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# RELATION OF DAILY PRICES TO THE MARKETING OF HOGS AT CHICAGO 

Howard J. Stover

## INTRODUCTION

Most studies of hog prices in the past have been concerned with their seasonal, cyclical, or secular changes. Relatively little attention has been given to an analysis of the short-time fluctuations, the day-to-day ups and downs.

From the standpoint of the individual farmer, daily price movements are of as much consequence, if not more, as seasonal or even cyclical movements. No better statement of this fact can be made than that appearing in the 1922 Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture: ${ }^{2}$

A fact which is sometimes overlooked or understressed by students of the hog market is that, in general, the long-time average does not materially affect the individual producer. The average man markets hogs once or twice a year. If he happens to have his hogs on the market on a day' when some wild rumor of an impending strike, war, or some other upheaval has suddenly depressed prices, that producer usually suffers severe loss. Within a week the market may have recovered the whole amount of the decline, but that is of little consequence or consolation to the man who has sold his hogs on the decline.

Timeliness in marketing is a necessary corollary to timeliness in production. The difference of a single day in the date of shipment of hogs to the central market may mean a difference of as much as a dollar a hundredweight in the price received. For the individual farmer it often means the difference between a profit and a loss.

The alternation of periods of under- and of over-production of hogs is partly explained by the responses which producers make to price changes. Indirectly, cyclical fluctuations in prices are violent because of such responses. Similarly, the violence of daily price fluctuations is due in part to the responses made by shippers of hogs to the short-time price changes.

The study here reported is an attempt to analyze the relationships existing between daily prices, receipts, and other factors at the Chicago market. Price and supply variations, supply-price relationships, and supply responses to price fluctuations under varying conditions, are of chief concern.

## SOURCES OF DATA

Daily top and average prices, receipts, and reshipments were taken from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal, Yearbook of Figures. The eight-year

[^0]DAILY AVERAGE PRICES AND RECEIPTS OF HOGS AT CHICAGO


Card 1 (See page 6)

DAILY HOG PRICES AND MARKET MOVEMENT


The methodization finally adopted for relating daily price changes to ir receipts was the result of considerable experimentation. Because the predominating effects of seasonal and cyclical movements in prices it receipts, the influences of short-time changes in prices were especially ticult to measuré. Normal daily variations in receipts also complicated 1 task. A detailed explanation of the methods used is given later in : bulletin (page 42 to 48 ).

## TEE CHICAGO HOG MARKET

The hog market in the United States is highly concentrated. Seven rkets receive more than half of the hogs sent to pablic stockyards in * country. Eleven markets receive more than two-thirds, and twenty rkets more than three-fourths, of the total number.
thicago alone receives nearly one-fifth of the hogs shipped to public ckyards each year. East Saint Louis, which ranks second in importance, eives less than half the number shipped to Chicago (figure 1). Omaha,

lgure 1. average daity beckipts of hogs at the seven most maportant public stocexards in the untted statis, 1921 to 1928
The data are based on a 308 -day year for all markets: Chicago, 27.800; East Saint Louis, 600; Omahn, 10,100; South Saint Paul, 10,100; Sicax City, 8,600; Kanges City, 8,000; , Int Joseph, 6,000
Chicago receives more than twice as many hoys as does East Saint Lonis, its most important mpetitor, and mearky as many as do Omaha, South Saint Paul, and Sionx City together
ith Saint Paul, Sioux City, Kansas City, and Saint Joseph, follow in $t$ order named.
The total number of hogs received at Chicago each year since 1890 is own in figure 2. From 1890 until about 1910 the trend of receipts was *htly downward, the number received in 1910 being the lowest for the liod. Since 1910 the trend has been sharply upward. A record number $: 10,460,134$ hogs was recorded at the yards in 1923.
-yclical variations in receipts are superimposed on secular changes, sing the graph a picture of great irregularity. As time goes on, these des become more and more pronounced. Receipts in 1925 were broximately 68 per cent of the receipts two years before.


Figure 2. ybarly receipts of hogs at chicago, 1890 to 1928
The number of hoge received at Chicago each year is highly varinble, reflecting cyclical well as secular cbangen. The trend has been upward aince about 1910 and the cyclu movements have been more pronounced

Official stockyard receipts do not include all hogs shipped into Chica since some are consigned direct to the various packers. This prac of selling hogs at country points and shipping direct to packers has b increasing in late years.

In 1921, 96 per cent of the total number of hogs shipped to Chicago w received at the stockyards for sale on the open market (table 1).
table 1. Annual Receipts of Hogs at Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Year | Total number of hoge received at Chicago | Par cent seceived at yards | Per cent received by packers civect | Por cent packed at <br> Chicago | Per c reahip to ot marl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1921. | 8.486.729 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 74.4 | 25. |
| 1922. | 8,562.301 | 95.3 | 4.7 | 78.4 | 21. |
| 1923. | 11,031,367 | 94.8 | 5.2 | 78.5 | 21. |
| 1924. | 11,068,687 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 73.0 | 27. |
| 1925. | 6.478.128 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 71.7 | 28. |
| 1926. | 7,543,891 | 94.0 | 6.0 | 72.1 | 27. |
| 1927. | 8.184 .584 | 94.4 | $5.6{ }^{*}$ | 74.2 | 25. |
| 1928. | 9,356.423 | 91.36 | $8.7{ }^{\circ}$ | 77.1 | 22. |
| Average. | 9,089,014 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 75.0 | 25. |

[^1]by packers outside the yards. In eight years the number of hogs marketed direct increased from 4 to nearly 20 per cent of the total movement.

In 1925 a larger proportion of the hogs arrived as "directs" in the winter than in the summer (table 2). This was probably owing to the lower cost of buying hogs in the country when the supply was large.
table 2. Monthly Recetpts of Hogs at Ceichgo, 1925

| Month | Total number of hogs received at Chicago | Per cent received yards | Por cent received by packers direct | Per cent packed Chicago | Per cent reshipped to other markets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January. | 1,363,500 | 93.9 | 6.1 | 70.1 | 29.9 |
| February | 978,377 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 70.5 | 29.5 |
| March. | 628,674 | 95.1 | 4.9 | 66.6 | 33.4 |
| April.. | 567,623 | 94.8 | 5.2 | 71.8 | 28.2 |
| May. | 561,359 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 69.3 | 30.7 |
| June. | 667.192 | 94.9 | 5.1 | 75.6 | 24.4 |
| July.... | 538, 192 | 95.1 | 4.9 | 72.5 | 27.5 |
| August.... | 470.392 | 95.2 | 4.8 | 77.4 | 22.6 |
| Oeptember. | 472.204 | 95.0 | 5.0 | 75.8 | 24.2 25 |
| November. | 605.790 718.696 | 94.2 94.3 | 5.8 5.7 | 74.3 71.0 | 25.7 29.0 |
| Decamber. | 906:128 | 92.7 | 7.3 | 71.3 | 28.7 |
| - Average. | 706.511 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 71.7 | 28.3 |

Of the hogs received at Chicago, approximately 75 per cent are slaughtered and packed there (table 1). The remaining 25 per cent are reshipped, as live hogs, to other markets.

The proportion of the hogs reshipped is not constant. It is much less on the downward slope of the hog-price cycle than when the prices are rising. In 1923, 21 per cent of the receipts were reshipped, as compared with 28 per cent in 1925.

In March, 1925, more than 33 per cent of the hogs received at Chicago were reshipped to other markets (table 2). In August this percentage was 22.6. The proportion of the receipts which were packed in Chicago was higher in the summer than in the winter.

More than half of the hogs received at Chicago are shipped from country points in Iowa (table 3). An additional 30 per cent come from Illinois. Together, these two States supply nearly 85 per cent of Chicago's hog demands. Wisconsin, which ranks third, ships less than one-fourth of the number of hogs shipped from Illinois.

TAble 3. Percentages of Hogs Received at tre Union Stock Yards, Chicago, from Various States, 1923 to 1928

| Pear | Iown | Illinoin | Wisconain | Minnewota | South Dakota | Indians | Miemour | Nebrenta | ${ }^{0} \text { Staten }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1938. | ${ }^{68 .} 5$ | 30.6 | 5.7 | 8.1 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 1024. | 55.3 | T 28.6 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
|  | 155.1 | 29.7 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| 1927......... | 54.8 | 30.2 | 8.2 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 1888. | 50.8 | \$53.0 | 7.8 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Avents. | 83.8 | 31.1 | 7.1 | 4.1 | 9.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 |

During late years the proportion of Chicago's hog supply received fror Iowa has been decreasing and that from Illinois has been increasin (table 3). South Dakota's number decreased from 4.3 per cent of th total in 1923 to 0.5 per cent in 1927. At the same time the numbe received from Wisconsin increased from 5.7 per cent to 9.1 per cent.

A small proportion, approximately 3 per cent, of the hogs receive at the stockyards in Chicago are shipped from other public stockyard: No information is available concerning the States in which such shipment originated. Hence the percentages in tables 3 and 4 are based solely o information relative to hogs shipped direct from country points to Chicag. It seems fairly safe to assume that the relative proportions for each Stat would be the same in the two cases. At any rate, the total numbe received from other markets was too small to materially affect the result:

Receipts of hogs from Iowa are larger, in proportion to the tota number, in the summer than in the winter months (table 4). In Octobe

TABLE 4. Percentagrs of Hogs Received at the Union Stock Yards, Chicao Monthly prom Various States, 1925

| Month | Iow: | Illinoia | Wreounin | Minneeota | Bonth Dakota | Indians | Mimour | Nebrais | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jamuery. | 52.5 | 82.7 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 02 | 0.6 |
| Pebrusy..... | ${ }_{56}^{56.4}$ | 38.9 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| April.. | 82.8 | 81.5 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 05 | 08 |
| May.......... | 66.1 | 80.5 | 8.8 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Jane......... | 50.7 | 81.1 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 08 | 0.6 |
| July.......... | 57.6 | 29.4 | 4.4 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 08 |
| Augut...... | ${ }^{89} .1$ | 30.8 | 8.8 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 08 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 |
| Boprember... | 56.0 61.5 | 80.8 <br> 25 <br> 8 | ${ }^{6.6}$ | 8.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 03 | 08 |
| Ootober...... | 61.5 | 25.8 23.9 | 18.7 108 | 8.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 07 08 | 0.1. | 07 |
| November.... | 56.2 84.1 | 28.0 29.8 | 10.8 8.8 | 8.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | - | 1.7 |
| Averge... | 56.1 | 99.7 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 |

- Leas than 0.1 per cent.

1925, they represented 51.5 per cent, and in August 59.1 per cent, of th total supply. Receipts from Illinois varied from 23.9 per cent $i$ November to 32.7 per cent in January.

The influence of the summer surplus milk supply in Wisconsin on th fattening of hogs is reflected in the seasonal variation of receipts at Chicag from that State. In June, 1925, only 3.4 per cent of the hogs received a Chicago came from Wisconsin. In October the percentage was 13.\% or four times as great.
The location of the Chicago market with respect to the producin territory and important competing markets is shown in figure 3. Th nearest competing hog market is East Saint Louis, approximately 201 miles distant. South Saint Paul is about 360 miles away, while Omahd Kansas City, Sioux City, and Saint Joseph lie beyond the 400 -mile rangi Since most of the hogs shipped to Chicago come from Iowa and westen Illinois, a shipping distance of from 200 to 400 miles is the most typical


Figure 3. location of the chicago hog market in relation to the producing TERRITORY AND COMPETING MARKETS
Only two of the six important competitors of Chicago are within 400 miles. Most of the hoge shipped to the Chicago market come from territory between the 200 - and the 400 -mile radius

## DAILY VARIATIONS IN RECEIPTS, RESHIPMENTS, NET SUPPLY, AND TOP AND AVERAGE PRICES

## NORMAL DAILY VARIATIONS

The problem of a more even distribution of receipts at the larger public stockyards has been discussed many times during the past twenty-five or thirty years. It is argued that the bunching of receipts on one or two days of the week causes sharp price fluctuations and a more or less unstable market situation. Furthermore, it is claimed that this places an undue burden on the entire marketing machinery, transportation agencies, stockyard companies, and the like. Prior to 1915 several attempts were made to bring about a better distribution of receipts, but without much success.

During the World War the United States Food Administration inaugurated a zoning system for regulating the movement of livestock to market. Under this system the livestock-producing territory was divided into zones and certain loading days were assigned to each zone. After the war some opposition to this plan developed, chiefly because other livestock markets were not so regulated. Consequently, the present study covers a period during which the zoning system was partially in operation although not strictly so.

