The Changing Role of USDA Inventory Reports in Livestock Markets

by

Berna Karali, University of Georgia

Olga Isengildina-Massa, Virginia Tech University

Scott H. Irwin, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Forthcoming in the *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*

The Changing Role of USDA Inventory Reports in Livestock Markets

Abstract

Using traditional price volatility tests we find that the market impact of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports largely disappeared after 2000. In contrast, using market surprise tests we find no evidence that the impact of Cattle on Feed information changed significantly after 2000. The evidence is mixed for Hogs and Pigs reports using market surprise tests, with market inventory information increasing in value and breeding inventory decreasing. The contrasting results can be explained by increasing market concentration in cattle and hogs leading to smaller market surprises and smaller futures price reactions.

***Key words*:** announcement effects, cattle, concentration, futures markets, hogs, informational value, price reaction

***JEL Codes*:** D84, G14, L1, Q11, Q13

The Changing Role of USDA Inventory Reports in Livestock Markets

Introduction

The traditional argument is that public information in agricultural markets helps facilitate efficiently functioning markets, reduce information asymmetries, and inform policy and program formation, operation and evaluation processes (C-FARE 2013). United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports have been the predominant source of public information in crop and livestock markets. A large body of literature (e.g., Sumner and Mueller 1989; Fortenbery and Sumner 1993; Grunewald, McNulty, and Biere 1993; Garcia et al. 1997; Isengildina, Irwin, and Good 2006; McKenzie 2008; Karali 2012) shows that these reports generally contain substantial informational value. The bulk of the studies in this literature test for informational value using a traditional event study approach, where price volatility on report release days versus non-report days is compared. If market prices are more volatile on report release days this indicates market prices are impacted by the information (e.g., Campbell, Lo, and MacKinlay 1997).

A recent study by Isengildina-Massa et al. (2016) finds that the market impact of USDA inventory reports in livestock markets decreased substantially in the last 15 years, while the impact of inventory and production reports in crop markets generally increased during the same time period. The authors of the study argued that the decrease in market impact in livestock markets was not likely due to the emergence of new information sources such as satellite imagery and precision agriculture. Instead, the authors argued that livestock markets underwent substantial structural changes starting in the 1990s due to increased vertical integration in the supply chain, and this was likely the primary driver of changes in livestock market reaction to

USDA inventory reports. The U.S. livestock sector has in fact been particularly affected by the movement toward greater consolidation, with the four-firm concentration ratio (CR4) measuring the four largest firms' share in total slaughter increased from 36% in 1980 to 85% in 2012 for steer and heifer, and from 34% to 64% for hogs (MacDonald 2017).[1] One of the outcomes of highly concentrated markets is lower variability and higher predictability of supply as vertically coordinated companies have more control of planning production in their operations. In this environment, USDA reports of livestock inventories would presumably be less valuable.

While the logic of the market concentration explanation for declining price reaction to USDA livestock reports is compelling, this does not necessarily imply that the informational value of these reports has disappeared completely. It is possible that markets continue to react to the information contained in the reports but the reaction cannot be identified with the relatively simple price volatility tests used in much of the literature, including the Isengildina-Massa et al. (2016) study. The value of USDA information can be estimated more precisely by directly measuring informational content using "market surprise," which is the difference between USDA estimates and private analysts' expectations. As long as data on market expectations for USDA reports are available, this approach allows a better identification of new information contained in the reports and the response of market price to USDA reports (e.g., Colling and Irwin 1990; Grunewald, McNulty, and Biere 1993; Garcia et al. 1997).

In light of this discussion, the goal of the current study is to evaluate changes in the market impact of USDA inventory reports in livestock markets using both price volatility and

[1] Furthermore, while there were 145 steer and heifer slaughtering plants in 1975-1976 with the five largest plants having a 14.8% share in total slaughter, there were only 36 plants in 2006-2007 with the 14 largest plants holding a 70.2% share (Ward 2010). Similarly, 235,000 hog farms maintained 67% of total hog inventories and 87% of hogs were sold via spot markets in 1993, there were 63,000 farms in 2009-2010 with 43% of share in hog inventories and only 8% of hogs were sold through spot markets (Lawrence 2010).

market surprise tests. We focus on the impact of Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports, which have historically played a key role in livestock markets and have been widely watched by market participants.[2] The sample period is 1977-2016 for cattle and 1982-2016 for hogs. The market response to release of these reports is estimated two ways using: i) the ratio of futures return variance on report vs. non-report days; and ii) a generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (GARCH) model of the relationship between futures returns and market surprises. Further, we compare market response across pre- and post-2000 sub-periods, as well as estimate 10-year rolling GARCH models for a more detailed comparison, to assess our hypothesis on whether the value of USDA information decreased over time as markets have become more vertically integrated and concentrated.

