			82. 0.	81.19.
PROFIT	... ..			<u>18. 0.</u>	<u>18. 1.</u>

\* Output = Sales of stock less Purchases, adjusted for increase or decrease in valuation at end of year.

TABLE 3

INDIVIDUAL COST ITEMS AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL COSTS

Average for 24 Farms in 1954,				28 Farms in 1955	
				1954	1955
				%	%
FOODS:	Home-grown:	Cereals		33	17
		Other		2	1
	Bought:	Concentrates		51	67
		Other		1	1
Total Foods				87	86
LABOUR	...	...	...	10	11
OTHER COSTS	...	...	...	3	3
TOTAL COSTS	...	...	...	100	100

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL PROFITS/£100 OUTPUT

	Losses	Profit £0-10	£10-20	£20-30	£30-40	Over £40
1954	3	4	5	7	3	2
1955	4	2	5	10	5	2

  

	1954	1955
Highest Profit per £100 Output	£41.19s.	£56. 5s.
Lowest " " " "	- £12. 0s.	- £45. 1s.
Average " " " "	£18. 0s.	£18. 1s.

The costs shown in Table 2 do not include any share of general farm overhead expenses and no charge has been made for straw used for bedding, nor has any credit been made for the value of manure produced. Home-grown foods have been charged at their estimated market value. Thus, unless in exceptional cases actual costs of producing home-grown foods were high\*, an element of profit is attributed to the crop rather than to the pigs.

Direct comparison of the results for 1954 and 1955 is not advisable, since apparent changes in the average costs of producing £100 output are attributable more to changes in the sample of farms than to changes in farm policies or in prices. For instance, while comparison of the annual averages suggests that bought food formed a higher proportion of total food costs in 1955 than in 1954 (Table 3), an explanation may be found in the fact that the 1955 sample included more farms which used mainly bought foods.

Records for ten farms were obtained during both years and a separate calculation has been made of the average results for these farms. While these ten farms are in no way representative of all farms keeping pigs and their results cannot be taken as measuring the economic position of pig-keeping in general, it is nevertheless interesting to see the changes which have occurred during the two years on these farms.

\* Home-grown foods were not costed in this investigation.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE COSTS INCURRED IN PRODUCING £100 OUTPUT  
FOR AN IDENTICAL SAMPLE OF 10 FARMS in 1954 & 1955

	1954	1955
	£. s.	£. s.
FOODS: Home-Grown: Cereals	24.16.	29. 2.
Other	2.12.	1. 5.
Bought: Concentrates	44. 5.	39.11.
Other	-	-
TOTAL FOODS	71.13.	69.18.
LABOUR	8. 3.	9. 7.
OTHER COSTS	2.13.	2. 4.
TOTAL COSTS	82. 9.	81. 9.
PROFIT	17.11.	18.11.

TABLE 6

INDIVIDUAL COST ITEMS AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL COSTS.  
AVERAGES FOR AN IDENTICAL SAMPLE OF 10 FARMS IN  
1954 and 1955

	1954	1955
	%	%
FOODS: Home-Grown: Cereals	31	35
Others	4	2
Bought; Concentrates	52	49
Other	-	-
Total Foods	87	86
LABOUR	10	11
OTHER COSTS	3	3
TOTAL COSTS	100	100

The total output of the ten farms was £23,266 in 1954 and £25,986 in 1955.

The main conclusion to be drawn from the results, both for the whole sample of farms and for the identical sample, is that, while there were considerable variations in the composition both of output and of production costs between individual farms, the general structure of costs and the general relationship between output and total costs remained steady.

Food costs amounted on average, to over 85% of total direct costs, and economy in feeding provides the greatest opportunity for increasing the efficiency of production. The distribution of food costs per £100 output through the sample, shown in the table below, illustrates the wide variation in feeding costs which exists.