The average number of hogs received at Chicago on Monday during the eight years included in this study was 49,000 (table 5). This represented 29.5 per cent of the total number received during the six market days of the week. Likewise, receipts on Thursday averaged 33,400 , or 20.1

TABLE 5. Average Daily Varbations in Rectipts, Rrbripments, Nat Supply, and Top and Average Pegces, of Hogs at Ceicago during the Figrt Yrans 1921 т0 1928

|  | Monday | Tuenday | Wedneeday | Thureday | Friday | Gaturday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recsipts ...................... | 49.000 | 30.500 | 20.700 | 33.400 | 26.700 | 3.000 |
| Reshippmenta....................... | 11,700 37.300 | 7,900 72,000 | 5.100 15.000 | 7.500 25.900 | 9.700 17.700 | 2.900 |
| Not supply . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 37.300 | 22,600 | 15,000 | 25,900 | 17.700 |  |
| Receipts (per cent of weok)...... | 29.5 26.6 | 18.3 18.0 | 12.3 11.6 | 20.1 17.0 | 16.1 20.6 | 8.3 |
| Net rupply (per cent of week).... | 30.3 | 18.5 | 12.8 | 21.2 | 14.3 | 2.5 |
| Top price (per hundredweight). . Averege price (per hundred- | 810.448 | 810.426 | \$10.390 | \$10.386 | \$10.423 |  |
| Spread between to............ | 89.752 | 69.728 | 69.715 | 69.728 | 89.746 | 9.718 |
| price (per hundredweight)..... | \$0.696 | \$0.698 | \$0.675 | 50.658 | 50.679 | 00.684 |

per cent of the week's receipts. Practically one-half of the week's supply reached Chicago on these two days alone. Saturday's receipts averaged 5900, or less than one-eighth of the number received on Monday.

About three-fourths of the hogs shipped to Chicago were slaughtered there. The remainder were reshipped, as live hogs, to other markets.


Figure 4 average daily distribution of weekly rectipts of hogs at Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

[^2]

Figure 5. anerage datly distrigution OF WEEKLY RESHIPMENTS OF HOG FROM CEICACO, Ig21 TO 1928
Weekty reshipmente of hoga are more evenl distributed than are reccipta. A larye propor tion of Friday's and Saturday's seceigts are 31 chipped on the alame day to other markete

A relatively smaller proportion of the hogs received on Monday and on Thursday were reshipped than of those received on the other days of the week. Monday, with 29.5 per cent of the week's receipts, contributed 26.6 per cent of the reshipments, whereas Friday, with 16.1 per cent of the receipts, contributed 20.4 per cent of the reshipments. Nearly one-half of Saturday's receipts were reshipped on the same day to other markets. As a consequence, weekly reshipments of hogs were somewhat more evenly distributed than were receipts (figures 4 and 5). The peak on Monday was lowered, and Friday supplanted Thursday in amount of movement. Saturday gained, largely at the expense of Monday, with the result that its reshipments exceeded one-half of Wednesday's whereas its receipts were less than one-third.

The net supply of hogs remaining for slaughter in Chicago was very unevenly distributed (table 5). More than 30 per cent of the week's supply for Chicago slaughterhouses was purchased at the stockyards on Monday. Only 2.5 per cent was purchased on Saturday. Thursday supplied 21.2 per cent, Tuesday 18.5 per cent, Friday 14.5 per cent, and Wednesday 12.8 per cent.

Weekly receipts were much more unevenly distributed before the war than after (figure 6). In the earlier period, nearly one-third ( 32.5 per cent) arrived on (Monday and an additional 19 per cent arrived on Thursday. These two days, Monday and Thursday, supplied well over half of the week's total supply. Wednesday was the day of lightest receipts before the war, but has been replaced by Saturday in later years. Undoubtedly the zoning system which was in operation during the war has left the hog market with somewhat more evenly distributed receipts.

It has sometimes been contended that heavy receipts on Monday depress prices on that day. However, the facts do not support this contention (table 5). During the eight years from 1921 to 1928, both top and average prices averaged higher on Monday than on any other day of the week. Incidentally this fact may well explain the heavy receipts on Monday.

Average prices, for the period as a whole, were lowest on Wednesday and Saturday, the days of light receipts. In general, the best market days, from the standpoint of prices received, were Monday and Friday. Wednesday and Saturday furnished the poorest market.


Figure 6. comparison of tee average dall ceipts of hogs at chicago before and AFTER THE WAR, 1910 to 1913 AND 1921 т0 1924

Much progress was made during the war toward a five-day market of more evenly distributed receipta

The spread between top and average prices is a rough measure of thi relative dispersion in the prices paid for various lots of hogs on differen days. On Tuesday the spread was the greatest and on Thursday it wa the least (table 5). In general, the tendency prevailed for the spread gradually increase from Thursday to Tuesday and to decline from Tuesdaf to Thursday.

## EFFECT OP CYCLE ON DAILY VARIATIONS

Although for the eight-year period Monday's receipts averaged 29. per cent of the week's total, this percentage varied considerably from yea to year (table 6). In 1921 it was 27.6 per cent and in 1926 it was 311 per cent, a difference of 3.5 per cent. This discrepancy is accounter for in part by trends in the total amount of movement. Monday's pro portionate share was larger when receipts were falling off rapidly, ant smaller when the trend was sharply upward. On Saturdays the revers was largely the case.

TABLE 6. Agerage Daily Receifts and Percentace Distibution of thit Weekiy Rectepts of Hogs at Chicaco, ay Years, 1921 to 1928

| Yer | Avorage diely roeapta (ruedred) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mow } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Tuen day | Wednes | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Thurs } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prio } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Sentar- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Mon day | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuex } \\ \text { diy } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wedsom } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Thure day | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pa} \\ & \mathrm{day} \end{aligned}$ | 80640) |
| 1921. | 440 | 317 | 198 | 827 | 260 | 57 | 27.6 | 19.9 | 121 | 208 | $16:$ | 1 |
| 1922. | 480 | 291 | 197 | 306 | 250 | 68 | 29.1 | 188 | 12.8 | 10. | ${ }^{18} 8$ | 4 |
| 1923 | 867 611 | 848 | 208 232 | 896 871 | 343 350 | 89 | 28.3 | 178 | 18.8 | 197 | 17.1 | 4 |
| 1925. | 483 | 274 | 202 | 205 | 201 | 48 | 20.7 | 17.4 | 12.6 | 194 | 168 | 8 |
| 1828. | 420 | 283 | 159 | 287 | 198 | 43 | 31.1 | 19.1 | 11.5 | $20:$ | 146 | 1 |
| 1927. | 436 | 308 | 171 | 335 | 210 | 42 | 29.2 | 20.8 | 11.4 | 224 | 140 | 8 |
| 1928. | 492 | 810 | 208 | 343 | 252 | 67 | 20.6 | 18.7 | 12.5 | 20.6 | 138 | 3. |
| Avernge. | 490 | 206 | 207 | 234 | 267 | 50 | 29.6 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 20.1 | 16.1 | 3. |

The amount of movement, disregarding trends, was also a factor infli encing the distribution of receipts. The number of hogs received on Wednesdays and Fridays as related to the number received on Tuesday and Thursdays was larger when the total receipts were large than whes they were small.

Reshipments were proportionately much larger on Saturdays whel receipts were heavy than when they were light (table 7). On Monday
table 7. Average Daily Reshipments and Peacbatage Distrisution of the Weexly Resbipuents of Hogs at Chicago, by Years, 1921 to 1928

| Yeat | Arange daily rehipmente (hundred) |  |  |  |  |  | Per eat of menlif reabipments |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mon- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuer } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Wednee day | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thury-1 } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pri} \\ & \text { dey } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Betar- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Mon $d a y$ | day | day | dis | Prd | 9+4y |
| 1921. | 94 | 82 | 5 | 70 | 79 | 27 | 28.5 | 10.7 | 13.4 | 18.9 | 189 | d |
| 1822. | 100 | 48 | 48 | 89 | 63 | 21 | 29.0 | 17.4 | 12.8 | 16.6 | 190 | 6.2 |
| 1923. | 118 | 74 | 61 | 74 | 92 | 20 | 25.7 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 201 | 8. |
| 1924 | 149 | 97 | 48 | 91 | 127 | 46 | 25.1 | 17.0 | 10.8 | 18. | 22.2 | 8.4 |
| 1925. | 130 | 8 | 46 | 76 | 97 | 81 | 27.9 | 18.8 | 9.9 | 18.5 | 20. | 6.7 |
| 1928. | 120 | 7 | 46 | 72 | 76 | 21 | 20.4 | 17.2 | 11.8 | 17.7 | 18 | 4 |
| 1927. | 108 | 78 | 48 | 75 | 90 | 17 | 25.9 | 19.1 | 10.8 | 18.8 | 28.0 | 42 |
| 1973. | 118 | 77 | 4 | 6 | 08 | 17 | 27.7 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 16.6 | 22. | 4. |
| Avarase. | 117 | 7 | 81 | 76 | 90 | 2 | 24.6 | 18.0 | 11.6 | 17.0 | 20.4 | 4 |

reshipments varied from 22.5 per cent of the week's total in 1921 to 29.4 per cent in 1926-a difference of 6.9 per cent.

* Owing to the relatively large proportion of Saturday's receipts which were reshipped on the same day to other markets when receipts were heavy, the net supply of hogs in Chicago at such times was very low (table 8). In 1925 only $1: 5$ per cent of the week's net supply was in Chicago on Saturday. This was offset by relatively larger supplies on Monday and Wednesday.

TABLE 8. Average Daily Net Supply and Percentage Distribution of the Weekly Net Supply of Hogs at Ceitcago, by Years, 1921 to 1928

| Year | Average diily net supply (hundred) |  |  |  |  |  | Per cant of weak'e net supply |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mon- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{\text {Tues }} \text { day }$ | $\underbrace{\text { day }}_{\text {Wodnese }}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Thuntr\| } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pri- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Satarr } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\int_{\text {Tues }}^{\text {day }}$ | $\mathrm{We}_{\substack{\text { Wedneses } \\ \text { day }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thure } \\ \text { day- } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fri- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Saturday |
| 1921. | 846 | ${ }_{2}^{235}$ | 137 | 248 | 181 | 30 | 29.4 | 20.0 | 11.6 | 21.1 | 15.4 | 2.5 |
| 1923. | 380 | 229 | 151 | 247 | 182 | 48 | 29.8 | 18.9 | 12.4 | 20.3 | 15.0 | 3.8 |
|  | 449 | 274 | 207 | 322 | 251 | 50 | 28.9 | 17.7 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 16.2 | 8.2 |
| 1925 | -462 | 240 | 190 | 280 | 232 | ${ }^{23}$ | 32.4 | 18.8 | ${ }_{14}^{13.3}$ | 19.6 | 16.3 | 1.6 |
| 1926. | ${ }_{3} 309$ | 190 | 113 | 215 | 124 | 22 | 31.8 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 22.1 | 12.6 | 1.6 |
| 1927 | 830 | 224 | 128 | 260 | 120 | 25 | 30.4 | 20.6 | 11.8 | 23.9 | 11.0 | 2.3 |
| 1828. | 876 | 233 | 164 | 874 | 156 | 10 | 30.3 | 18.7 | 13.2 | 22.0 | 12.6 | 8.2 |
| Arenge... | 375 | 236 | 156 | 259 | 177 | 31 | 30.5 | 18.5 | 18.8 | 21.2 | 14.5 | 2.8 |

Monday's net supply of hogs fluctuated between an average of 28.9 per cent of the week's total in 1923 and 32.4 per cent in 1924, a difference of 3.5 per cent. On Friday the variation was from 11.0 to 16.3 per cent, a range of 5.3 per cent.

Although both top and average prices for the period as a whole averaged highest on Monday, individual years showed some variations. From the standpoint of average prices, Monday furnished the best market for hogs in three years, Friday in three years, Tuesday in one year, and Saturday in one year (table 9). In most cases the best average-price days were also the best top-price days.

The days of lowest prices were generally either Wednesday or Saturday. Average prices were lowest on Saturday in three and on Wednesday
table 9. Average Daily Top and Average Prices of Hogs at Chicago, by Years, 1921 to 1928

| Year | Average daily top prices (per hundredweight) |  |  |  |  |  | Average diily average prioes (per hundredweight) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mon day | Tues day | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wedneer } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Thurt } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\underset{\mathrm{Cri}}{\mathrm{mi}}$ | Saturn | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Tuas } \\ \operatorname{din} y \end{array}\right\|$ | Wodnew day | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thurst } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{pri} \\ & \mathrm{din} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Satur- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |
| ${ }_{1022}^{1921}$ | 88.376 | 59.34 | 8 0.822 | + 9.285 | 10.018 | 9.312 10.003 | $\mid 88.597$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 88.680 \\ & 9.300 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 8.571 \\ 9.347 \end{array}$ | 90. 58 9.368 | (88.592 |
| 1923 | ${ }_{8.167}$ | 8.189 | 8.135 | 8.120 | ${ }^{8.129}$ | ${ }^{8.121}$ | 7.653 | 7.686 | ${ }^{9} .643$ | 7.641 | 7.867 | 7.3408 |
| 1924. | 8.621 | 8.857 | 8.653 | 8.641 | 8.689 | 8. 688 | 8.163 | 8.165 | 8.178 | 8.164 | 8.206 | 8.210 |
| 1985. | 12.664 | 12.629 | 12.603 | 12.613 | 12.681 | 12.605 | 12.060 | 12.045 | 12.029 | 12.056 | 12.080 | 12.039 |
|  | 13.648 | 13.598 | 13.529 | 13.562 | 18.678 | 13.618 | 12.389 | 12.338 | 12.850 | 12.305 | 12.405 | 12.361 |
|  | 11.038 | 10.068 | 10.927 | 10.977 | 10.963 | 10.887 | 10.219 | 10.166 | 10.14 | 10.138 | 10.148 | 10.111 |
| 1028. | 10.045 | 10.028 | 9.091 | 0.973 | 10.003 | 0.055 | 0.588 | 9.563 | 0.528 | 0.611 | 9.541 | 0.532 |
| Averes | \$10.448 | 810.288 | 810.390 | \$i0.380 | 810.483 | 810.599 | \$0.758 | \$0.728 | \$0.716 | \$0.728 | ¢. 746 | \$0.715 |

in two of the eight years. Wednesday had the lowest top prices in th years, and Saturday in two years.