Using traditional price volatility tests we find that the market impact of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports largely disappeared after 2000. In contrast, using market surprise tests we find no evidence that the impact of Cattle on Feed information changed significantly after 2000. The evidence is mixed for Hogs and Pigs reports using market surprise tests, with market inventory information increasing in value and breeding inventory decreasing. The contrasting results across market impact tests can be explained by the fact that price reaction per unit of market surprise generally did not change, but instead, the magnitude of market surprises decreased. The end result is that increased market concentration in cattle and hogs markets possibly led to smaller market surprises and smaller futures price reactions.

[2] The surveys by Pruitt et al. (2012, 2013), for instance, show that while livestock extension agents ranked Cattle on Feed as the second and Hogs and Pigs as the eighth most useful report, market analysts and/or agribusiness professionals regarded Cattle on Feed as valuable and Hogs and Pigs as more valuable.

Data

We use daily data for nearby futures contracts of live cattle and lean hogs, both are traded at the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME). To match the availability of private analysts' forecasts, futures data are collected starting in 1977 for live cattle and 1982 for lean hogs. The hog series uses live hog futures prices through November 1996 and lean hog futures prices from December 1996 onward. Nearby series are constructed by rolling over to the second closest to expiration contract once that next contract has a trade volume exceeding the nearest delivery contract. Due to relatively low trading volume, we eliminate the May contract for lean hogs.

Futures contracts are subject to daily price limits from the previous day's settlement price, and therefore they mask the true price reaction by making the free market equilibrium price no longer observable.[3] Livestock futures contracts, especially lean hogs, experienced several trading days that were subject to a limit hit in the past. Therefore, to measure the true price reaction to market surprises we compute the price difference from the day preceding the report release (if it was not subject to a limit hit) to the first non-limit move day (if the report-day was subject to a limit hit).

Cattle on Feed reports are published monthly by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) agency of USDA and contain data on the total number of cattle and calves on feed, placements, marketings, and other disappearances. These reported categories are closely related as on-feed inventory numbers are stocks at a particular point in time, placements are additions to these stocks, and marketings and other disappearances are reductions in these stocks. Therefore, the difference between the on-feed numbers from the beginning of one month to the

[3] The price limit for live cattle futures during our study period was $1.50/cwt. until 2004 and increased to $3.00/cwt. cents after 2014. The limit for lean hogs was $1.50/cwt. until 1995, $2.00/cwt. during 1995-2006, and increased to $3.00/cwt. thereafter.

next reflects the on-feed inventory from the previous month, plus placements, less marketings and other disappearances (Mark and Small 2007). The reports are typically released at 3:00pm EST[4] on the third Friday of the month and contain data as of the beginning of the month. The information in these reports is based on the survey of feedlots in major cattle feeding states[5] in the U.S., representing about 98 percent of total U.S. production.[6]

Hogs and Pigs reports are also prepared by NASS and released quarterly. The two main categories of the hogs and pigs inventories are breeding herd and market hogs. The reports are typically released at 3:00pm EST[7] on Friday near the end of March, June, September, and December and present inventory data as of the first day of the month and the previous and future quarters.[8] Inventory estimates in these reports are for the major hog producing states[9] which account for about 95 percent of total U.S. production. The reports also aggregate the remaining states to generate the U.S. total, thereby providing the most comprehensive publicly available estimates of current and future hog supplies (Small, Waterbury, and Mark 2007).