TABLE 7. DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD COSTS PER £100 OUTPUT  
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE in 1954 and 1955

	No. of Farms with Food Cost per £100 Output					
	Below £50	£50-60	B e t w e e n		£80-90	Over £90
			£60-70	£70-80		
1954	3	3	6	6	3	3
1955	3	5	6	10	-	4



Another measure of efficiency in feeding is the quantity of meal being fed in order to produce a one pound increase in live weight (the conversion ratio). This calculation has been made for nine farms in 1954 and thirteen in 1955.

The average food conversion ratio on the nine farms in 1954 was 4.2 lbs. of food per 1 lb. of live weight increase and on the thirteen in 1955, 4.3 lbs. of food per 1 lb. live weight increase. The cost per pound of the meal used and the value of the live weight increase produced should, of course, always be considered in conjunction with the conversion ratio. In other words, the conversion ratio, by itself, is only a measure of the physical efficiency of the pigs as converters of feeds into meat. Economic efficiency involves the question of financial cost and return. Under some circumstances of food and pig prices, a cheaper food mixture may give a lower food cost per £100 output in spite of an increase in the quantity of food used to obtain a given live weight increase. Again, a system of feeding giving a higher conversion ratio may produce a better graded carcass (thus increasing the value of the live weight increase), the increase in the return being greater than the increase in total food cost.

GRADING RESULTS  
 Another important consideration in profit making is the marketing aspect. During the two years under review the system of marketing changed from Ministry control and guaranteed prices to free marketing with deficiency payments (an average level of returns only being guaranteed) with individual sales free to vary above a certain minimum level. Since the end of controlled marketing there have been very considerable fluctuations in the market prices of bacon pigs, porkers and store pigs and the farmer's decision on the most suitable type of production for his own particular circumstances was made more difficult. Most of the farms co-operating in the Pig Management Survey were concerned mainly with the production of bacon pigs.

For bacon pigs, the increasing importance of carcass quality, in the face of overseas competition, has been reflected in the differential payments made in relation to carcass grading.

The average grading results for 17 farms in 1954 and for 22 farms in 1955 are shown below.

TABLE 8. AVERAGE GRADING RESULTS FOR BACON PIGS

	<u>17 Farms in 1954</u>	<u>22 Farms in 1955</u>
	%	%
Bacon Pigs graded A	66	64
B	27	23
C	5	9
L	-	1
F	1	2
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

These results are in line with, though slightly below, the results for 6,525 bacon pigs of all breeds, the gradings of which are reported from the National Pig Records Scheme for 1954/55.

% Grade A	68.1
B	23.1
C	6.8
L	0.4
F	0.8
Other	0.8

**LITTERS** In the breeding section of the pig enterprise it is necessary for maximum profit-making for each sow to have large litters as often as possible. It has been suggested that two litters a year with eight or more pigs reared in each litter should be the aim. In 1954 fifteen of the farms co-operating in the investigation had an average farrowing rate of 1.8 litters per sow per year and nineteen farms in 1955 had an average rate of 1.5 litters per sow per year. The average number of pigs reared in each litter was 7.5 in 1954 (18 farms) and 8.7 in 1955 (19 farms). The average number born was 9.5 and 11.1 pigs respectively. From these results it may be inferred that on most of the farms concerned, some improvement is possible in the number of litters born per sow each year and in the rate of mortality up to weaning.

**GENERAL CONCLUSION** The Survey has shown that a very wide range exists in the composition both of output and of costs, and in the resulting profits from pig keeping on the farms surveyed. There is no reason to doubt that this situation is general.

The results indicate that there are many ways in which pigs may be managed, often with profit, sometimes otherwise, and that on most farms there is one or other aspect of management in which improvement could readily be made, given the will and the determination to seek out the reasons for unsatisfactory results.

It is clear, however, that on many farms a first need is an accurate record of what is happening, in respect of farrowings, litter sizes, growth rates, food consumption and so on. Without knowledge of the facts, the causes of unprofitable production are likely to pass undetected and the unprofitable production to continue. Examination and appraisal of the factors leading to greater efficiency demands accurate knowledge of the facts, and careful recording to this end can be well repaid. Technical and economic advice, both readily available through the Advisory Services, can only be effectively given in cases where the essential facts are known.