The premium paid in some years on certain days of the week was lar In 1927 an average of 10.8 cents more per hundredweight was paid hogs on Monday than on Saturday. In 1924 the premium paid on Sat day over Monday was 4.7 cents per hundredweight.

The discrepancy between top prices on different days of the week w even greater than that between average prices. In 1927 Monda top-price premium over Saturday's price was 15.2 cents per hundredweig In 1924 the top price paid on Saturday averaged 6.5 cents per hundri weight over Monday's price.

These differentials can be explained in part by the trend of prices duri each of the years. However, in 1927 trend can account for no more th a 6.5 -cent differential. The actual differences were 10.8 and 15.2 cents 1 average and top prices, respectively, leaving approximate differenti of 4.3 and 8.7 cents to be accounted for.

With the elimination of the trend factor for 1924, the differentials 1 average prices would be reversed, giving Monday a premium or Saturday. The top-price differential would be approximately offset price trends.

For the period as a whole, price trends have very little effect on $\mathbf{t}$ existing discrepancies between prices on different days of the wer For individual years, however, distinct price trends have an importa influence.

## EFFECT OF SEASON ON DAILY VARIATIONS

Hog production and marketing are highly seasonal. There are t distinct periods of heavy market movement, reflecting, respectively, sprir and fall-farrowing practices. The first peak is in June, when the amou of movement is approximately 118 per cent of that in April and 1 per cent of that in September. The second peak, and by far the high is in December and January. Average daily receipts at Chicago in Deces ber are more than double the receipts in September. April and Septemt are months of light receipts and relatively high prices.

The time of year also is a factor affecting daily variations. The pt portionate number of hogs received and reshipped on different days the week varies with the season. Larger price premiums on certain da are paid in some months than in others.

Although Monday's receipts for the entire period averaged 29.5 per ce of the week's receipts, they averaged about 33 per cent in April and M and 25 per cent in November (table 10). In general, receipts on Mond were proportionately heavier in the spring and summer than in the $f_{i}$ and winter.

Tuesday's receipts varied from a low of 15.2 per cent in March to 21 per cent in November-a difference of 6.3 per cent. Receipts on Thursd were not so variable, the difference between the high and the low beil 4.3 per cent on a somewhat higher base.

Both Tuesday's and Thursday's receipts were high in the fall and wink offsetting the reverse situation on Monday and Wednesday. Friday share of the week's receipts varied with the total amount of moveme being higher when receipts were heavy than when they were light.

TABLE 10. Average Daily Receipts and Percentage Distribution of Weekly Receipts of Hogs at Ceicago, by Four-Week Periods, 1921 to 1928

| Period | Weekg | Avarage daily recoipts (hundreds) |  |  |  |  |  | Per cont of weekia rocaiphs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mop } \\ \text { dey } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Tues } \\ \text { diy } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednee } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Thurb } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Fi}- \\ & \text { diay } \end{aligned}$ | Satur | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuep } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednes } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thurw } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Priv} \\ & \mathrm{Can} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\text { Santur }}$ |
|  | 1-4 | 591 | 468 | ${ }_{238}^{262}$ | 529 | 406 | 82 | 25.4 | 20.1 | 11.2 | 22.4 | 17.4 | 8.5 |
|  | ${ }_{9-12}^{5-8}$ | (645 | 392 | 2205 | 408 | 389 | ${ }_{64}^{80}$ | ${ }_{32.1}^{30.6}$ | 18.3 | 11.0 | 19.1 | 17.8 | 8.7 |
|  | 18-16 | 454 | 229 | 173 | 255 | 217 | 52 | 32.9 | 18.6 | 12.5 | 18.8 | 15.7 | ${ }_{8.8}^{8.8}$ |
| 5. | 17-20 | 480 | 228 | 177 | 266 | 208 | 50 | 33.1 | 18.4 | 12.7 | 19.2 | 15.0 | 8.6 |
|  | ${ }^{31-244^{\circ}}$ | 498 | 270 | 221 | 313 | 247 | 58 | 31.0 | 16.8 | 18.8 | 19.8 | 15.4 | 8.5 |
|  | 25-28* | 515 | 277 | 208 | 315 | 259 | 52 | 31.7 | 17.1 | 12.7 | 10.4 | 15.9 | 8.8 |
|  | 29-32 | 447 | 228 | 187 | 260 | 220 | 45 | 32.2 | 18.4 | 13.5 | 18.8 | 15.9 | 8.8 |
|  | 33-367 | 383 | 226 | 173 | 220 | 171 | 40 | 31.8 | 18.6 | 14.3 | 18.1 | 14.1 | 8.8 |
| 10 | 37-40 | 329 | 219 | 163 | 234 | 168 | 38 | 28.6 | 19.1 | 14.2 | 20.4 | 14.6 | 8.1 |
|  | 41-44. | 388 489 | 284 | 189 | 279 | 227 818 | 57 | ${ }_{27}^{27.8}$ | 19.9 | 18.8 | 19.6 | 15.9 | 4.0 |
|  | 45-48** | ${ }_{629} 88$ | 426 <br> 504 | 237 278 | 444 | 318 | 71 | 24.8 | 21.5 | 11.9 | 22.4 | 16.0 | 8.6 8.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Averaso. |  | 480 | 305 | 207 | 334 | 267 | 59 | 29.5 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 20.1 | 16.1 | 3.6 |

- Only three weeks included, because of holidays.

Reshipments' of hogs from Chicago were generally relatively heavy when receipts were heavy. However, there were several exceptions. Receipts on Thursday were lighter in October than for the period as a whole, but reshipments were heavier (tables 10 and 11). The same was true on Tuesday in July.

TABLE 11. Average Daily Reshipments and Percentage Distribution of tee Wericy Reshipments of Hogs from Chicago, by Four-Week Periods, 1921 то 1928

| Pariod | Woobe | Average daily reahipments (bundreds) |  |  |  |  |  | Per cent of week's reabipments |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mor- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Tues- }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednew- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thary } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pri-} \\ & \mathrm{day} \end{aligned}$ | Satar- | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mon- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | Tuesday | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednes- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thurat } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Fri-} \\ & \text { div } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{\text {Santur }}$ |
| 1. | $1-4$ | 176 | 131 | 85 | 185 | 152 | 59 | 23.8 | 17.8 | 11.5 | 18.3 | 20.6 | 8.0 |
|  | 8-8 | 180 | 125 | 76 | 181 | 137 | 48 | 20.4 | 18.3 | 11.1 | 17.7 | 20.1 | 0.4 |
|  | 9-12 | 145 | 88 | 61 | 86 | 108 | ${ }^{36}$ | 27.7 | 16.8 | 11.6 | 16.4 | 20.6 | 6.8 |
|  | 13-18 | 110 | 6 | 41 | 62 | 78 | 21 | 30.3 | 17.4 | 11.3 | 14.3 | 20.9 | 8.8 |
|  | 17-20 | 90 | 52 | 35 | 45 | 62 | 18 | 29.8 | 17.2 | 11.6 | 14.8 | 20.5 | 8.0 |
|  | 21-24** | 85 | 54 | 35 | 61 | 64 | 18 | 27.9 | 17.7 | 11.5 | 18.7 | 21.0 | 8.2 |
|  | 25-28* | 112 | 87 | 42 | 84 | 70 | 18 | 30.8 | 18.4 | 11.8 | 14.9 | 19.8 | 5.01 |
|  | 29-32 | 104 | 61 | 4 | 60 | 74 | 19 | 28.7 | 18.9 | 12.8 | 16.6 | 30.4 | 5.2 |
|  | 33-36* | 80 | ${ }^{57}$ | 41 | 48 | 59 | 16 | 28.7 | 18.4 | 18.2 | 15.5 | 19.0 | 8.2 |
|  | 37-40 | 70 | 45 | 38 | 49 | 58 | 16 | 25.8 | 16.6 | 18.2 | 18.1 | 21.4 | 5.91 |
|  | 41-4. | 80 | ${ }^{56}$ | 83 | ${ }_{80}^{88}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6 | 89.8 |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {40- }}^{\text {45-48*** }}$ | 117 | 98 128 | 61 76 | ${ }_{111}^{99}$ | 109 | 30 4 | 23.2 23.7 | 19.5 20.1 | 10.1 11.8 | 19.6 | 21.6 20.1 | 6.0 |
| Averamb. |  | 117 | 70 | 61 | 75 | 00 | 28 | 28.6 | 18.0 | 11.6 | 17.0 | 20.4 | 0.4 |

- Only three weeks included, because of holidays.

In January, 8 per cent of the hogs reshipped left Chicago on Saturday. In July this percentage was much less- 5 per cent. A larger proportion was reshipped on Saturday in the winter than in the summer. Undoubtedly the summer heat, with no market on the following day, was a contributing factor.

Since a larger proportion of. Saturday's hog receipts was reshipped in the winter than in the summer, it naturally follows that the proportion remain-
ing for slaughter in Chicago was less. In January, Saturday furnishe only 1.4 per cent of the supply of hogs for Chicago slaughterhouse (table 12). In June and October the percentage was 3.1.

TABLE 12 Antrage Daily Net Supply and Precentage Distrincition of th Wexict Net Supply of Hogs at Chicaco, ay Four-Wrez Pratog 1921 T0 1928

| Pwod | Fiocis | Avenge daily nut surpoly (bundrado) |  |  |  |  |  | Per enat of weak's sat capply |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\right\|_{\substack{\text { Tues } \\ \text { diny }}}$ | Wodnem- | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Thurs } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Fr} \\ & \mathrm{~d} y \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Setur- } \\ \text { dey } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Tyor | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wednew } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Thust day | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pr} \\ & \mathrm{day} \end{aligned}$ | 80/0y |
|  | 1-4 | 415 | - 837 | 177 | 387 | 264 | ${ }^{23}$ | 26.1 | 21.8 | 11.1 | 4 | 189 |  |
|  | 5-8 | 475 | 267 | 160 | 237 | 238 | ${ }^{86}$ | 22.6 | 18.3 | 11.0 | 19.7 | 18 ? |  |
|  | 13-16 | 844 | 168 | 132 | 208 | 111 | 1 | 32.8 | 16.8 10.8 | 12.8 | 208 | 18. |  |
|  | 17-20 | 870 | 176 | 142 | 821 | 146 | 32 | 34.0 | 16.8 | 13.1 | 201 | 13. | 8. |
|  | 21-24" | 413 | 216 | 186 | 282 | 183 | 40 | 11. | 16.6 | 14.8 | 801 | 141 |  |
|  | 25-28* | 403 | 210 | 16 | 201 | 189 | 34 | 32.0 | 10.6 | 18.0 | 207 | 150 | 8 |
|  | 20-32. | 343 | 167 | 142 | 200 | 146 | 20 | 38. | 18.8 | 14.0 | 188 | 14.8 |  |
|  | 33-380 | 294 | 169 | 132 | 172 | 112 | 24 | 38.0 | 18.7 | 14.6 | 190 | 12. |  |
|  | 37-40 | 230 | 174 | 130 | 185 | 110 | 20 | 29.5 | 19.8 | 14.8 | 211 | 12. |  |
| 12. | 45-48* | 308 872 | ${ }_{828}^{228}$ | 186 | 345 | 209 | ${ }_{41}$ | 25.1 | 22.1 | ${ }_{12}^{12.8}$ | 2208 | 14.8 |  |
|  | 49-52* | ${ }_{478}$ | 870 | 208 | 875 | 261 | 48 | 27.7 | 21.8 | 11.6 | 21.7 | 14.8 | 8 |
| Avarace |  | 878 | $2 \times 8$ | 156 | 259 | 177 | 81 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 15.8 | 21.2 | 14.6 | 2.1 |

*Only three weeks included, because of holidays.
Monday's net supply varied from 25.1 per cent of the week's total il November to 34.0 in March and May-a difference of 8.9 per cent. A in the case of receipts, the proportions were high in the spring and summe months and low in the fall and winter.

Since prices and receipts are inversely correlated, the peaks of heav: receipts correspond with the troughs of low prices. However, seasona price variations do not exhibit as great a range as do supply fluctuations Whereas receipts in December were approximately 142 per cent of th average for the year, the average price in December was about 90 per cent In September, with receipts 70 per cent of the average for the year, th average price was 104 per cent.