Industry analysts' estimates, which are usually released a few days before the USDA reports, have been traditionally used as a proxy for market expectations of government reports (e.g., Colling and Irwin 1990; Grunewald, McNulty, and Biere 1993; Garcia et al. 1997;

[4] There were two exceptions due to USDA's release schedule before the holidays. Cattle on Feed report in December 2005 was released at 1:00pm EST, and May 2015 and December 2016 reports were released at 12:00pm EST.
[5] The USDA's definition of feedlots included in the survey has changed over time. The data set is composed of inventory levels in all feedlots in seven states through December 1994, the feedlots that have at least 1,000 head of cattle in seven states from January 1995 to October 1998, and those 1,000+ capacity feedlots in the U.S. thereafter.
[6] For more information, please see Mark and Small (2007).
[7] Hogs and Pigs report was released at 1:00pm EST in December 2011, and at 12:00pm EST in March and December 2016 due to the USDA's release schedule before the holidays.
[8] The release schedule of Hogs and Pigs report has changed to monthly from January 2001 through September 2003, after which quarterly schedule was resumed. Only quarterly reports are included in our study.
[9] The USDA's definition of major states has changed over time as some states have experienced a great expansion of hog production, while others have become less important in the hog industry. The data set is composed of 14 states through March 1982, 10 states from June 1982 to March 1996, 17 states from June 1996 to September 2009, and 16 states thereafter.

Egelkraut et al. 2003; Frank, Garcia, and Irwin 2008). Private analysts' expectations for Cattle on Feed reports, available starting in 1977, are obtained from Knight-Ridder Wire Service and Bridge Wire Service for the period 1977-2000, and from Oster Dow Jones and Dow Jones for the period 2000-2017. The expectations are reported as the average trade estimate of cattle on feed, placements, and marketings for the current quarter as a percentage of the comparable month a year ago. Private analysts' expectations of Hogs and Pigs reports, available from 1982, are obtained from various sources: Futures World News for 1982-1991, Knight-Ridder Wire Service for 1992-2000, Reuters (Bridge) and Dow Jones Newswire for 2000-2004 and December 2006, Dow Jones Newswire for 2005-2013, and Urner-Barry 2015-2017. The expectations are reported as the average trade estimate of the breeding and marketing inventory for the current quarter as a percentage of the comparable quarter a year ago. For both reports, we multiply year-ago inventory levels by the analysts' expected percentage of year-ago figures. This provides us the market analysts' expectations in terms of the number of cattle and hogs, making them comparable to USDA figures.

Market Impact Tests

The first test of market impact we consider is the volatility response in livestock futures markets on report days versus non-report days, which is the traditional event study approach. The main premise of the price volatility tests is that the USDA reports have value for the market if futures prices change significantly in response to report release, whereas they have no value if futures prices do not change (e.g., Campbell, Lo, and MacKinlay 1997). We define $\Delta P_t = 100 \times (\ln P_t - \ln P_{t-1})$ as the percentage change in a futures contract's settlement price from day $t-1$ to day t and compute the variance of price changes on report and all non-report days. The ratio

of the variances is reported as an F-test in table 1, and these tests demonstrate that live cattle futures reaction to Cattle on Feed reports was large and highly significant in 1977-1999, with price volatility on report release days 1.62 times volatility on non-report days. In contrast, price volatility on report release days for the 2000-2016 sub-period is only 1.08 times volatility on non-report days and statistically insignificant. Lean hog futures reaction to Hogs and Pigs reports is very large and highly significant over 1982-1999, with a report/non-report volatility ratio of 2.74. During 2000-2016, the ratio fell to 1.34 and retained statistical significance but only at the 10% level. These results are similar to those found in the Isengildina-Massa et al. (2016) study and suggest that the market impact of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports largely disappeared after 2000.

The second test of market impact that we consider is based on the response of prices to the unanticipated component of new information measured in terms of market surprise (e.g., Colling and Irwin 1990; Garcia et al. 1997). Hence, these tests measure the magnitude of price reaction per unit of market surprise. To allow for time-varying volatility observed in futures prices, we specify the following GARCH system:

$$(1)\quad \Delta P_t = \mu + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda^k Surprise_t^k + \gamma TrendDev_t + \sum_{p=1}^{P} \delta_p \Delta P_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t,$$

$$\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t,$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = \omega + \alpha \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta \sigma_{t-1}^2,$$

where ΔP_t is once again the percentage change in futures contract's settlement price from day $t-1$ to day t, ε_t is the regression error term, and z_t is a standard normal random variable. The variable $Surprise_t^k$ is defined as the percentage difference between the USDA's ($q_t^{k,U}$) and private analysts' forecasts ($q_t^{k,P}$) for category k in a report on day t:

(2) $Surprise_t^k = 100 \times \left(\ln q_t^{k,U} - \ln q_t^{k,P}\right)$,

and takes the value of zero on non-report days.[10] Thus, the coefficients λ^k measure the price reaction per unit of market surprise (%). The variable $TrendDev_t$ represents percent deviation of the USDA's estimate ($q_t^{k,U}$) from a quadratic trend in inventories before 2000 and a linear trend after 2000.[11] The lagged values of the dependent variable in the conditional mean equation are included to account for serial correlation in the daily futures price changes.