**FATTENING PIGS** In addition to the main scheme of the Pig Management Survey, costs were recorded on a few farms for batches of fattening pigs. These comprised in 1954, 128 pigs on 6 farms and in 1955, 275 pigs on 3 farms. The results are summarised below with the usual caution against attaching too much significance to results from small samples.

The unweighted average costs and returns for a fat pig were as follows:-

TABLE 9. AVERAGE COSTS and RETURNS FOR FATTENING PIGS

	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>
	£. s.	£. s.
Return on Fat Pig ... ..	17.18.	18.17.
Cost of Store Pig ... ..	<u>6.19.</u>	<u>7.12.</u>
Gross Margin ... ..	<u>10.19.</u>	<u>11. 5.</u>
Costs:		
Foods: Home-Grown; Cereals	1. 7.	1.11
Bought: Concentrates	<u>5.17.</u>	<u>6.14.</u>
Total Foods ... ..	7. 4.	8.. 5.
Labour ... ..	15.	12.
Other Costs ... ..	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total ... ..	<u>8. 1.</u>	<u>9.. 2.</u>
Net Margin ... ..	<u>2.18</u>	<u>2. 3.</u>

\* \* \* \* \*

OTHER SURVEYS Further information on the economics of pig production may be found in the reports of other University Departments of Agricultural Economics where investigations have recently been made.

The following extracts from recently published reports illustrate the type of information available. The methods of investigation used are comparable with those used at Newcastle but on points of detail reference to the reports concerned is advisable.

Report No. 93 of The University of Bristol Department of Economics at Newton Abbot\* reviews the results of a study of pig production in south-west England in 1954-55. Table 8 of the report gives details of average costs and margins for groups of farms having three different systems of production.

#### Costs and Margins by System of Production

	Per £100 of Output		
	Breeding & Fattening	Purchasing & Fattening	Selling Stores and Weaners
No. of Farms	42	14	6
Food Costs	£ 69.8	£ 68.6	£ 74.5
Labour Costs	6.4	5.0	13.1
Other Costs	3.4	2.2	6.1
Total Costs	79.6	75.8	93.7
Margin	20.4	24.2	6.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Margin per Baconer	£4.2s.	£2.18s.	

\* An Economic Analysis of Pig Production on South-Western Farms 1954-55 by Estelle Burnside, N.D.D., C.D.D. (Hons.) and W.M. Strong, M.A. Price 2/6d.

In the same year, 1954/55, the financial results of 46 pig herds were studied by the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Reading. An analysis of the results of the herds grouped according to their main item of production is given in Table 1 of a report, Miscellaneous Cost Studies No. 32\*. Part of this table is reproduced below.

Financial Results of 46 Pig Herds. (Gross Output = £100)

	Herds producing mainly weaners	Herds producing mainly pork	Herds producing mainly bacon	All Herds
Number of Herds	14	13	19	46
	£	£	£	£
Purchased Feed	69.5	67.2	62.1	65.7
Home-grown Feed	7.1	9.3	7.8	8.0
Labour	14.1	8.5	8.1	10.1
Other Costs	6.0	3.2	3.6	4.2
Total Costs	96.7	88.2	81.6	88.0
Surplus	3.3	11.8	18.4	12.0

Another recent publication is Farmers' Report No. 127\*\* of the Economics Section of Leeds University Department of Agriculture. Here the results of nine Yorkshire farms are considered and Table II of the report gives the following details of costs per £100 output.

Costs per £100 Gross Output from Pigs

	Average of 9 farms	
	Costs per £100 Gross Output	Percentage Total Cost
	£. s. d.	%
Purchased Foods	54.12. 6.	70.2
Home-grown Foods	12.13. 0.	16.3
Labour	7.11. 0.	9.7
Other Costs	3. 0. 0.	3.8
Total Costs	77.16. 6.	100.0
Surplus	22. 3. 6.	
	100. 0. 0.	