Top prices change with the season more than do average prices. It September the top prices were 108 per cent of the average for the year and in December they were 88 per cent. For average prices thes percentages were 104 and 90 , respectively.
The spread between the top and the average prices of hogs was greates in August and September and least in May and June (figure 7). Fron December to April and from June to September, as receipts decreasec the spread between the two prices widened. It narrowed again as thi supply again became plentiful.
This spread is largely a reflection of quality differences in the hog marketed during different seasons of the year. When the spread was wide as in August and September, the bulk of the supply was of rather poos quality-breeding stock, and the like-for which relatively low price were paid. These lowered the average price, but had little effect on thi top price which is the price paid for a few lots of choice hogs.
From the standpoint of average prices. Monday furnished the bes market for hogs in five of the thirteen four-week periods into which thi


Figure 7. average daty receitpts, antd top and average prices, op hocs at CEICAGO, BY FOUR-WEFK PERIODS, 1921 TO 1928
The spread between the top and the average prices of hogs widens as the receipts decline, and narrows again when the movement is heavy
year was divided (table 13). Friday had the highest prices in five and Saturday in the three remaining periods.

Table 13. Average Daily Top and Average Prices of Hogs at C̀micago, by Four-Weex Periods, 1921 to 1928


Only three week included, because of holidayt.
Wednesday, Saturday, and Monday had the lowest average prices in each of four periods. Lowest prices were paid on Tuesday in December. Saturday had the lowest top prices in four periods, Wednesday in four periods, Thursday in three periods, and Monday and Tuesday in one period each.

For individual periods, the seasonal variation in hog prices was an important factor contributing to variations in the prices paid on different days of the week. From September to November, when average prices were falling at the rate of $21 / 3$ cents per hundredweight per market day and top prices at the rate of $32 / 3$ cents, prices on Monday from 14 to 22 cents higher than those on Saturday would be expected.

The premium paid for hogs on certain days of the week was often very great. In October, Monday's top price exceeded that of Saturday by 32.7 cents per hundredweight. The average-price differential was 24.8 cents. In the preceding period, the tenth, the differentials for top and average prices were 23.5 and 8.6 cents, respectively.

Price trends cannot possibly explain such large differences in the prices paid for hogs on different days of the week. Some other factor or factors must have affected the situation. Apparently the number of hogs received on Monday in September and October was in some way limited, for the supplies were decidedly inadequate.

## DAILY VARIABILITY OF PRICES

## AVERAGES FOR THE PERIOD

One measure of daily-price variability is an average of changes from one day to the next, taken without regard to the direction of the change. These results may then be made comparable for different days by expressing the average change as a percentage of the average price on the day of the change. The percentages so obtained may be referred to as coefficients of daily-price variability.

Both top and average prices undergo many changes from day to day. These variations are greatest from Saturday to Monday and least from Friday to Saturday (table 14). For the period as a whole, average prices changed 15 cents a hundredweight from Saturday to Monday and only 8.5 cents from Friday to Saturday. Prices generally changed in about the same amount from Monday to Tuesday and from Wednesday to Thursday, although top prices changed more than did average prices.
TABLE 14. Average Daily Changes, and Coefficients of Variability of Daily Changes, in Top and Average Prices of Hogs at Chicago, 1921 to 1928

|  | Average daily changes (cents per hundredweight) |  | Coefficients of variability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In top prices | In average prices | In top prices | $\begin{gathered} \text { In average } \\ \text { prices } \end{gathered}$ |
| Saturday to Monday | 14.9 | 15.0 | 1.43 | 1.54 |
| Monday to Tuesday Tresday to Wednesdiay | 13.4 | 12.8 11 | 1.29 | 1.32 |
| Tvesday to way to Thursday | ${ }_{13.7}^{12.9}$ | 11.9 12.7 | 1.32 | ${ }_{1}^{1.22}$ |
| Thursday to Friday . | 12,5 | 12.1 | 1.20 | 1.24 |
| Friday to Saturday. | 10.0 | 8.5 | 0.96 | 0.87 |

The coefficients of variability indicate that both top and average prices fluctuated about 1.25 per cent of the price from day to day (table 14). From Saturday to Monday the average price changed 1.54 per cent, and from Friday to Saturday 0.87 per cent. Average prices fluctuated more than did top prices from Saturday to Monday, Monday to Tuesday, and Thursday to Friday, but less on the other three days.

## EFFECT OF CYCLE ON DAILY VARIABILTTY

The variations in hog prices from day to day are somewhat dependent on the phase of the hog-price cycle. In 1921, average prices changed 20 cents per hundredweight from Saturday to Monday (table 15). In 1928 the corresponding changes averaged 12 cents. Top-price changes from Saturday to Monday fluctuated between 12.4 cents in 1928 and 16.9 cents in 1925.
table 15. Average Daily Cbanges me Top and Average Prices of Hogs at Chicngo, by Years, 1921 to 1928

| Yetr | Top prioes |  |  |  |  |  | Avarese priose |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tues- } \\ & \text { day } \\ & \text { Wo } \\ & \text { Wodnem } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Town } \\ & \text { day } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tednew- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | (Center per hancred weight) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971. | 18.8 | 16.6 | 18.8 | 18.5 | 18.9 | 11.8 | 80.0 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 15.9 | 18.2 | 13.0 |
| 1937 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 0.6 | 15.1 | 13.8 | 10.3 | 18.8 | 11.1 | 10.6 |
| 1923 | 14.0 | 11.6 | 12.4 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 0.5 | ${ }^{15.6}$ | 10.0 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 7.8 |
| 1024 | 14.1 | 11.5 | 10.8 | 12.0 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 15.0 | 11.9 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 10.9 | 8.7 |
| 1925. | 18.8 | 15.2 | 14.5 | 16.6 | 16.8 | 11.0 | 17.8 | 18.6 | 14.6 | 16.6 | 15.5 | 10.2 |
| 1938. | 18.0 | 14.4 | 15.4 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 12.1 | 13.6 | 13.2 | 13.1 | 13.8 | 12.8 | 8.8 |
| 1927. | 15.8 | 12.8 | 11.8 | 11.3 | 10.2 | 9.0 | 13.1 | 10.2 | 8.8 | 9.8 10.9 | 8.8 | 4.8 |
| 1088 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 10.7 | 12.0 | 12.7 | 10.5 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 6.3 |
| Averaso. | 14.9 | 13.4 | 12.8 | 18.7 | 18.5 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 12.8 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 10.1 | 8.5 |

When these averages are expressed as percentages of the respective prices, which removes the effect of differences in the level of prices, both top and average prices changed the most from Saturday to Monday in 1921 and the least in 1926 (table 16). On this basis the fluctuations in the average price from Saturday to Monday were more than twice as great in 1921 as in 1926. Fluctuations in the average price from Friday to Saturday in 1921 were more than three times as great as they were in 1927.

In general, price changes from day to day, as expressed in percentages of the prices, were greatest when the level of prices was low and least

TABLE 16. Coefficients of Variability of Daily Ceanges in Top and Average Prices of Hocs at Chicago, by Years, 1921 to 1928

| Yerr | Top prices |  |  |  |  |  | Averse pricen |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Satan- din To Mon- day | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Max- } \\ \text { div } \\ \text { mo } \\ \text { Tuev } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taes } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Tednes- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wedpeo } \\ \text { dy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Thuse } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | Thant day to Po Piay | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pir } \\ \text { diy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Sentur } \\ \text { diyy } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mooc } \\ \text { doy } \\ \text { doy } \\ \text { Toot- } \\ \text { duy } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tres- } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { Todneo- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | Wednese dy to Thuy day | Thur <br> day <br> 0 <br> Pris <br> day | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pr} \\ \text { diy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Sitar } \\ \text { dyy } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1931. | 1.70 | 1.78 | 1.74 | 8.00 | 1.30 | 1.4 | 2.38 | 1.88 | 1.88 | 1.88 | 1.80 | 1.53 |
| 1928 | 1.82 | 1.29 | 1.12 | 1.11 | 1.07 | 0.96 | ${ }^{3} .68$ | 1.48 | 1.11 | 1.37 | 1.18 | 113 |
| 1028. | 1.71 | 1.48 | 1.58 | 1.39 | 1.47 |  |  |  | 138 | 1.38 | 1.4 | 1.08 |
|  | 1.6 | 1.38 | 1.28 | 1.39 | 1.28 | 0.72 | ${ }_{1}^{1.84}$ | 1.48 | 1.39 | 1.45 | ${ }_{1}^{1.38}$ | 0.87 |
| 1938. | 1.17 | 1.06 | 1.14 | 1.19 | 1.85 | 0.80 | 1.10 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 1.08 | 0.8 |
| 1937. | 139 | 1.11 | 1.08 | 1.03 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.28 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.97 | 0.88 | 0.47 |
| 1988. | 1.23 | 1.17 | 1.10 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 1.88 | 1.10 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 0.06 |
| Amene | 1.4 | 1.20 | 1.24 | 1.38 | 1.20 | 0.96 | 1.54 | 1.32 | 1.28 | 1.31 | 1.24 | 0.87 |

when the level of prices was high. In other words, the absolute changea tended to remain fairly constant, regardless of differences in the general level of prices. The amount of the price change did not increase with increasing prices as would be expected.

## EFFECT OF SEASON ON DAILY VARIABILITY

The time of year also had an important effect on price variability. Prices were much more variable in some seasons of the year than in others.

Both top and average prices were highly variable in July and August (table 17). From Friday to Saturday the average price changed 5.2 cents per hundredweight in May and June and 15.4 cents in August. From Saturday to Monday the average change was 20 cents in July and August. Top prices changed 17.5 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday in August and 8.8 cents in December.

TAble 17. Averagr Changes in Top and Averagr Prices of Hoge at Ceicaco, by Four-Werk Periods, 1921 to 1928

| Patiod | Weels | Top prices |  |  |  |  |  | Avwrage priens |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Setar- } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Mon- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Mop } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Tuep } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Tues desy to Wednes day | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wodnes } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { Tho } \\ \text { Thut } \\ \text { doy } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Thume } \\ \text { doy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Prt } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Pri- } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { startur- } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Setaxy } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Mot- } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mop } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { Tut } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | Tuev day To day dy | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text { Wodne } \\ \text { dzy } \\ \text { Thurs } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Thurvol} \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { fio } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Fro } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { so } \\ \text { Betur } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
|  |  | (Cente per bundredwoicht) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-4 |  |  | 10.9 | 18.6 | 15.0 | 11.6 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 102 | 18.4 | 14.4 | 1 |
| 8. | ${ }_{\text {8-8 }}^{5-12}$ | 18.8 | 12.8 | 18.6 16.1 | 14.7 128 | 14.8 | 10.9 | 18.4 | 11.6 | 12.8 | 10.4 | 12.8 | 6.1 |
| 8. | ${ }^{18-10}$ | 11.8 | ${ }_{12}^{15.8}$ | 16.1 11.6 | 12.8 14.7 | 14.8 10.8 | 8.8 | 12.7 | 18.7 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 18.8 | 7.8 |
|  | 17-20 | 14.6 | 8.9 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 0.4 | 12.0 | 8.9 | 9.6 | 18.6 | 6.8 | 5.6 |
|  | 21-24* | 14.0 | 10.0 | 18.1 | 8.8 | 10.8 | 0.5 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 7.6 | 10.6 | 8. |
|  | 25-289 | 12.8 | 12.6 | 8.8 | 10.8 | 11.0 | 12.1 | 16.0 | 12.8 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 11.0 |
|  | 20-32 | 19.8 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 17.5 | 13.6 | 12.8 | 20.6 | 14.1 | 19.8 | 18.0 | 15.0 | 12.8 |
| 9 | 83-386 | 17.7 | 14.8 | 17.8 | 14.4 | 15.0 | 12.7 | 20.0 | 14.8 | 15.8 | 18.8 | 10.2 | is. 4 |
|  | 47-40 | 17.5 | 14.1 | 15.6 | 18.1 | 13.7 | 10.8 | 17.8 | 14.6 | ${ }_{12} 1.8$ | 130 | 11.9 | 8 |
| 12. | 45-48. | 13.5 | 18.4 | 9.6 | 10.8 12.9 | 12.1 | 0.8 | 18.6 | 12.9 | 8.6 | 11.0 | 12.8 | 8.8 |
| 18. | 40-52* | 12.8 | 11.5 | 8.8 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 8.6 |
| Avanga |  | 14.8 | 13.4 | 12.9 | 18.7 | 12.6 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 12.8 | 11.8 | 12.7 | 12.1 | 8. |

- Only three weeks included, because of holidays.

In general, from the standpoint of absolute changes, prices fluctuated the most in the four months July to October inclusive, and least in the four months February to May inclusive. During the former period, however, the level of prices was somewhat higher than in the latter. Hence, somewhat larger fluctuations would be expected from July to October.

The coefficients of variability substantiate the fact that prices vary more from day to day during the summer than during the spring. The contention that absolute price changes tend to remain constant regardless of changes in the level of prices, also is supported.

In July and August, changes in the average price from Saturday to Monday amounted to more than 2 per cent of the price paid in those months (table 18). In May the coefficient was 1.22 per cent. For corresponding changes from Friday to Saturday, the figures were 1.56; and 0.57 per cent, respectively.

