

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.

Profitability in Marketing Bred Heifers in Alabama

Brittney Goodrich Ken Kelley Max Runge

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Alabama Cooperative Extension System Auburn University

> April 6, 2018 SCC-76 Annual Meeting Kansas City, MO

Alabama Cattle Production

- Beef cattle sales: \$450 million in 2016
 - 2nd in AL agricultural receipts (#1 is poultry)
 - 31st in U.S.
- 12th in U.S. for % of farms with beef cattle
 - 41% of total farm operations in AL
 - $\bullet~87\%$ of AL cattle operations have ${<}50$ head
- Many small cow-calf operations
 - Sell to stocker or feedlots in Midwest

Background	Data	Empirical Model	Estimation Results	Conclusion
Motivatior	1			

- Extension agents and specialists objectives:
 - Create opportunities and education to increase profitability for cattle producers in AL
- 1999: ACES began hosting the Herdbuilder Replacement Female Sale
 - Partnership with producers
 - Goal: Create value-added for heifers in comparison to steers in their cohort
 - Annual event with biennial training
- 2017 training: What characteristics add value when marketing bred heifers?



- Many studies use Hedonic models to explain value of cattle characteristics
 - Feeder cattle: Coatney, Menkhaus, and Schmitz (1996), Williams et al. (2012), Zimmerman et al. (2012), Schulz, Dhuyvetter, and Doran (2015), Blank, Saitone and Sexton (2016), Mallory et al. (2016) many more
 - Bulls: Dhuyvetter et al. (1996), Vestal et al. (2013)
 - Cow-Calf Pairs: Parcell, Schroeder, Hiner (1995)
 - Bred cows: Mitchell, Peel and Brorsen (2017)

- 2008-2017 data from annual Herdbuilder Replacement Female Sale
 - Every August in Uniontown, AL
- Unbalanced panel:
 - 749 pens of 3-5 bred heifers
 - 61 producers
- Dataset provides additions to literature:
 - Relatively disaggregated data
 - Additional positives: No spatial, seasonal, or age effects to account for
 - Can explore producer reputation effects (Maybe?)
 - Many unknowns for buyer: first calf, no contractual guarantees

Individual Heifer Characteristics

- Sale Order
- Breed Code (Ex: SSSS, AAAS)
- Color
- Calving Range (Ex: Oct. 20-Jan. 15)
- Breeding: Artificial Insemination (AI) vs Conventional
- Per Heifer Price
 - Same for all heifers in pen so need to aggregate

Aggregate Pen Characteristics

- Same across heifers in pen: Sale Order, Breeding Al vs Conv., Per Heifer Price
- Calving Range:
 - Range: Average number of days
 - Months until beginning of calving range: Average for pen
- Pen color:
 - Black vs. non-black
 - Non-black: \leq 50% black heifers
 - Same vs. Mixed

Aggregate Pen Characteristics

• Breed Influence:

- >0% in pen
- Hereford, Brahman, Simmental, Angus

• (Somewhat) Specific Breed Mixes:

- 50% Hereford, 50% Brahman
- \geq 75% Brangus
- \geq 75% Angus
- \geq 75% Angus with Simmental Influence
- \geq 75% Simmental with Angus Influence

Background	Data	Empirical Model	Estimation Results	Conclusion
6				

Summary Statistics N=749, Years 2008-2017

Statistic	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Pen Average Price/Heifer	1,831.66	683.91	800	4,600
Breeding: Conventional (1) vs A.I. (0)	0.79	0.41	0	1
Calving Range (# Days)	85.04	17.34	24	153
Months Until Calving Begins	2.26	1.43	1	8
Sale Order	38.36	22.50	1	96
Pen Color: Same (1) vs. Mixed (0)	0.76	0.43	0	1
Color: Non-Black	0.14	0.34	0	1
50 Heref/50 Brahm	0.03	0.18	0	1
Brahman Influence	0.19	0.39	0	1
75+Brangus	0.06	0.24	0	1
75+ Angus	0.13	0.34	0	1
75+ Simmental	0.05	0.22	0	1
Angus Influence	0.83	0.38	0	1
Simmental Influence	0.59	0.49	0	1
Hereford Influence	0.10	0.30	0	1
75+ Angus × Simm Inf.	0.03	0.16	0	1
75 Simm × Angus Inf.	0.03	0.18	0	1

メロト メポト メヨト メヨト

▶ <u></u>≣ ४

Background	Data	Empirical Model	Estimation Results	Conclusion
Empirical	Model			

- Hedonic model
 - Ladd and Martin (1976): Input price=Sum of money value of input's characteristics
 - Assumption: Supply is perfectly inelastic
 - Reasonable for a given sale

$$Price_{ikt} = \beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j x_{ikjt} + YearFE + \epsilon_k + \lambda_{it}$$

- *i*=pen, *k*=producer, *t*=year, *j*=characteristic
- β_j : marginal value of j^{th} characteristic
- λ_{it} : iid random error
- ϵ_k : Errors correlated for each producer

Hypothesized Effects on Price

- Conventional breeding discounted to AI
 - Conventional less accurate
- Calving Range (# Days): Negative
- Months Until Calving Begins: Negative
 - Further out means more inputs before calf (Mitchell, Peel and Brorsen, 2017)
- Sale Order: Negative
 - Sale order roughly approximates quality
- Pen Same Color receives premium compared with Mixed
- Color: Non-Black discounted to Black (Mitchell, Peel and Brorsen, 2017)

Hypothesized Breed Effects on Price

• Brahman Influence: ???