These extracts confirm the broad similarity in the achievements of pig-keepers in different parts of the country. All the reports also bear witness to the fact that the wide differences between farm and farm that have been shown to occur amongst the north country farms, have their parallels elsewhere.

\* Some Economic Aspects of Pig Production 1954-55. By D.S. Thornton. Price 2/-

\*\* Costs and Returns from Keeping Pigs on Nine Yorkshire Farms 1954-5. Price 2/-.

A P P E N D I X I

INDIVIDUAL FARM RESULTS IN  
DESCENDING ORDER OF OUTPUT

1 9 5 5

Farm Code No.	DIRECT COSTS INCURRED PER £100 OUTPUT									
	OUTPUT	F e e d s					Labour	Other Costs	Total	Profit
		Home-Grown		Bought		Total				
		Cereals	Other	Conc.	Other					
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>										
	£.s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.
724	17282.0	4.13.	-	86. 4	-	90.17.	9. 2	3. 6.	103. 5	-3. 5.
730	9223. 4	-	-	29. 0	6.17	35.17	5. 1	2.17	43.15	56. 5.
517	6840.17.	33.19.	-	38. 4	-	72. 3	5.18	2.10	80.11	19. 9
738	5591. 7	-	-	72. 4	-	72. 4	2. 7	2.12	77. 3	22.17.
524	4609.17.	25. 9	1. 4.	33.18	-	60.11	3. 1	1.11	65. 3	34.17
2	4248. 1	27. 4.	1. 4.	28.11.	-	56.19.	3.18	2. 1	62.18	37. 2
703	3352. 9.	-	-	59.18.	-	59.18.	3.11	2. 4	65.13	34. 7
75	3181. 5	50.15.	11.	25.16	-	77. 2	11. 8	1. 0	89.10	10.10
702	2804.19	46.17	-	31.11.	-	78. 8	5.14	2.15	86.17	13. 3
722	2468. 6	-	2. 5	123.11	-	125.16	11.19	7. 6	145. 1	-45. 1
387	2307.12	43.18	1. 6	14. 0	-	59. 4	8.11	4.10	72. 5	27.15.
801	2243.13	27. 9	-	32.12	-	60. 1	14. 6	5. 2	77. 9	20.11
727	1998. 1	-	-	57. 2	-	57. 2	3.16	1. 2	62. 0	38. 0
605	1691.19	-	-	71. 4	-	71. 4	5. 6	4. 4	80.14	19. 6
735	1495.18	-	-	65.16	-	65.16	11. 9	1.14	78.18	21. 2.
740	1293.11	-	-	47.13.	-	47.13	18.11	9. 1	75. 5	24.15
717	1283. 7	-	-	95. 5	-	95. 5	11. 5	1. 5	107.15	-7.15.
726	1073. 2	-	-	70. 8	-	70. 8	5.18	9	76.15	23. 5
741	1008.13	-	-	72. 2	-	72. 2	8. 6	1.14	82. 2	17.18.
708	689. 8	7.17	2. 3	34. 7	-	44. 7	8. 2	2.14	55. 3	44.17.
704	675. 9	23. 6	15	49.19	-	74. 0	15. 1	2.14	91.15	8. 5
734	541.15	-	-	67. 6	-	67. 6	4.14	18.	72.18	27. 2
736	461.18	18. 9	1. 2	40.15	-	60. 6	12. 2	3.17	76. 5	23.15
804	418.19	17. 4	-	40.17	-	58. 1	11.12	6.10	76. 3	23.17
707	239.19	58.19	6.10	12.10	-	77.19	20.17	17	99.13	7.
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>										
713	819. 9	-	-	75.18	-	75.18	3. 2	8	79. 8	20.12
712	470.10.	-	-	102.10	22.19	125. 9	11. 1	2. 3	138.13	-38.13
733	270. 9	-	-	61. 7	-	61. 7	7.15	11	69.13	30. 7