TABLE 18. Coepfictents of Variability of Dally Cehanges in Tor and Averagr Prices of Hogs at Chicaco, by Four-Weeic Periods, 1921 to 1928

| Paind | Feols | Top prisen |  |  |  |  |  | Averago prices |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mop } \\ & \text { dy } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tuoy- } \\ & \text { dyy } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Tues } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednee- } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wedrest } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { dion } \\ \text { Thurbs } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pri} \\ \text { div } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { stame } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Setury } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { dow } \\ \text { Moxy } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Moes } \\ d \operatorname{dyy} \\ \mathrm{to}_{0} \\ \text { Tues- } \\ d y y \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Tuas- } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wencom- } \\ \text { dy } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Wednes- } \\ \text { dy } \\ t_{0} \\ \text { Thowte } \\ \text { diny } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Thury } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { trio } \\ \text { day } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fi- } \\ & \text { div } \\ & \text { totur- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1 | 1.44 | 1.84 | 1.11 | 1.89 | 1.58 | 1.17 | 1.4 | 1.47 | 1.09 | 1.4 | 1.58 | 0.96 |
|  |  | ${ }_{1}^{1.36}$ | 1.28 | 1.34 | 1.48 | 1.41 | 1.06 | 1.39 | 1.20 | 1.97 | 1.07 | 1.4 | 0.83 |
|  | ${ }_{18-18}^{9-12}$ | 1.42 | 1.19 | ${ }_{1.11}^{1.5}$ | 1.19 1.40 | 1.37 | 0.88 | 1.20 | 1.65 | 1.14 0.82 | 1.14 | 1.37 | 0.71 |
|  | 17-20 | 1.41 | 0.87 | 1.16 | 1.38 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.20 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 1.39 | 0.89 | 0.57 |
|  | 21-24* | 1.39 | 0.99 | 1.32 | 0.88 | 1.07 | 0.84 | 1.31 | 0.93 | 1.14 | 0.77 | 1.09 | 0.54 |
|  | 25-28* | 1.23 | 1.19 | 0.98 | 1.98 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.68 | 1.28 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.12 | 1.11 |
|  | 20-38 | 1.78 | 1.19 | 1.50 | 1.56 | 1.21 | 1.10 | 2.03 | 1.40 | 1.94 | 1.49 | 1.49 | 1.23 |
|  | 33-36* | 1.57 | 1.32 | 1.57 | 1.28 | 1.32 | 1.18 | 2.01 | 1.50 | 1.60 | 1.59 | 1.00 | 1.56 |
|  | 37-40 | 1.54 | 1.25 | 1.39 | 1.18 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 1.70 | 1.34 | 1.18 | 1.88 | 1.17 | 0.94 |
|  | 41-44. | 1.18 | 1.54 | 1.07 | ${ }_{1}^{1.53}$ | 1.30 | 0.91 | 1.41 | 1.49 | 1.30 | 1.71 | 1.48 | 1.08 |
|  | ${ }_{40-69^{\circ}}$ | 1.40 | 1.25 | 1.01 0.86 | 1.37 1.40 | 1.29 | 0.74 | 1.51 | 1.48 | ${ }_{1}^{0.91}$ | 1.33 1.38 | 1.37 | 0.69 0.68 |
| Avare. |  | 1.48 | 1.29 | 1.4 | 1.38 | 1.20 | 0.98 | 1.54 | 1.32 | 1.22 | 1.81 | 1.24 | 0.87 |

- Onily three woeks incloded, becanse of holidays

For the week as a whole, average prices underwent greater seasonal variation in day-to-day fluctuations than did top prices. This was the case despite the fact that average prices themselves showed less seasonal variation than did top prices.

From Tuesday to Wednesday, the coefficients of daily top-price variability ranged from 0.93 to 1.57 per cent, a difference of 0.64 per cent. For the same days the coefficients for average prices ranged from 0.92 to 1.94 per cent, a difference of 1.02 per cent.

## HOW PRICES VARX

The bulk of the changes in hog prices from one day to the next are changes of 25 cents per hundredweight or less (table 19 and figure 8). For the week as a whole, the distributions are approximately normal, with few large changes either up or down and with increasing frequency with small fluctuations.

The main difference between the frequency distributions of daily changes in top and in average prices is in the number of small changes (figure 8). There were many days when the top price did not change from the price on the preceding day. The number of days when the average price did not change was much less. On the other hand, average prices underwent more small changes changes from 5 to 10 cents-than did top prices.


Figure 8. mequency distribution of dally changes in top and average pRICES OF Hogs, CHICACO, 1921 to 1938
For the weck as a whole, the daily top price undergoes fewer small change than does the daily average price. However, there are more daya on which no change in price takes place

TABLE 19. Frequency Distribution of Daily Changes in Top and Aviaha Prices of Hogs, without Regaid to Direction, at Ceicaco, 1921 to 1928

| Priee change por bundrodweight | Number of changes in top priowe |  |  |  |  |  | Number of thegen la avereap drien |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Setary } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Mos- } \\ \text { doy } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Moos- } \\ \text { doy } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Tues } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tues } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wedre- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wedae } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { Thumb } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & \text { Thary } \\ & d x y \\ & t 0 \\ & \text { Yo } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} 8+1 \\ \text { daty } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { giturn } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sular- } \\ & \text { dey } \\ & \text { Mo } \\ & \text { Mos. } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Moos } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Tuer } \\ \text { day } \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wodnev } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { To } \\ \text { Thurs } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thurev } \\ \text { dyy } \\ 10 \\ \text { yo } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pr } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { dam } \end{gathered}$ |
| 0. (Conta) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8............. | 81 | 88 | 77 | ${ }_{68} 6$ | 81 | 107 | 88 | 89 | ${ }_{0}^{40}$ | 08 | \% | 12 |
|  | 81 | 88 | 86 | 80 | 67 | 69 | 81 | 88 | 111 | 0 | 01 | 7 |
|  | 77 | 58 | 68 | 7 | 68 | 50 | 73 | 85 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
|  | 46 | 48 | 41 | 84 | 84 | 4 | ${ }^{81}$ | 48 | 4 | 41 | 47 | 19 |
| 25. | 35 | 83 | 3 | 29 | 8 | 21 | 20 | 38 | 14 | 24 | 87 | 1. |
| 80 | 17 | 11 | ${ }^{11}$ | 16 | 15 | 9 | ${ }^{28}$ | 16 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
|  | 14 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 | \% | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| Over 40. | 8 | 10 | 10 |  |  | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | \% | 1 | 1 |
| Total. | 876 | 276 | 878 | 878 | 876 | 876 | 876 | 876 | 876 | 876 | 176 | 376 |

Disregarding the direction, the most frequent average-price change was 5 cents (table 19). A 10 -cent change was most frequent for top prices. Well over half of the changes were 10 cents or less.
Different price changes were typical for different days of the week. In the case of average prices, the most frequent changes from Monday to Tuesday, Thursday to Friday, and Friday to Saturday, were 5 -cent changes. From Saturday to Monday and from Tuesday to Wednesday 10 -cent changes were most frequent, while from Wednesday to Thursday the number of 5 - and of 10 -cent changes was the same. For top prices, 10 -cent changes were most frequent on all days except Thursday to Friday and Friday to Saturday.

TABLE 20. Frequency Distribution of Daily Canages in Tof and Avrage Prices of Hogs at Chicaco, 1921 to 1928


The number of large price changes, 35 cents or more, was greater for top prices than for average prices every day of the week. Moreover, in both cases, the number of large changes tended to be greater at the beginning of the week and to decrease as the week passed.

Frequency distributions of daily price changes, taken with regard to the direction of the change, are somewhat variable in shape for different days of the week (table 20). The most frequent change in the average price from Saturday to Monday was a 15 -cent advance; from Monday to Tuesday it was a 5 -cent decline; from Tuesday to Wednesday, a 10 -cent decline; from Wednesday to Thursday, a 10 -cent advance; from Thursday to Friday, a 5-cent advance; and from Friday to Saturday the greatest frequency was with no price change.

With top prices, no changes were most frequent on four of the six days. From Monday to Tuesday and from Wednesday to Thursday, 10 -cent advances were the commonest changes. Relatively few large price advances were made from Tuesday to Wednesday and from Friday to Saturday. Large price advances from Saturday to Monday were the


Figure 9. frequency distribution of dally changes in the average price of hogs from friday to saturday and from saturday to monday, chiCago, 1921 to 1928
More than half of the changes in the average price of hogs from Friday to Saturday were changes of 5 centa or les.. Threefourth3 of the changea from Saturday to Monday were changes of 10 centa or more


Figure 10. frequency instribution of daily changes in the average price of hags from monday to tuesday and from thursday to friday, criCAGO, 1921 to 1928
The most typical price change from Monday to Tuesday was al deccine of $s$ cents, whereas from Thursday to Friday the most typical change was an advance of 5 cents
most frequent. The greatest number of large price declines were made from Tuesday to Wednesday, and the smallest number from Thursday to Friday.

The frequency distributions of daily changes in the average price from Friday to Saturday and from Saturday to Monday show a marked contrast (table 20 and figure 9). There were more than three times as many instances when the average price did not change from Friday to Saturday as there were from Saturday to Monday. Moreover, 5 -cent changes, both advances and declines, were more frequent from Friday to Saturday. The number of price declines of 10 cents or more was not materially different for the two days, but from Saturday to Monday there were many more advances in price of 10 cents or more.

The distribution of average-price changes from Friday to Saturday was distinctly unimodal, with no changes predominating. From Saturday to Monday, 5 - and 10 -cent declines and 10 - and 15 -cent advances were the most frequent changes. Although 15 -cent advances predominated to some extent, no distinct modal change stood out, owing to the flatness and irregularity of the central part of the distribution.

Whereas 5 -cent advances in the average price from Thursday to Friday were the most typical changes, 5 -cent declines were the most frequent from Monday to Tuesday (table 20 and figure 10). Moreover, average prices showed fewer price advances of any amount from Monday to Tuesday than from Thursday to Friday. Likewise, there were more price declines from Monday to Tuesday than from Thursday to Friday.

Several statistical measures for the frequency distributions presented in table 20 were calculated and are presented in table 21. The results are intended principally to show differences between days of the week rather than absolute values.

The arithmetic mean and the median are measures of the average net advance or decline of the price from one day to the next during the entire eight-year period. For example, the top price of hogs on Monday aver-

Table 21. Mran, Median, Mean Deviation, Skewness, and Coniflation of Daily Changes in the Top and Average Prices of Hogs at Chicaco, 1921 то 1928

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seturday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Momity } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Tuoeday } \\ \text { Wedinoeder } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wedreenday } \\ & \text { Thurndey } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thursiay } \\ & \text { Pridioy } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arithmetic mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Top-price changee............. | +3.47 | -2.17 | -3.60 | -0.45 | +3.95 | -2.66 |
|  | +2.51 | -2.39 | -1.25 | +1.21 | +1.85 | -3.11 |
| Top-price changes............. | +3.37 | -1.19 | -1.19 | +0.53 | +4.09 | -1.49 |
|  | +3.08 | -2.74 | -0.69 | +2.27 | +3.47 | -1.43 |
| Top-price changes............ | 14.9 | 13.4 | 12.9 | 13.7 | 12.5 | 10.9 |
| Coefficient of skewnesses: | 15.0 | 12.8 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 12.1 | 8.5 |
| Top-price changes............ | $\underset{-0.11}{+0.02}$ | -0.22 +0.08 | ${ }_{-0.14}^{-0.56}$ | -0.21 | -0.03 | -0.35 |
| Coefficient of correlation between |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| price changes............ | +0.87 | +0.82 | +6.73 | 10.79 | +0.74 | +0.32 |

[^3]aged more than 3 cents per hundredweight above Saturday's top price. The average price on Tuesday was between 2 and 3 cents below this price on Monday. Tuesday's, Wednesday's, and Saturday's prices were typically lower than the prices paid on the preceding day.

Differences between the arithmetic mean and the median value for corresponding days and prices are indications of the lack of symmetry in the frequency distributions. They form the basis for calculating coefficients of skewness, a measure of this lack of symmetry.

In general, the coefficients of skewness were negative and very small. This means that the distributions deviated very little from normal, and that the large price declines outnumbered the large price advances in most cases.

The distributions which deviated the most from normal were those of top-price changes from Tuesday to Wednesday and of average-price changes from Friday to Saturday. The distributions of top-price changes from Saturday to Monday and from Thursday to Friday were practically normal.

## SYNCHRONOUS VARIABILITY OF TOP AND AVERAGE PRICES

If the same spread existed between top and average prices at all times, their changes from day to day would, of course, be exactly the same. However, such is not the case. During the eight-year period, top and average prices fluctuated together from day to day approximately 27 per cent of the time (table 22). A 5-cent difference in their changes added

TABLE 22. Frequency Distribution of Differences in the Daily Changes in Top and Average Prices of Hogs at Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Price change per hundredweight | Saturday Mondey | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tuesday } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Tuesday } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednesday } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednesdey } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Thursday } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Thursdey } \\ \text { to }}}{ }$ Friday | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Priday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Saturday } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Cents) |  | 123 |  |  |  |  |
| 5................................. | 151 | 147 | 162 | 141 | 144 | 137 |
|  | 70 | 63 | 69 | 76 | 81 | 74 |
| 15............................. | 27 | 17 | 26 | 26 | 22 | 28 |
|  | 12 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 20 | 20 |
|  | 4 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| 30................................ | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 35.................................. | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 40........................ | 1 | 1 | 4 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 |

another 39 per cent, leaving approximately one-third of the days when changes in the average price from the preceding day differed from changes in the top price by 10 cents or more.