In order to assess changes in reaction to market surprises in USDA livestock reports, we performed Chow structural break tests by regressing the futures return series on an intercept, each of the surprise variables, and trend deviation variable, allowing all surprise coefficients to vary across pre- and post-2000 possible regimes. Based on the results confirming a break in 2000,[12] we interact all the surprise variables in the conditional mean equation in (1) with sub-period dummy variables to examine differences in price reaction to market surprises across sub-periods. In addition, changes in price reaction over time are demonstrated by estimating the GARCH system (1) with a 10-year rolling window by dropping the earliest calendar year and adding the newest one as we move forward in time.

Full sample results for live cattle are shown in table 2. Column (I) presents the estimates obtained by using the full sample period and column (II) shows the results obtained by interacting surprise variables with the pre- and post-2000 period dummy variables.[13] The results

[10] The market surprise variable takes its corresponding value on the exact announcement day for reports released before or during trading hours, and on the following trading day for reports released after trading hours.
[11] Trend is estimated for each report month separately. In-sample deviations from trend are calculated as the difference between the USDA's figure in a given report and the forecast for that month obtained from the trend models.
[12] The Chi-squared statistic is 9.30 with a p-value of 0.03 for cattle, and 6.38 with a p-value of 0.04 for hogs.
[13] The length of autoregressive lags, p, is set to five for both commodities in all estimations. Their parameter estimates, δ_p, are not included in the tables to save space, but available from the authors upon request.

indicate a negative reaction to placement surprises and a positive reaction to marketing surprises, and no significant reaction to on-feed surprises. Since cattle on-feed values illustrate the levels of supply available at a point in time and placements reflect additions to cattle supply (Small and Mark 2007), all else equal, positive surprises in both categories will result in lower prices. Cattle marketings, on the other hand, reflect reductions in supply, and therefore positive surprises result in higher prices.

Our findings show that market surprises associated with cattle inventories on feed do not cause a significant price reaction both for the full sample as well as sub-samples. The magnitude of estimated coefficient for cattle placements surprise is small (-0.042) and statistically significant for the entire sample but insignificant in the post-2000 sub-period.[14] The only information in Cattle on Feed reports that causes consistent price reaction is associated with the amount of cattle marketed. Full sample results indicate that when the USDA's cattle marketing estimates are 1% higher than expected, live cattle prices increase by about 0.102 percentage points, with the same magnitude of reaction occurring in the post-2000 sub-period and slightly smaller reaction of 0.096 percentage points during the earlier sub-period. This observation is confirmed by the Wald test reported in the last column of table 2 that examines statistical differences in the estimates across sub-periods and shows lack of significant differences in market reaction to marketed surprise.

Figure 1(a) shows price reaction estimates for live cattle from rolling GARCH regressions.[15] The plot demonstrates that the magnitude of cattle price reaction to on-feed surprise increased dramatically during 1997-2007 and 2003-2013. Even though the coefficient

[14] Although, the Wald test result suggests that there is no significant difference between the pre- and post-2000 sub-periods.
[15] Coefficient estimates that are statistically significant at the 10% level are plotted with a filled marker symbol, whereas insignificant estimates are indicated with an open marker.

estimated for the 2000-2016 sub-period in table 2 suggests that a 1% increase in on-feed surprise results in 0.210 percentage point drop in live cattle futures prices, the estimate is statistically insignificant. Cattle price reaction to placed and marketed surprises appear stable over time with very small reaction to placed surprises and a larger reaction to marketed surprises consistent with sub-period analysis.