- Feeder cattle Brahman influence receives discount (Williams et. al, 2012; Coatney et al., 1996)
- Tolerance to heat and endophyte-infected fescue increases value to Southeast producers
- Hereford Influence: Discount (Parcell et al.,1995)
- 50% Hereford/50% Brahman: Premium
 - Tigerstripe, heat tolerance increases value

Hypothesized Breed Effects on Price

- 75+ Angus: Premium (Parcell et al., 1995)
- 75+ Brangus: Premium
 - Heat tolerance combined with Angus
- 75+ Simmental: Premium
- 75+ Simmental x Angus,75+ Angus x Simm: Premium
 - Premiums for European Crosses (Coatney et al., 1996; Hawkes et al., 2008)

Background	Data	Empirical Model	Estimation Results	Conclusion

Results

Bred Heifer Hedonic Price Model with Producer Cluster-Robust Errors

	Dependent Variable: Average Price/Heifer		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Conventional Breeding	-160.90*** (46.33)	-162.79*** (46.79)	-51.59 (36.42)
Calving Range (# Days)	-1.91**`(0.79)	-1.86**`(0.81)	-1.30(0.92)
Months Until Calving Begins	-79.17*** (13.62)	-78.79*** (13.66)	-61.18^{***} (12.13)
Sale Order	-1.87***`(0.49)	-1.90***`(0.48)	-1.42***`(0.49)
Pen Same Color	18.26 (16.63)		. ,
Color: Non-Black	20.52 (22.01)		
50 Heref/50 Brahm	225.65** (88.21)	247.09*** (54.16)	242.65*** (35.90)
Brahman Inf.	-26.87 (27.63)	. ,	
75+Brangus	91.75** (̀37.52)́	78.77** (33.57)	72.43* (43.68)
75+ Angus	-121.34*** (38.70)	-120.06*** (37.46)	-53.82 (40.32)
75+ Simmental	-68.98 (52.26)	-69.47 (51.99)	-74.28 ^{**} (30.52)
Hereford	26.93 (49.24)	()	()
75+ Angus × Simm Inf.	111.94*** (43.32)	113.26*** (43.11)	20.17 (53.29)
75+ Simm × Angus Inf.	188.07** (̀77.35)́	192.48** (̀77.60)́	231.22*** (66.39)
Constant	1,735.04*** (86.48)	1,748.08 ^{***} (86.67)	1,456.51*** (114.33)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Producer FE	No	No	Yes
R ²	0.88	0.88	0.9
Adjusted R ²	0.87	0.88	0.9
Note:		*p<0.1	: ***p<0.05: ****p<0.01

Image: A matrix

æ

∃ → (∃ →

- Conventional breeding to AI: -\$163
- Calving Range (# Days): -\$2
- Months Until Calving Begins: -\$79
- Sale Order: -\$2
- 50% Hereford/50% Brahman: \$247
- 75+ Angus: -\$120
 - 75+ Angus × Simm: -\$7
 - Surprising?
- 75+ Brangus: \$79
- 75+ Simmental x Angus: \$123
- No statistically significant effect: Pen Same Color vs. Mixed, Color: Non-Black vs. Black, Brahman Influence, Hereford Influence, 75+Simmental

Reputation Effects

Producers selling 2+ years

Producer 1	104.56** (43.76)	Producer 16	80.85 (72.13)
Producer 2	32.68 (45.33)	Producer 17	-233.14*** (44.88)
Producer 3	266.56*** (46.14)	Producer 18	49.50 (42.12)
Producer 4	-47.89 (66.61)	Producer 19	-6.48 (43.56)
Producer 5	91.09* (47.52)	Producer 20	78.97 (54.55)
Producer 6	373.29*** (43.65)	Producer 21	227.11*** (59.66)
Producer 7	309.98*** (60.06)	Producer 22	-36.67 (63.96)
Producer 8	746.95*** (55.28)	Producer 23	81.53** (41.29)
Producer 9	258.99*** (41.56)	Producer 24	127.81*** (46.81)
Producer 10	414.46*** (60.59)	Producer 25	132.45 (105.95)
Producer 11	256.02*** (45.95)	Producer 26	65.44 (54.21)
Producer 12	206.97*** (38.66)		
Producer 13	158.47*** (41.77)		
Producer 14	58.93 (37.47)		
Producer 15	175.50*** (43.70)	∢ □	

Goodrich, Kelley and Runge

Background

Residual 95% CI Box Plots by Producer



Conclusions and Future Work

- Limiting calving range: effective in getting higher prices
 - Al valued significantly higher than conventional
- Tolerance to heat and/or endophyte-infected fescue seems to play a big role in this market compared with others
 - Brahman mixes receive premiums comparable or higher than Angus/Simm mixes
- Evidence of reputation effects
 - Could be additional breed effects?
 - Further investigation is necessary
- Find better methods for capturing breed effects?

Background

Data

Empirical Model

Estimation Results

Conclusion

Questions? Comments?

Thank you!

Contact: Brittney Goodrich

bkg0007@auburn.edu

Goodrich, Kelley and Runge

Significant Characteristics of Bred Cows

- Mitchell, Peel and Brorsen (2017) finding the following effects of characteristics on bred cow price:
 - Age: Negative
 - Weight: Positive but diminishing
 - Months bred: Positive
 - Highest premiums 8-month bred
 - Color: Black receives premium
 - Quality: Premiums for higher quality
 - Spatial and Seasonal differences
- USDA AMS bred cow reports
 - Aggregation across lots