Coefficients of correlation also were calculated as measures of the synchronous variability of top and average prices from day to day (table 21). The two prices fluctuated most nearly together from Saturday to Monday. The relationship was much less from Friday to Saturday.

VARIABILITY OF DAILY HOG RECEIPTS
The number of hogs received daily at Chicago is highly variable. The principal factors affecting the number are the hog cycle, the seasonal variation, and the unequal distribution of weekly receipts.

Monday's receipts varied, during the period, from about 21,000 to about 123,000 hogs (table 23). The highest number officially recorded at the stockyards on any day was 122,749 , received on Monday, December 15, 1924.
table 23. Frequency Distarbution of Dark Recerts on Hoce at Caicaco, 1921 T0 1928

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Receipts (hundreds) \& Monday \& Treaduy \& Weaneetisy \& Thursday \& Pridey \& 80turday <br>
\hline 10-49.9 \& ......... \& ......... \& \& \& \& 175 <br>
\hline $50-89.9$

$90-129$. \& \& $\cdots$ \& $\cdots$ \& 1 \& 17 \& 147 <br>
\hline 90-
$130-129.9$
109 \& \& 21 \& 84 \& ${ }^{2}$ \& 59 \& 16 <br>
\hline $170-209.9$ \& \& 51 \& 111 \& 26 \& 70 \& 1 <br>
\hline $210-249.9$ \& ${ }^{8}$ \& 75 \& 62 \& 57 \& 61 \& .... <br>
\hline $250-289.9$
$200-329$ \& 16 \& 71 \& 38 \& 58 \& 4 \& ..... <br>
\hline $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 290- } & 389.9 \\ 360-9\end{array}$ \& 26
4 \& 28 \& 21 \& 61 \& 25 \& …...... <br>
\hline $370-409.9$ \& 35 \& 23 \& 8 \& 16 \& 16 \&  <br>
\hline 4100449.9 \& 39 \& 17 \& 2 \& 16 \& 12 \& ....... <br>
\hline $450-489.9$
$490-529.9$ \& 46 \& 8 \& 2 \& 23 \& 10 \& . $\cdot$...... <br>
\hline $530-569.9$ \& 35 \& 9 \& \& 12 \& 7 \& …...... <br>
\hline $570-609.9$ \& 20 \& 6 \& \& 2 \& 2 \& ........ <br>
\hline $610-649.9$ \& 17 \& 5 \& \& 7 \& 4 \& ......... <br>
\hline $650-689.9$ \& 18 \& 6 \& \& 1 \& 1 \& . <br>
\hline $690-729.9$
$730-769.9$ \& 8 \& 1 \& \& 5 \& 1 \& ......... <br>
\hline 770-809.9 \& 7 \& 1 \& \& 1 \& \& . <br>
\hline 810-88989 \& 3 \& ......... \& ......... \& 1 \& . \& , <br>
\hline $890-929.9$ \& 3 \& .......... \& \& \& \& . <br>
\hline $930-969.9$ \& 2 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1.070-1.009.9 \& 0 \& . \& ......... \& \& \& <br>
\hline $1.010-1.049 .9$
$1.050-1.089 .9$ \& 2 \& . \& \& \& \& ......... <br>
\hline 1.090-1.129.9 \& 0 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1.130-1,169.9 \& 0 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1.170-1.209.9 \& 0 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1.210-1.249.9 \& 1 \& \& \& \& ...... \& ....... <br>
\hline Toxal. \& 376 \& 376 \& 376 \& 376 \& 376 \& 376 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

The largest number of hogs received on Saturday did not exceed 21,000 , the lowest number that arrived on Monday. Tuesday's receipts varied between 9000 and 81,000 hogs; Wednesday's, between 9000 and 53,000 ; Thursday's, between 5000 and 89,000 ; and Friday's, between 5000 and 77,000 .
Receipts of approximately 47,000 hogs were most frequent on Monday. The commonest number received on Tuesday was 23,000 , less than half the number on Monday. Typical receipts on Wednesday were 19,000, on Thursday 31,000, on Friday 19,000, and on Saturday 3000.

Various measures of central tendency, dispersion, and skewness were calculated for the frequency distributions in table 23. The results are presented in table 24. As with the frequency distributions of price changes, the results are intended to show differences between days of the week rather than absolute values.

On all days of the week the arithmetic mean was larger than the median, indicating positive skewness in the distributions. This means that there were more days of very heavy receipts than of very light receipts.

The distributions were more skewed for some days of the week than for others. For Monday, the distribution was more nearly normal than for the other five days. The distribution for Tuesday was skewed the most.

TABLE 24. Mean, Median, Standard Deviation, Skrwness, and Coeppicient of Variability of Daily Receipts of Hogs at Ceicago, 1921 to 1928

|  | Arith metic mean | Median | Standard deviation | Coefficient of skewness* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Coefficient } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { variability } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monday . | 48.920 | 46,700 | 15,830 | +0.42 | 32.4 |
| Tuesday. | 30,480 | 27,230 | 12,400 | +0.79 | 40.3 |
| Wednesday | 20.690 | 19,400 | 7.080 | +0.55 | 34.2 |
| Thursday | 33,530 26,650 | 31,000 $\mathbf{2 3} \mathbf{7 2 0}$ | 12,800 11,960 | +0.59 | 38.2 40.0 |
| Saturday | 5,980 | 5.280 | 3.040 | +0.69 | 50.8 |

-Calculated from the formula
Skewness $=\frac{3 \text { (mean }- \text { median })}{\text { Standard deviation }}$
The coefficients of variability, which were computed by expressing the standard deviations as percentages of the arithmetic means, averaged approximately 39 per cent for the week. Saturday's receipts were the most variable, while receipts on Monday showed the least variation.

## RELATION OF DAILY PRICES TO DAILY RECEIPTS <br> daily variations

There are important differences in the effect that fluctuations in the receipts of hogs have upon prices on different days of the week. In measuring these relationships, the average number of hogs received on each day of the week and the average price paid during the entire eightyear period were assumed as normals. Logarithmic curves were then used to relate percentage deviations in receipts from normal, to percentage deviations in the price from normal.

Owing to the large number of observations which were used in constructing these curves, the data were grouped on the basis of the amount of receipts. The group averages, both receipts and price, were then used as observations for constructing the curves of relationship. They were weighted according to the number of cases in each group.

Receipts below normal were associated with prices above normal, and receipts above normal were associated with prices below normal, on all days of the week. The amount, however, that prices were below or above normal when receipts fluctuated from normal, differed for the different days of the week (table 25 and figures 11 to 17).
table 25. Relation of Daily Receipts of Hogs to Adernge Prices, Chicago, 1921 т0 1928




Figuke 11. prlation op the recrits of hocs on monday to the avisage PRICE, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
When receipts an Monday were 50 per cent below normel, the price wat is per cent above normal
-


Figure 12. relation of the receipts of hogs on tuesday to the averace paices CHICACO, 1921 tO 1928
When receipts on Tuesday were 50 per cent below normal, the price wat 19 per cean above normal


Figure 13. detation of the receipts of hocs on whomesdat to the aveaace PRICE, CHICACO, 1921 to 1928
When receipts on Wedmenday were 50 per cent below normal, tho price wes 27 per cent above normal


Figure 14. rehation of the receipts of hogs on thursday to the average PRICE, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
When receipta on Thursday were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 16 per cent above normal


Figure 15. rriation of the receipts of hogs on friday to the average PRICE, CHICAGO, 1921 to 1928
When receipts on Friday were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 17 per cent above normal

PRICE, IN PER CENT OF NORMAL


Figure 16. relation of the receipts of hogs on saturday to the avrbage PRICE, CEICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
When receipta on Saturday were '50 per cent below normal, the price was 12 per cent above normal


Figure 17. relation of the receipts of hogs on monday, wednesday, and saturday, to the average price, chicago, 1921 to 1928
When receipts on Saturday were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 12 per cent above normal. On Monday and on Wednesday the price was 22 per cent and 27 per cent above normal, respectively, when receipts were 50 per cent below normal

The adjustment of prices to receipts was greatest on Wednesday and least on Saturday. Receipts 50 per cent below normal were associated with a price 27 per cent above normal on Wednesday and a price 12 per cent above normal on Saturday.

In general, the degree of price adjustment to receipts on different days was associated with the daily variability of receipts. The more variable a day's receipts, the less was the adjustment of prices to fluctuations in the receipts. Saturday's receipts were the most variable (table 24), and Monday's and Wednesday's receipts were the least variable. The price adjustment was least on Saturday and greatest on Monday and Wednesday.

## DAILY, WEEKLY, AND YEARLY RELATIONSHIPS

The adjustment of prices to receipts for the week as a whole was greater than for any single day (figure 18). When weekly receipts were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 31 per cent above normal.


Figure 18. relation of the weekly receipts of hogs to the average price, CHICAGO, 192I TO 1928

[^4]As in measuring the relationship of daily receipts to prices, the averages for the entire period were assumed as normal. Also, group averages, weighted according to the number of cases in each group, were used in constructing the logarithmic curve of relationship between weekly receipts and prices.

When the period of time was extended to a year, the adjustment of prices to receipts was complete. That is to say, the total value (price times number of hogs received, disregarding changes in the average weight) remained constant for annual data. When a year's total receipts were 20 per cent below normal, the price was 25 per cent above normal (table 26 and figure 19). When the receipts were 20 per cent above normal, the price was 17 per cent below normal.

Although for the entire period yearly prices were completely adjusted to receipts, individual years deviated from the average relationship. When prices were advancing in the hog cycle, they advanced faster than receipts declined. Going down the cycle, prices declined faster than receipts increased. In consequence, relative to the average relationship, prices were over-adjusted in the first case and under-adjusted in the second. Or, in other words, prices led the way in both phases of the hog cycle.

A comparison of the relation of prices to daily, weekly, and yearly receipts shows the effect of the


Figure 19. relation of the yeardy receipts of hogs to the average price, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
On the average, the price of hogs was completely adjusted to yariations in yearly receipts. However, individual years were not fully adjusted. Going up the hog-price cycle, prices advanced faster than receipts fell off; on the way down, prices declined faster than receipts increased

Table 26. Relation of Daily, Weekly, and Yearly Recbipts of Hogs to Average Prices, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

length of time on the adjustment of prices to receipts (table 26, and figures 20 and 21). The longer the period of time elapsing, the greater was the adjustment. When receipts were 20 per cent below normal, on Saturday


Figure 20. nelation of the saturdat, wiekiy, and yearly receipts of hocs to the averack price, chicaco, ig2I T0 1928
When receipts of hoga at Chicago for Satur. day, for a week, or for a year were 20 per cent below normal, the pricee were 4, 9 , and 25 per cent above normal, reapectively


Figure 21. relation of the widneke DAY, WEEEIY, AND YRARLY RKCEIPTI of hoos to the averaot price, chi CA00, 1921 to 1928
When receipts of hogs at Chicaso to Wednesday, for a week, or for a year wer 20 per cent below normin, the pricee wert : 20 per and as per cent above, normil, reappectivali)
the price was 4 per cent above normal, on Wednesday it was 8 per cent above normal, for the week it was 9 per cent above normal, and for the year it was 25 per cent above normal.

## BEPORE AND AFTER THE WAR

The relation of daily receipts to prices during different periods of time was measured for Thursday. Average receipts and average prices during each of the periods were the assumed normals for that period A comparison of the relationship of Thursday's receipts to Thursday's price before and after the World War is shown in table 27 and in figures 22, 23, and 24. Since the 1910-1913 and 1921-1924 periods were com-

TABLE 27. Changes in the Reantion of Thursday's Receipts of Hocs to tbe Averace Price, Chicaco

|  | Per cent change in | Receipta 50 per cent below norma | Rectipts $\mathbf{5 0}$ per cent above norm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | per-cent change in receipts | Per cent thet price was above norma | Per cunt that price wat below normal |
| 1910-1913................................... | 0.202 | 15 | s |
| 1921-1924. . .................................... | 0.151 | 11 | 6 |
| 1925-1928.1.1.197.................................... | 0.205 | 15 | 8 |
|  | 0.253 | 28 |  |

parable in so far as the phases of the hog cycle are concerned, they were used for comparing pre-war and post-war relationships.

 CEICACO, 1910201913
Before the war, when receipts an Thursday mere 50 per cent belon normal the price was 15 per cent ahove normil


FHURE 23. RBTATION OF THE DECBIPTS OF HOCS ON TEUBSDAY AT THE BOTTOM OF TEKE HOG-PRES CYCTE, TO TEE AVEPAGE FRICE, CEICACO, I92I TO 1904
After the war and at the bottom of the hog-price cycie, when roceipts on Thursday were 50 per cent below mormal the price was ti per cent above normai





Before the war, receipts on Thursday 50 per cent below normal werı associated with a price 15 per cent above normal. After the war, wher receipts were 50 per cent below normal the price was 11 per cent abovi normal.