Full sample results for hogs in table 3 suggest that an increase in both breeding and marketing herd surprise by 1% each results in a decrease of 0.495 percentage points in hog futures prices on average. Small, Waterbury, and Mark (2007) discuss that "an increase in market hog inventory would indicate future increases in hog slaughter and pork supplies. This would cause prices to decrease, everything else held constant. … Market analysts can use the information in the report related to breeding herd inventory and average litter size to make long-term price forecasts based on expected expansions and contractions in pork production." (p. 2) Thus, a larger than expected inventory level (positive surprise) in either category would cause a drop in hog prices. The sub-period results indicate that the market reaction to breeding inventory surprise is significant only in the earlier part of the sample (1982-2000). Wald test result in the last column of the table shows that the price responses to breeding inventory surprises in the first and second sub-periods are statistically different from each other, supporting the pattern found in figure 1(b). The sub-period findings for market hog surprises, on the other hand, show statistically larger price response in magnitude after 2000. For a 1% increase in marketing hog surprise, lean hogs futures prices decrease by 0.421 percentage points before 2000 and by 0.754 percentage points after 2000. Figure 1(b) suggests that market reaction to market hog inventory surprise increased through 2007 reaching -1.810 percentage points over 1998-2007 and

decreased thereafter. The market reaction to hog breeding herd surprise exhibits a mirror-image to that of market hog surprise through 2005, but diminished thereafter except for 1999-2008.

In sum, the results of the market impact tests present an interesting contrast. On one hand, using traditional price volatility tests we find, similar to Isengildina-Massa et al. (2016), that the market impact of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports largely disappeared after 2000. On the other hand, using market surprise tests we find no evidence that the impact of Cattle on Feed information changed significantly after 2000. The evidence is mixed for Hogs and Pigs reports using market surprise tests, with market inventory information increasing in value and breeding inventory decreasing. These results confirm that market surprise tests are more powerful in detecting market impact than traditional price volatility tests, which is sensible because market surprise tests use more information.

Reconciling the Market Impact Test Results

We know from the results in the previous section that post-2000: i) price volatility on release days for Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports was generally not significantly different from non-report days; and ii) live cattle and lean hog futures prices continued to react to the surprise component in the two reports. The first clue to resolving this seeming contradiction is found in figure 2, which highlights the sharp decrease in volatility of cattle and hog inventories starting around 2000, immediately following the spike in market concentration in these industries.[16] The mean and standard deviation of cattle inventories (in logs) are 8.97 and 0.12 before 2000, and 9.30 and 0.06 after 2000. For hog inventories (in logs), the mean and standard deviation are 10.73 and 0.11 before 2000, and 11.00 and 0.06 after 2000. For both cattle and hogs, the

[16] Cattle inventories refer to the number of cattle on feed, and hog inventories refer to the total number of breeding and marketing hogs.

equality of means and variances across sub-periods are strongly rejected with the t-test with Welch adjustment and with the Brown-Forsythe F-test, respectively, indicating larger and less variable inventories in the post-2000 period.[17] This decrease in supply variability coincides with the decrease in price volatility following the release of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports.

We now turn to the behavior of the market surprises for the USDA reports. Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the patterns in average surprises and average absolute surprises for cattle and hogs, respectively. Figure 3 shows that cattle placements estimates had the largest surprises throughout the study period, while the magnitudes of surprise for cattle marketed and on-feed estimates were much smaller. It appears that average surprises became closer to zero in the 2000s following structural changes that took place in the cattle market. This pattern is also captured in absolute surprises that tend to become smaller in magnitude in 2000s across all three categories. Similar patterns are observed for the hogs in figure 4 with the size of surprises becoming smaller in 2000s. Differently from cattle, there appears to be a tendency to overestimate breeding inventory estimates in the earlier part of the sample, which seems to have been corrected in the latter part of the sample.

To assess changes in the size of market surprise and its variability over time, differences in average absolute surprises and differences in their variances across sub-periods are examined in table 4 using the t-test with Welch adjustment and the Brown-Forsythe test, respectively. Consistent with the patterns observed in figures 3 and 4, our findings show that the means and

[17] Welch's (1947) adjustment of the t-test relaxes the assumption of equal variances across samples and can be used to compare means of sub-periods with unequal variances. The Brown-Forsythe test is based on the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the absolute median differences; it is a modification of Levene's F-test which evaluates absolute mean differences in ANOVA and has been shown to perform better in terms of robustness and power in previous studies (e.g., Neter et al. 1996).