Farm Code No.	OUTPUT	INDIVIDUAL COST ITEMS AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL DIRECT COST						
		F e e d s				Total	Labour	Other Costs
		Home-Grown		Bought				
		Cereals	Other	Conc.	Other			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>								
724	17282.0	4	-	84	-	88	9	3
730	9223.4	-	-	66	16	82	12	6
517	6840.17	42	-	47	-	89	7	4
738	5591.7	-	-	94	-	94	3	3
524	4609.17	39	2	52	-	93	5	2
2	4248.1	43	2	46	-	91	6	3
703	3352.9	-	-	91	-	91	5	4
75	3181.5	56	1	29	-	86	13	1
702	2804.19	54	-	36	-	90	7	3
722	2468.6	-	2	85	-	87	8	5
387	2307.12	61	2	19	-	82	12	6
801	2243.13	35	-	41	-	76	18	6
727	1998.1	-	-	92	-	92	6	2
605	1691.19	-	-	88	-	88	7	5
735	1495.18	-	-	83	-	83	15	2
740	1293.11	-	-	63	-	63	25	12
717	1283.7	-	-	88	-	88	11	1
726	1073.2	-	-	92	-	92	7	1
741	1008.13	-	-	88	-	88	10	2
708	689.8	14	4	62	-	80	15	5
704	675.9	25	1	55	-	81	16	3
734	541.15	-	-	92	-	92	7	1
736	461.18	24	2	53	-	79	16	5
804	418.19	23	-	53	-	76	15	9
707	239.19	59	7	12	-	78	21	1
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>								
713	819.9	-	-	95	-	95	4	1
712	470.10	-	-	74	16	90	8	2
733	270.9	-	-	88	-	88	11	1

1955

Farm Code No.	Breeding Stock		Fattening Stock	Grading Results						% Fat Pigs sold as Baconers	
	Litters per sow per year	Av. No. born in litter	Av. No. reared	Conversion Ratio	% A	% B	% C	% L	% F		% Other
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>											
724	1.2	9.4	7.5	-	79	18	3	-	-	-	80
730	1.4	11.1	9.2	-	87	10	1	2	-	-	92
517	1.6	9.3	8.2	5.00	53	33	10	-	2	2	73
738	-	-	-	4.07	67	23	9	-	1	-	94
524	1.4	8.6	8.3	4.26	41	33	20	-	2	4	86
2	1.4	10.6	8.8	-	64	26	7	-	1	2	85
703	1.5	14.1	11.3	3.86	93	7	-	-	-	-	75
75	1.3	11.3	6.0	-	35	36	23	-	5	1	75
702	1.6	10.7	5.1	3.65	48	37	12	-	-	3	81
722	1.9	9.4	7.0	-	62	23	15	-	-	-	9
387	1.5	11.0	9.0	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	54
801	2.0	11.9	7.9	3.85	*	*	*	*	*	*	80
727	*	*	*	3.51	87	3	5	4	1	-	100
605	1.8	10.5	8.8	-	48	43	9	-	-	-	57
735	1.3	12.8	11.0	3.72	73	25	2	-	-	-	76
740	1.0	11.0	11.0	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	2
717	1.2	17.0	10.0	5.37	61	25	8	-	-	6	97
726	1.7	9.0	7.5	5.07	74	21	5	-	-	-	90
741	*	*	*	3.70	88	12	-	-	-	-	98
708	1.5	11.9	8.8	-	No fat pigs					-	
704	2.1	12.2	9.4	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	78
734	-	-	-	-	72	14	14	-	-	-	78
736	-	-	-	-	77	8	15	-	-	-	46
804	0.7	10.0	10.0	3.78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
707	-	-	-	-	11	33	11	-	45	-	27
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>											
713	-	-	-	6.16	59	30	11	-	-	-	97
712	-	-	-	-	29	39	24	8	-	-	82
733	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	24