## at the bottom and the top of the cycle

During the 1921-1924 period the prices of hogs were low, whereas dur ing the 1925-1928 period they were high. In the earlier period hoga werı at the bottom of the hog-price cycle, and in the later period they were a the top.

The relation of receipts on Thursday to the price during each of thess two periods is shown in table 27 and in figures 23, 25, and 26. Wher receipts on Thursday at the bottom of the cycle were 50 per cent belon


Fioure 25. relation of the recipts of hogs on thurgday at the top of the HOG-PRICE CYCLE, TO THE AVERAOE PRICE, CHICACO, 1925 TO I9a8

- After the war and at the top of the hog-price cycle, when receipts on Thuraday were go per cent below normal the price was 15 per cent above normal


Figure 26. RELATION OF THE RECEIPT8 OF HOOS ON THURSDAY AT THE TOF ARD AT TEE BOTTOM OF THE FOG-PRICE CYCLE, TO THE AVERAOE PRICE, CHICACO, 1925 TO 1924 AND 1925 TO 1928
Prices fuctuated more with Thursday's receipte at the top of the hog-price cycle than at the bottom
normal, the price was 11 per cent above normal. When receipts on Thursday at the top of the cycle were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 15 per cent above normal. Apparently the adjustment of daily prices to receipts is greater when prices are high and receipts are light than when prices are low and receipts are heavy.

## DURING THE WINTER AND THE SUMMER MONTHS

The relation of receipts on Thursday to the price of hogs differed during the winter and the summer months (table 27, and figures 27, 28, and 29). During the winter, receipts on Thursday 50 per cent below normal


FIGURE 27. RELATION OF THE RECEIPTS OF HOGS ON THURSDAY DURING THE WINTER MONTES, TO THE AVERAGE PRICE, CEICAGO, I92I TO 1928
During the winter, when receipts on Thursday were 50 par cent below normal the price was 16 per cent above normal


Figure 28. relation of the receipis of hogs on thursday during tee sumimer MONTES, TO THE AVERAGE PRICE, CEICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
During the summer, when receipts on Thursday were 50 per cent below normal the price was 18 per cent above normal


Figure 29. relation of the receipts of hogs on thursday during the wanter AND THE SUMMRER MONTHS, TO THE AVERAGE PRICE, CHICACO, 1921 tO 928
Prices fluctuated more with Thursday's receipts during the summer than during the winter
were associated with a price 16 per cent above normal. During the summer, when Thursday's receipts were 50 per cent below normal the price was 28 per cent above normal. The adjustment of prices to receipts was much greater in the summer than in the winter.

Since prices are high and receipts are light in the summer as compared with the winter, support is given to the contention that the arljustment of daily prices to receipts is greater when prices are high and receipts are light than when prices are low and receipts are heavy.

## relation of daily receipts to daily price changes

When the price of hogs advances from one day to the next, the number of hogs received at Chicago on the second day is generally small. When the price declines the number is generally large.

During the eight-year period from 1921 to 1928 inclusive, the number of hogs received at Chicago on Monday when the average price declined 40 cents per hundredweight from Saturday to Monday, averaged 67,200 (table 28). When the price advanced 40 cents the average number of hogs received on Monday was 39,200, or about 58 per cent of the number received when the price declined by the same amount.

TABLE 28. Rflation of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs mom Satueday to Monday, to Receipts of Hoas ox Monday, Critcaco, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Saturday to Morday | Prequency | Receipta of how on Monday |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total (humdrede) | Averate (hundreds) | Per cent of normal |
| -40....... |  |  |  |  |
| -40......... | 2 | 1.343 | 672 578 | 1.37 |
| -30...... | 9 | 3.287 | 587 | 120 |
| -25. | 10 | 5.875 | 5A88 | 120 |
| -20....... | 28 | 14.060 15.904 | 6.39 568 | 131 116 |
| -10.. | 36 | 20.604 | 572 | 117 |
|  | 38 27 | 19.521 13.761 | 514 510 | 103 |
| + 5 | 30 | 13.761 14.248 | 310 475 | ${ }^{104}$ |
| +10. | 40 | 18.677 | 467 | 95 |
| +15....... | 42 | 17.906 | 426 | 87 |
| +20....... | 27 | 10.894 | 403 | 82 |
| +25....... | 11 | 6.773 $\$ .202$ | 3139 382 | \% ${ }^{5}$ |
| +35. | 16 | 2.514 | 388 419 | 6 |
| +40. | 2 | 2.384 | 392 | 00 |

The average number of hogs received on Monday during the entire period was 49,000 (table 5, page 12). This figure was taken as normal for Monday receipts.

As would be expected. Monday's receipts were approximately normal when the price of hogs did not change from Saturday to Monday (table 28). When the price declined 40 cents the receipts were 37 per cent above normal, and when it advanced 40 cents they were 20 per cent below normal. In general, the variance of receipts from normal was proportionate to the size and direction of the price change.

A logarithmic curve was fitted to these percentage deviations from normal (figure 30 ). In calculating the equation for this curve, the group


Figere 30. relation of changes in the average price of hogs from saturday to monday, to receipts on monday, chicaco, 1921 то 1928
When the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday, receipta on Monday were 47 per cent above normal


Figure 32. relation of changes in the avirage price of hogs from tuesday TO WEDNESDAY, TO RECETPTS ON WEDNESDAY, CHCACO, 1921 TO 1928
When the price declined 40 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday, receipta on Wedneaday were $3 s$ per cent above normal


Figure 31. relation of changes in the average price of hoos prom monday to tuesday, to receipts on tuesday, chicago, 1921 T0 1928 When the price declined 40 cents from Monday to Tuesday, receipts on Tuesday were 18 per cent above normal

Figure 33. relatton of changes in tiete average price of hocs frome wednesdAY To telersday, to reckipts on thursday, chicago, 1921 to 1928
When the price declined 40 cents from Wedoesday to Thursday, receipts on Thurndiy were 51 per cent above normal


Figure 34. relation of cebanges in the average price of hocs prom thursday to prday, to recripts on prday, chiccio, 1921 to 1928
When the price deelined 40 cents from Thursday to Friday, recespts on Friday were $3^{8}$ per cent above normal. When the price advanced 40 cente, reccipis were 25 per cent below normal


Figure 35. relation of changes in the average prick of hocs prom friday to saturday, to receipts on saturday, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
When the price declined 40 cents from Pryday to Saturday, receipta on Saturday were i1 per cent above normal. When the price advanced 40 cents, receipte were 8 per cent below nưmal
averages given in table 28 were weighted according to the frequency of the group. For example, 137 per cent was given a weight of 2,118 per cent a weight of 5 , and so on.

On the basis of the fitted curve, Monday's receipts of hogs were 47 per cent above normal when the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday. They were 30 per cent below normal when the price advanced 40 cents. When there was no change in the price, receipts on Monday averaged 1 per cent above normal.

Similar curves were fitted to the data for the other days of the week (figures 31 to 35 ). On Tuesday, receipts were only 18 per cent above normal when the price declined 40 cents from Monday to Tuesday. Moreover, receipts were 2 per cent below normal when the price did not change.

There was considerable difference in the relation of price changes from one day to the next, to the variations in the number of hogs received on different days of the week (table 29). When the price declined 40 cents from Wednesday to Thursday, Thursday's receipts were 51 per cent above normal. When the same change in price took place from Friday to Saturday, Saturday's receipts were only 11 per cent above normal.

Monday's and Thursday's receipts of hogs deviated the most from normal with a given price change from the preceding day (figures 36 and 37). Saturday's receipts deviated the least. Not only is the slope of
table 29. Relation of Daily Changes in the Average Price of Hogs to the Variation of Daily Receipts from Normax, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928



Figure 36. relation of changes in the AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS FROM TEE PRECEDING DAY, TO RECEIPTS ON MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY, CEICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
When the price deelined 40 cents from that on the preceding day, receipts on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday were, respectively, 147, 118, and 133 per cent of normal


Figure 37. retation of changes in the average price of hogs prom the preceding day, to receipts on thursday, priday, and saturday, chicago, 1921 T0 1928
When the price declined 40 cents from that on the preceding day, receipts on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday were, respectively, 151, 138, and 111 per cent of normal
the curve less in the case of receipts on Saturday, but the observations fit less closely to the mathematically fitted curve.

It might at first appear as though a larger percentage deviation of receipts from normal was required on days of normally heavy than on days of normally light receipts, to swing the price a given amount. Instead, however, the price changes more in accordance with changes in receipts on Monday and Thursday than on Saturday. Saturday's receipts are so small in any case, relative to the receipts on other days, that fluctuations
in the number have little effect on the price. Changes in Monday's and Thursday's receipts, on the other hand, have an important influence on price.

## Effect of daily price changes on later receipts

Price is generally considered a resultant rather than a causal factor. Thus, it is often said that a given price has been arrived at through the interaction of supply and demand forces for the particular product concerned.

More and more attention is being given to the fact that price itself is an important factor governing future supply. Higher prices lead to a larger supply and lower prices to a smaller one. Thus, fluctuations in the supply of the product produced and offered for sale are partly attributable to variations in the price. To say that fluctuations in supply are more influential or causal than fluctuations in price, is like saying that the force of gravity is more effective than inertia in producing the swing of the pendulum.

Responses to price changes may be classified as production or marketing responses. In the case of livestock, evidences of the former are found in the number of animals bred. Changes in receipts at important markets over a short period of time give evidence of marketing responses to price.

The length of time elapsing between the stimulus and the response is very different for production and for marketing responses. For the former, the time conforms fairly closely to the period required to produce the particular product. This, of course, differs for different types of livestock. Cycles of production of varying lengths reflect this time factor. Since marketing responses assume a given supply produced and ready for sale, the biological element does not enter. The time elapsing between the stimulus of price change and the response as evidenced by market receipts is largely dependent on the distance of the particular market from the supply, the production center, or the place of storage, and on transportation facilities.

Because of this difference in time requirements, marketing responses are more difficult to measure than are production responses. Where the product can be stored in or near the market, responses to price changes may be almost instantaneous. Under such circumstances, many of the price changes may never be recorded and the whole picture may be blurred.
Since in the case of Chicago the storage of livestock in or near the market is limited and the centers of production are sufficiently removed, the measurement of marketing responses for hogs at that market was considered promising. Moreover, the availability of reliable data on the daily number of hogs received, and on daily prices, was a factor contributing to the selection of that market and that product for the present analysis.

## METHOD OF ANALYSIS

In order to eliminate, in so far as possible, the effects of seasonal and cyclical variations in receipts and prices, as well as of normal daily varia-
tions in receipts, the following method of analysis was adopted. The effect of changes in the average price of hogs from Saturday to Monday on subsequent receipts is used as an illustration.

Twice during the period the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday (table 30). The total number of hogs received on Monday on those two occasions was 134,300 , or an average of 67,150 (table 31). On Tuesday, the following day, 63,400 were received, or an average of 31,700 . On Wednesday an average of 20,200 hogs were received, and so on.

When the price advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, on twenty occasions, Monday's receipts totaled 677,300, Tuesday's 496,000, Wednes-
table 30. Relation of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, to the Total Number Recenved on Each of the Six Succerding Days, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Change in average price from Saturday to Monday} \& \multirow{2}{*}{Brequenoy} \& Monday \& Tueaday \& Wednesday \& Thursday \& Friday \& Suturdin \& Monday <br>
\hline \& \& \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total drily receeipto (hundreda)} <br>
\hline -40 (Canta) \& \& 1.343 \& 634 \& \& 443 \& 587 \& \& 816 <br>
\hline - $35 . . . . . .$. \& 6 \& 1,891 \& 2,101 \& 1,052 \& 1,438 \& 1,418 \& 403 \& 2,542 <br>
\hline -30. \& 9 \& 8.287 \& 8.075 \& 1,910 \& 2,792 \& 2,581 \& 661 \& 4,302 <br>
\hline -25 \& 10 \& 6,875 \& 8,058 \& 1,771 \& 3,036 \& 2,607 \& 648 \& 4,093 <br>
\hline \& 22 \& 14,000 \& 7.447 \& 4,662 \& ${ }^{6,731}$ \& 6,292 \& 1,489 \& ${ }^{11}$ 1,2985 <br>
\hline ${ }_{-10}-1$. \& ${ }_{38}^{28}$ \& $15 ; 804$
20,604 \& -8,036 \& 6,307
7,880 \& -8,672 \& 8,7614 \& 1,846
$\mathbf{2}, 227$ \& -18,870 <br>
\hline -5. \& 38 \& 19,521 \& -18,366 \& 7,464 \& 18,834 \& 10,105 \& 2,154 \& 18,'052 <br>
\hline O \& 27 \& 13,761 \& 7,867 \& 5,561 \& 0,269 \& 7,460 \& 1,673 \& 18,065 <br>
\hline $\pm 10$ \& 30 \& 14.248
18.677 \& -9,381 \& 5,096
8,478 \& 10,617 \& 8,912
11,270 \& 1,915

2, 646 \& 15,092 <br>
\hline -15 \& 42 \& 17,006 \& 18,619 \& 8,444 \& 16,946 \& 12,078 \& 2,1638
2 \& 21, 2506 <br>
\hline +20 \& 87 \& 10,894 \& 7,474 \& 5,548 \& 8,868 \& 6,891 \& 1,288 \& 12,037 <br>
\hline $+25$ \& 30 \& 6.773 \& 4,060 \& \& 8,049 \& 4.188 \& 938 \& 8,135 <br>
\hline \& 11 \& 4,208 \& 8,381 \& 1,917 \& 8,177 \& 8,406 \& 468 \& 4,780 <br>
\hline  \& 8 \& 2.514
78 \& 1,860 \& $\begin{array}{r}1,445 \\ \hline 09\end{array}$ \& ${ }^{2} \mathbf{8 1 1 6}$ \& 1,634 \& 1289 \& 8,389 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABle 31. Rrlation of. Cbanges in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to monday, to tres Average Number Received on Each of tare Six Succeeding Days, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Saturdiy to Monday | Prequenoy | Mondav | Tuesday | Todnesday | Thurreay | Friday | Saturday | Monday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average disily receipts (hundreda) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Conta) | 888108288888887808040489780111088 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -30.................. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{408}$ |
| -30................... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{478}$ |
| -20. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 518 |
| -10............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 800 |
| -8...... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{417}$ |
| + $5 . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ +10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 503 |
| +15............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 516 |
| +20............... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 468 |
| + +3..................: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63 658 |
| +85................... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{44}$ |

day's 368,600 , and Thursday's 604,900 . They averaged $33,865,24,800$, 18,430 , and 30,245 , respectively.