variances for the two sub-samples are significantly different for each surprise category, dropping as much as 0.66 to 1.79 percentage points across various categories from the earlier to the later part of the sample. The average size of cattle on-feed surprises declined by 0.66 points from 1.28% to 0.62%. A larger decrease is observed in the magnitude of cattle marketed surprises, a 1.25 point decrease from 2.35% to 1.10%. Cattle placement surprises decreased in magnitude even by a larger amount of 1.79 percentage points from 4.82% to 3.03%. In hogs, breeding surprises decreased by 1.26 points from 1.87% before 2000 to 0.61% in post 2000 sub-period. The decrease in hog marketing surprises, from 1.50% to 0.85%, is more modest at 0.66 percentage points. These findings indicate that the information "shocks" from the USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports decreased after 2000.

These results allow us to reconcile the seemingly contradictory market impact test results, with price volatility on report release days decreasing after 2000 and live cattle and lean hog futures markets continuing to react to the release of reports. The key is that price reaction per unit of market surprise generally did not change, but rather, the magnitude of market surprises decreased as analysts were able to better anticipate USDA information. The end result is that surprises and price reactions became smaller after 2000, which coincides with a period of increased market concentration in cattle and hogs.

Summary and Conclusions

This study evaluated changes in the market impact of USDA inventory reports in livestock markets using both price volatility and market surprise tests. We focus on the impact of Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports, which have historically played a key role in livestock markets and have been widely watched by market participants. The sample period is 1977-2016 for cattle and 1982-2016 for hogs. Using traditional price volatility tests we find that the market

impact of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports largely disappeared after 2000. In contrast, using market surprise tests we find no evidence that the impact of Cattle on Feed information changed significantly after 2000. The evidence is mixed for Hogs and Pigs reports using market surprise tests, with market inventory information increasing in value and breeding inventory decreasing. These results confirm that market surprise tests are more powerful in detecting market impact than traditional price volatility tests, which is sensible because market surprise tests use more information.

We conducted additional analysis to determine why price volatility on report release days decreased after 2000 yet live cattle and lean hog futures markets continued to react to the information contained in the reports. The key is that price reaction per unit of market surprise generally did not change, but rather, the magnitude of market surprises decreased. We posit that market analysts were better able to anticipate USDA information in more concentrated and less variable cattle and hog markets (in terms of inventories). The end result was that increased market concentration in cattle and hogs led to smaller market surprises and smaller futures price reactions.

What conclusion should be reached regarding the informational value of USDA Cattle on Feed and Hogs and Pigs reports in concentrated livestock markets? The decline in price volatility reaction to report releases indicates that the reports do not move the cattle and hog markets as much after 2000 as before, which implies a clear decline of informational value. However, there is also evidence that the reports continue to impact market prices when more powerful tests are used. In fact, there has been limited change in the impact of the reports per unit of market surprise. The bottom-line is that the overall impact of the USDA inventory reports in cattle and hog markets is smaller but nonetheless still significant.

References

Campbell, J.Y., A.W. Lo, and A.C. MacKinlay. *The Econometrics of Financial Markets*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (1997).

C-FARE. "Value of USDA Data Products." The Council on Food, Agricultural & Resource Economics, Washington, D.C. (2013)

Colling, P.L. and S.H. Irwin. "The Reaction of Live Hog Futures Prices to USDA Hogs and Pigs Reports." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 72(1990):84-94.

Egelkraut, T.M., P. Garcia, S.H. Irwin, and D.L Good. "An Evaluation of Crop Forecast Accuracy for Corn and Soybeans: USDA and Private Information Agencies." *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 35(2003):79-95.

Fortenbery, T.R. and D.A. Sumner. "The Effects of USDA Reports in Futures and Options Markets." *Journal of Futures Markets* 13(1993):157-173.

Frank, J., P. Garcia, and S.H. Irwin. "To What Surprises Do Hog Futures Markets Respond?" *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 40(2008):73-87.

Garcia, P., S.H. Irwin, R.M. Leuthold, and L. Yang. "The Value of Public Information in Commodity Futures Markets." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 32(1997):559-570.

Grunewald, O., M.S. McNulty, and A.W. Biere. "Live Cattle Futures Response to Cattle on Feed Reports." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 75(1993):131-137.