INDIVIDUAL FARM RESULTS IN  
DESCENDING ORDER OF OUTPUT

1 9 5 4

Farm Code No.	DIRECT COSTS INCURRED PER £100 OUTPUT										
	OUTPUT		F e e d s				Labour	Other Costs	Total	Profit	
			Home-Grown		Bought						Total
	Cereals	Other	Conc.	Other	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total		
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>											
	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.
517	5342. 1	37.10	-	37.17	-	75. 7	6.12	2. 5	84. 4	15.16.	
126	4880. 1	39. 1.	-	29. 1.	-	68. 2	11.18	3.13.	83.13	16. 7.	
703	3151.10.	-	9.	72. 0.	-	72. 9	3. 4.	3. 4.	78.17	21. 3.	
524	3088. 0	-	3.13.	82.11.	-	86. 4	4.14	2.11	93. 9	6.11	
75	2943. 3	47. 5	-	33.14	-	80.19	11.17	2.15	95.11	4. 9	
702	2380. 9	28. 1	1. 9	46.16	-	76. 6	13. 1	3.17	93. 4	6.16	
387	2229. 8	42.15	2.10	12.16	-	58. 1	7.14	4.10	70. 5	29.15	
717	2191.16	-	-	66.16	-	66.16	5.16	16	73. 8	26.12	
713	1752. 3	-	-	73. 7	-	73. 7	2. 4	10	76. 1	23.19	
145	1393. 7	13.16	1. 2	86.10	-	101. 8	10. 8	4	112. 0	-12. 0	
712	916. 1	-	-	62. 7	15.13	78. 0	9.12	1. 4	88.16	11. 4	
704	862. 3	28. 6	3. 5	35.12	-	67. 3	9.15	2.18	79.16	20. 4	
709	851. 7	2.16	-	91.10	-	94. 6	4. 5	5. 3	103.14	- 3.14.	
215	790. 4	15.17	-	37.14	-	53.11	9. 3	5.18	68.12	31. 8	
478	706.19	29.12	-	20. 7	-	49.19	7.15	1.18	59.12	40. 8.	
708	660.15	24. 6	7.16	54. 9	-	86.11	7. 5	1.16	95.12	4. 8	
705	239. 1	15. 7	4. 2	48.13	-	68. 2	10. 8	2.19	81. 9	18.11	
254	176.16	93. 5	13	8.11	-	102. 9	7.16	-	110. 5	-10. 5.	
707	416.14	39.17	6.18	-	-	46.15	11.10	1.19	60. 4	39.16	
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>											
2	1691. 2	30.11	-	27. 7	-	57.18	4.17	1. 3	63.18	36. 2	
63	1524.18	31. 8	8.14	6. 1	7.46	10	9.15	1.16	58. 1	41.19	
113	1310.11	35. 0	10. 5	33. 6	-	78.11	4. 1	1. 8	84. 0	16. 0	
214	915.10	52. 6	-	17. 2	-	69. 8	5.11	6	75. 5	24.15	
605	834.13	13. 5	-	53. 4	-	66. 9	6.12	5. 2	78. 3	21.17	



1954

Farm Code No.	OUTPUT	INDIVIDUAL COST ITEMS AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL DIRECT COST						
		F e e d s				Total	Labour	Other Costs
		Home-Grown		Bought				
		Cereals	Other	Conc.	Other			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>								
	£. s.							
517	5342. 1	44	-	45	-	89	8	3
126	4880. 1	47	-	35	-	82	14	4
703	3151.10.	-	1	91	-	92	5	3
524	3088. 0.	-	4	88	-	92	5	3
75	2943. 3	49	-	36	-	85	12	3
702	2380. 9	30	2	50	-	82	14	4
387	2229. 8.	62	3	18	-	83	11	6
717	2191.16	-	-	91	-	91	8	1
713	1752. 3	-	-	96	-	96	3	1
145	1393. 7	13	1	77	-	91	9	-
712	916. 1.	-	-	70	18	88	11	1
704	862. 3.	36	4	45	-	85	11	4
709	851. 7.	3	-	88	-	91	4	5
215	790. 4.	23	-	55	-	78	13	9
478	706.19	50	-	34	-	84	13	3
708	660.15.	25	8	57	-	90	8	2
707	416.14.	66	12	-	-	78	19	3
705	239. 1	19	5	59	-	83	13	4
254	176.16.	84	1	8	-	93	7	-
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>								
2	1691. 2.	48	-	43	-	91	7	2
63	1524.18.	54	15	10	1	80	17	3
113	1210.11.	42	12	40	-	94	5	1
214	915.10	69	-	23	-	92	7	1
605	834.13	17	-	68	-	85	8	7

Farm Code No.	Breeding Stock		Fattening Stock	Grading Results						% Fat Pigs Sold as Baconers	
	Litters per sow per year	Av. No. born in Litter	Av. No. Reared	Conversion Ratio	% A	% B	% C	% L	% F		% Other
<u>Full Year Accounts</u>											
517	1.8	9.6	9.0	4.65	66	20	10	-	3	1	62
126	-	-	-	-	51	30	16	-	3	-	55
703	2.2	9.8	7.7	4.02	80	18	1	-	1	-	70
524	1.8	9.0	8.4	4.23	73	18	6	-	3	-	81
75	2.1	11.1	6.8	-	56	34	10	-	-	-	56
702	0.9	10.2	4.1	3.95	63	26	4	-	-	7	68
387	1.6	9.2	7.9	*	*						92
717	1.5	10.7	10.7	4.44	70	22	3	-	-	5	65
713	1.8	8.4	7.2	3.81	78	18	3	-	1	-	96
145	-	-	-	-	*						47
712	-	-	-	-	71	17	12	-	-	-	48
704	1.5	8.1	7.3	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	48
709	2.3	9.0	8.1	3.61	67	27	-	-	-	6	55
215	2.1	9.5	7.8	-	*						56
478	1.5	9.6	9.3	-	*						20
708	1.5	9.6	9.3	-	*						20
707	-	-	-	-	63	32	5	-	-	-	63
705	2.1	12.7	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
254	2.0	5.7	3.1	-	33	67	-	-	-	-	67
<u>Part-Year Accounts</u>											
2				-							
63	-	-	-	3.90	72	20	4	-	-	4	61
113	-	10	8.3	-	75	25	-	-	-	-	43
214	-	9.2	7.7	-	81	16	3	-	-	-	75
605	-	10.6	9.4	4.98	50	33	9	-	8	-	92

A P P E N D I X I I

The following tables form an Agreed Supplement prepared according to the principles agreed by the Informal Commodity Group on Pigs.

TABLE I. COSTS PER £100 OUTPUT

(a) Whole sample

Feed	Labour	Miscellaneous	Surplus	Total	No. Herds
£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£	
68.11.	8. 6	2.11.	20.12	100	19

(b) Distribution of annual results

Average of Farms in -

Category	Top qtr.	2nd qtr.	3rd qtr.	Bottom qtr.
	by profit			
	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.	£. s.
Feed	56.13	63. 1.	69.11	88.19
Labour	5. 5.	8.12.	7. 5.	13. 3.
Miscell.	1.12.	3. 4.	3. 4.	2. 2.
Surplus	36.10.	25. 3.	20. 0.	- 4. 4.
Total	100. 0.	100. 0.	100. 0.	100. 0.
No. Herds	5	5	5	4

TABLE II. MANAGEMENT FACTORS

(a) Breeding Herd

No.  
Herds

No. Litters per Sow per Year	...	...	1.6	11
No. Weaners per Litter	...	...	8.7	11
Cost of Food per Sow	...	...	£47. 0s.	11
Cost of Food per Weaner	...	...	£3.14s.	11

(b) Fattening Herd. "All meal" Herds

Fattening Conversion Rate	...	...	4.08	10
Cost of Food per lb. live weight increase	...	...	14.2d.	10

TABLE III. REVENUE FACTORS

Type of Herd Factor	All Meal
Revenue per Score Liveweight	£. s. d.
(a) Baconers	1.18. 6.
(b) Porkers	1.12. 8.
% of Total Sales by Numbers	
(a) Baconers	54
(b) Porkers	25
(c) Stores, etc.	21
Total	100