Isengildina, O., S.H. Irwin, and D.L. Good. "The Value of USDA Situation and Outlook Information in Hog and Cattle Markets." *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 31(2006):262-282.

Isengildina-Massa, O., B. Karali, S.H. Irwin, M.K. Adjemian, and X. Cao. 2016. "The Value of USDA Information in a Big Data Era." Proceedings of the NCCC-134 Conference on Applied Commodity Price Analysis, Forecasting, and Market Risk Management. St. Louis, MO. [http://www.farmdoc.illinois.edu/nccc134].

Karali, B. "Do USDA Announcements Affect Comovements Across Commodity Futures Returns?" *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 37(2012):77-97.

Lawrence, J.D. "Hog Marketing Practices and Competition Questions." *Choices* 25(2010). Available at http://www.choicesmagazine.org/magazine/article.php?article=122.

MacDonald, J.M. "Consolidation, Concentration, and Competition in the Food System." Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, *Economic Review* Special Issue (2017):85-105.

Mark, D.R. and R.M. Small. "Interpretation of the USDA Cattle on Feed Report." Nebraska Extension publication EC850 (2007).

McKenzie, A.M. "Pre-Harvest Price Expectations for Corn: The Information Content of USDA Reports and New Crop Futures." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90(2008):351-366.

Neter, J., M. Kutner, C. Nachtsheim, and W. Wasserman. *Applied Linear Statistical Models*. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., NY (1996).

Pruitt, J.R., G.T. Tonsor, K.R. Brooks, and R.J. Johnson. "County Extension Agent Preferences for USDA Market Information." LSU AgCenter Research & Extension, Pub. 3237 (2012).

Pruitt, J.R., G.T. Tonsor, K.R. Brooks, and R.J. Johnson. "Agribusiness and Market Analyst Preferences for USDA Market Information." LSU AgCenter Research & Extension. Pub. 3230 (2013).

Small, R.M., J.A. Waterbury, and D.R. Mark. "Interpretation of the USDA Quarterly Hogs and Pigs Report." Nebraska Extension publication EC851 (2007).

Sumner, D.A. and R.A.E. Mueller. "Are Harvest Forecasts News? USDA Announcements and Futures Market Reactions." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 71(1989):1-8.

Ward, C.E. "Assessing Competition in the U.S. Beef Packing Industry." *Choices* 25(2010). Available at http://www.choicesmagazine.org/magazine/article.php?article=121.

Welch, B.L. "The Generalization of 'Student's' Problem When Several Different Population Variances Are Involved." *Biometrika* 34(1947):28-35.

Table 1. Livestock Futures Returns on Report-Release and Non-report Days

		All Days			Report Days			Non-report Days			Variance		
	Period	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	F-test	p-value	
Cattle	1977-2016	0.01	0.97	10,087	-0.01	1.15	480	0.01	0.96	9,607	1.41	0.00	***
	1977-1999	0.02	0.99	5,808	-0.13	1.24	276	0.03	0.98	5,532	1.62	0.00	***
	2000-2016	0.00	0.95	4,279	0.14	0.98	204	0.00	0.95	4,075	1.08	0.43	
Hogs	1982-2016	0.00	1.46	8,828	0.23	2.05	140	-0.01	1.45	8,688	2.01	0.00	***
	1982-1999	0.02	1.43	4,549	0.29	2.33	72	0.01	1.41	4,477	2.74	0.00	***
	2000-2016	-0.02	1.49	4,279	0.16	1.72	68	-0.03	1.48	4,211	1.34	0.07	*

Note: The null hypothesis of the F-test is the unity of the return variance ratio (report vs. non-report days). The asterisks *, **, *** represent statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

Table 2. Price Reaction Test of the Informational Value of Cattle on Feed Reports in Live Cattle Futures Market

	(I)	(II)	
	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Equality test χ^2 [p-val]
Mean equation			
On Feed	0.011		
	(0.058)		
On Feed$_{Pre\text{-}2000}$		0.018	
		(0.065)	
On Feed$_{Post\text{-}2000}$		-0.210	1.72
		(0.161)	[0.19]
Placed	-0.042 ***		
	(0.014)		
Placed$_{Pre\text{-}2000}$		-0.032 **	
		(0.017)	
Placed$_{Post\text{-}2000}$		-0.036	0.01
		(0.030)	[0.93]
Marketed	0.102 ***		
	(0.016)		
Marketed$_{Pre\text{-}2000}$		0.096 ***	
		(0.018)	
Marketed$_{Post\text{-}2000}$		0.102 **	0.01
		(0.049)	[0.91]
Trend Deviation	0.003	0.003	
	(0.007)	(0.007)	
Constant	0.019 **	0.018 **	
	(0.009)	(0.009)	
Variance equation			
ARCH	0.043 ***	0.043 ***	
	(0.003)	(0.003)	
GARCH	0.951 ***	0.951 ***	
	(0.003)	(0.003)	
Constant	0.005 ***	0.005 ***	
	(0.001)	(0.001)	
Observations	10087	10087	
Log likelihood	-13246.94	-13242.03	
AIC	26519.88	26516.06	
BIC	26613.73	26631.56	

Note: Results are obtained from AR(5)-GARCH(1,1) estimation. Full sample period is 1977-2016. The asterisks *, **, *** represent statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

Table 3. Price Reaction Test of the Informational Value of Hogs and Pigs Reports in Lean Hogs Futures Market

	(I)	(II)	
	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Equality test χ^2 [p-val]
Mean equation			
Breeding	-0.495 ***		
	(0.048)		
$\text{Breeding}_{\text{Pre-2000}}$		-0.561 ***	
		(0.048)	
$\text{Breeding}_{\text{Post-2000}}$		-0.060	5.68 **
		(0.206)	[0.02]
Marketing	-0.495 ***		
	(0.054)		
$\text{Marketing}_{\text{Pre-2000}}$		-0.421 ***	
		(0.057)	
$\text{Marketing}_{\text{Post-2000}}$		-0.754 ***	3.09 *
		(0.182)	[0.08]
Trend Deviation	-0.011	-0.008	
	(0.034)	(0.035)	
Constant	0.005	0.005	
	(0.015)	(0.015)	
Variance equation			
ARCH	0.043 ***	0.042 ***	
	(0.003)	(0.003)	
GARCH	0.945 ***	0.945 ***	
	(0.005)	(0.005)	
Constant	0.025 ***	0.025 ***	
	(0.004)	(0.004)	
Observations	8828	8828	
Log likelihood	-15287.10	-15284.17	
AIC	30598.20	30596.34	
BIC	30683.23	30695.54	

Note: Results are obtained from AR(5)-GARCH(1,1) estimation. Full sample period is 1982-2016. The asterisks *, **, *** represent statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

Table 4. Tests for Equality of Absolute Surprises between Pre-2000 and Post-2000 Sub-periods

		Full Sample	Pre-2000	Post-2000	Equality Test	p-value
Cattle						
On Feed	Mean	0.98	1.28	0.62	8.65	0.00 ***
	Std. Dev.	0.92	1.06	0.52	41.07	0.00 ***
	N	454	250	204		
Placed	Mean	4.02	4.82	3.03	6.04	0.00 ***
	Std. Dev.	3.39	3.84	2.42	20.61	0.00 ***
	N	454	250	204		
Marketed	Mean	1.79	2.35	1.10	9.11	0.00 ***
	Std. Dev.	1.66	1.87	1.01	67.53	0.00 ***
	N	454	250	204		
Hogs						
Breeding	Mean	1.26	1.87	0.61	6.33	0.00 ***
	Std. Dev.	1.35	1.61	0.47	28.20	0.00 ***
	N	140	72	68		
Marketing	Mean	1.18	1.50	0.85	4.05	0.00 ***
	Std. Dev.	1.03	1.25	0.56	22.47	0.00 ***
	N	140	72	68		

Note: Equality tests are conducted for the absolute value of variables to measure the differences in magnitude between sub-periods. The equality of means is tested by the t-test with Welch adjustment allowing for unequal variances across sub-periods. The equality of variances is tested by the Brown-Forsythe F-test. Full sample period is 1977-2016 for cattle and 1982-2016 for hogs. The asterisks *, **, *** represent statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.



(a) Cattle



(b) Hogs

Figure 1. Livestock futures price reactions to per unit surprises in USDA reports over time



Figure 2. Livestock inventories over time



Figure 3. Average annual market surprises in Cattle on Feed reports



Figure 4. Average annual market surprises in Hogs and Pigs reports