In measuring the changes which took place in receipts, Monday was taken as a base. Receipts on subsequent days of the week were expressed as a percentage of the receipts on Monday, the day of the change in price from the preceding day. The results are given in table 32.

TABle 32. Relation of Changes in the Averice Paice of Hogs pmom Saturday to Monday, to the Percentage Change, prox Monday, tr the Numale Reckived on Eace of the Six Succeeding Days, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| Change in avenge pries from soturday to Monday | Prequeney | Monday | Treaday | Wedneaday | Thursela | Yrideg | Bumerday | Maedy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Deily reouipte in por cent of Mooclay |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -40 (Cants) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -35........ | 8 | 1100.0 | 87.7 | 88.4 | 497 | 48 | 11.7 | \%. |
|  | 8 | 100.0 | 58.2 | 36.1 | 32.8 | 48.5 | 18 | 1. |
| -25 | 10 | 1000 | 62.2 | 80.1 | 61.7 | 44 | 110 | 78 |
| -20. | 22 | 1000 | 68.0 | 33.3 | 47.8 | 44 | 10.6 | 808 |
| -15. | 28 | 100.0 | 58.8 | 89.7 | 845 | $47 \%$ | 118 | 07 |
| -10. | 88 | 100.0 | 56.1 | 382 | 56 | 478 | 108 | 明 6 |
| -8 | 88 | 1000 | 88.8 | 38.3 404 | ${ }_{67} 6$ | 81 | 118 | ${ }^{0}$ \% |
| $+8$. | 30 | 100.0 | 6.8 | 421 | 74.8 | ${ }^{69}$ | 484 | 105 |
| +10. | 40 | 100.0 | 61.8 | 454 | 74.8 | $60 \%$ | 34.8 | 111. |
| +15. | 48 | 100.0 | 75.8 | 527 | 94.6 | 67.6 | 14.7 | 120.0 |
| $+20$ |  | 1000 |  |  | 81 |  |  | 110.5 |
| +25. +30 | 11 | 1000 1000 | 73.7 68 | 34.4 458 | 808 78.8 | 818 | 41. | 108.1 118.1 |
| +30 +35 | ${ }_{6}$ | 100.0 100.0 | 66.7 62.8 | 46.8 67.5 | 76.8 | 678 618 | 11.6 | 111.8 |
| +40. | 2 | 100.0 | 84.8 | 82.8 | 106.4 | 6.1 | 18 | 118.4 |

When the average price declined 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, Tuesday's receipts averaged 62.2 per cent of Monday's receipts, Wednesday's receipts averaged 30.1 per cent, and Thursday's averaged 51.7 per cent. When the price advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, receipts on Tuesday were 73.2 per cent of those on Monday, those on Wednesday were 54.4 per cent, and those on Thursday were 89.3 per cent.

In general, the percentages for each day increased with price advances and decreased with price declines. The rate of increase or decrease varied with the day, being much more on certain days than on others.

The relative effect of price changes on the receipts on different days was somewhat blurred by the fact that there were normal variations in the number of hogs received at Chicago on different days of the week. Monday's receipts for the entire period averaged 49,000. Tuesday's 30,500 , Wednesday's 20,700 , Thursday's 33,400 , Friday's 26,700 , and Saturday's 5900 (table 5, page 12).

In order to convert all percentages in table 32 to a comparable basis, the average number of hogs received on each day during the entire period was considered normal for that day. Thus, Tuesday's receipts were normally 62.4 per cent of Monday's receipts, Wednesday's were 42.3 per cent, Thursday's were 68.3 per cent, Friday's were 54.5 per cent, and Saturday's were 12.1 per cent. By dividing the several percentages in table 32 by the normal for the corresponding day, all items were made comparable.

The results of this process are given in tables 33 and 34 . When the average price of hogs declined 20 cents per hundredweight from Saturday to Monday, Tuesday's receipts were 85 per cent of what they would normally be, based on Monday's receipts. Wednesday's receipts were 78 per cent, and Thursday's receipts 70 per cent, of the normally expected number for those days. Or, in other words, a decline of 20 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday was followed by a decrease of 15 per cent in Tuesday's receipts, 22 per cent in Wednesday's receipts, and 30 per cent in Thursday's receipts.

TAble 33. Relation of Ceanges in the Aperage Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, to the Percentage Change (Corrected for Normal Daily Variations), prom Monday, in the Number Received on Eact of tee Six Succerding Days, Ceicago, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Beturday to Monday | Prequency | Monday | Tuesday | Wedneadiny | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Monday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily receipts in per cent of Monday (normal = 100) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -40 (Centa) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | 100.0 100.0 | 75.5 116.5 | 71.2 86.1 | 48.8 72.8 | 80.2 89.9 | 188.7 | 60.7 87.9 |
| -30. | 8 | 100.0 | 93.8 | 85.3 | 77.3 | 89.5 | 103.8 | 81.4 |
| -25. | 10 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 71.2 | 75.7 | 81.6 | 90.8 | 78.9 |
|  | 22 | 100.0 | 84.9 | 78.5 | 70.1 | 82.2 | 87.8 | 80.8 |
| -15 | ${ }_{36}^{28}$ | 100.0 100.0 | 90.1 80.0 | 93.8 90.8 | 79.8 85.8 | 86.6 87.3 | 95.8 80.3 | 87.2 88.4 |
| - 5 | 38 | 100.0 | 101.4 | ${ }_{90} 9$ | ${ }_{96.2}^{88.8}$ | 8.0 | 80.8 | 80.5 |
| 0..................... | 27 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 05.5 | 98.7 | 89.8 | 94.2 | 101.5 |
| $+5$ | 30 | 100.0 | 105.4 | 99.5 | 108.1 | 114.7 | 110.7 | 105.8 |
| $+10$ | 40 | 100.0 | 98.7 | 107.3 | 109.7 | 110.6 | 117.4 | 111.8 |
| $\pm$ | $\frac{48}{27}$ | 100.0 100.0 | 181.0 109.8 | $\underline{120.3}$ | 138.6 | 123.7 | $\underline{05.9}$ | 120.8 10.8 |
| +25 | 20 | 100.0 | 117.3 | 128.6 | 130.7 | 118.4 | 114.9 | 120.1 |
|  | 11 | 100.8 | 90.8 | 1178.8 | 110.7 | 105.1 | 91.7 | 113.8 |
|  | 6 2 | 100.0 100.0 | 100.2 134.0 | 135.9 123.4 | 123.3 154.3 | 111.9 128.8 | 95.0 130.6 | 131.7 113.4 |

TABLE 34. Relation of Cbanges in the Average Price of Hogs prom Saturday to Monday, to the Percentage Change (Corrected for Normal Daily Variations), prom Monday, in the Number Received on Each of the Six Succeeding Days, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Saturdiny to Mondny | Proquenoy | Monday | Tuecdiny | Wedneochy | Thurediay | Friday | Saturday | Monday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Per cent change in daily reocipts from Monday |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Conts) |  |  |  |  | -61.7 |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | 0 | +24.5 | -13.8 | -27.2 | $-10.1$ | +14.9 | -12.8 |
|  | 0 | 0 | -6.7 | -14.7 | -22.7 | -10.5 | +3.3 | -18.6 |
|  | 10 | 0 | -0.8 | -28.8 | $-24.3$ | -18.8 | - 9.1 | $-11.1$ |
|  | ${ }_{28}^{28}$ | 0 | -15.1 -9.9 | -21.5 -6.1 | ${ }_{\text {-20.2 }}$ | -17.8 | -12.4 | -19.7 |
|  | ${ }_{36} 8$ | 0 | -9.9 | -8.1 -9.7 | -20.2 -14.2 | -13.4 | -10.7 | -12.8 |
| -8..................... | 38 | 0 | +1.4 | - 8.7 | - 3.8 | -5.0 | $-8.1$ | - 4.6 |
|  | 27 |  | +8.8 | - 4.5 | - 1.3 | -0.7 | - 80.8 | +1.5 |
| +5.................. | 80 40 | 0 | + 8.4 | -0.5 +7.8 | +9.1 +9.7 | +14.7 +10.6 | +10.7 | + 5.8 |
|  | 42 | 0 | +81.0 | +24.6 | +38.5 | +23.9 | +21.6 | $+20.0$ |
| +80 | 27 | 0 | $+8.8$ | $\pm 20.3$ | +19.8 +807 | +18.7 +18.4 | - 4.1 | +10.5 |
| +25 | 120 | 0 | +17.8 -0.1 | +28.6 | +30.7 +10.7 | ${ }^{+18.4}$ | +14.0 -8.3 | +20.1 +13.3 |
| + 35 | 11 | 0 | +0.2 | +35.0 | + +2.8 | ${ }_{+11.9}$ | -8.0 | +31.7 |
| +10. | \% | - | +34.9 | +23.4 | +54.3 | +86.8 | +30.6 | +13.4 |

When the average price advanced 20 cents from Saturday to Monday, Tuesday's receipts were 110 per cent of what they would normally be, based on Monday's receipts, Wednesday's receipts were 120 per cent, and Thursday's were 119 per cent. Thus, an advance of 20 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 10 per cent in Tuesday's receipts, 20 per cent in Wednesday's receipts, and 19 per cent in Thursday's receipts.

Plottings of the data for each day indicated that the relationships between price changes and subsequent receipts were approximately linear.' Assuming linear relationships, straight lines were fitted to the percentages for each day by the method of least squares (figures 38 to 43). In calculating the mathematical equations for the lines, each percentage corresponding to a given price change was weighted according to the frequency of that price change.

Based on readings from the fitted lines, Tuesday's receipts of hogs averaged 17 per cent above the normally expected number when the average


Figure 38. relation of changes in the average pricz of houis from saturday to monday, to percentace changes in recerts trom monday to tUESDAY, CHECACO, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 11 per cent in Tuesday's receipta; a decline of 25 centa was followed by a decrease of 11 per cent


FIGURE 39. RELATIOM OV CHANGES TH THE AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS FROM SATURDAY TO MONDAY, TO PERCENTAGK CHANGES IM RECEIPTS FROM MONDAY TO WEDNREDAY, CHICACO, 192I TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Mondzy was followed by an is crease of 22 per cent in Wednesday's receipes; a decline of 25 cente wan followed by a decrease of 32 per cent

[^5]

Figure 40. relation of changes in the AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS FROM SATURDAY TO MONDAY, \%O PERCENTAGE CEANGES IN RECEIPTS FROM MONDAY TO THURSDAY, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
Receipts on Thursday were greatly affected by the price changea from Saturday to Monday. An advance of 25 eents increased receipts on Thurbday by 30 per cent; an advance of 40 centa incremsed them by 47 per cent


Figure 41. relation of chances in the average price of hogs from saturday to monday, to percentage changes IN RECEIPTS PROM MONDAY TO FRIDAY, catcaco, r921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 18 per cent in Friday's receipts; a decline of 25 centa was followed by a decrease of 17 per cent
price advanced 40 cents from Saturday to Monday (figure 38). Wednesday's receipts averaged 36 per cent, Thursday's 47 per cent, Friday's 29 per cent, Saturday's 16 per cent, and the following Monday's 28 per cent (figures 39 to 43 ). When the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday, receipts on Tuesday averaged 17 per cent below normal, on Wednesday 36 per cent, on Thursday 45 per cent, on Friday 28 per cent, on Saturday 13 per cent, and on the following Monday 22 per cent.

In other words, an advance in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase in the number of hogs received on each of the six succeeding days. A decline in price was followed by a decrease in receipts. With a 40 -cent advance, the increases were $17,36,47,29$, 16 , and 28 per cent, respectively. With a 40 -cent decline, the decreases were $17,36,45,28,13$, and 22 per cent.

Further adjustments were made to the straight lines as fitted, to meet an assumption that no change in receipts should correspond with no change in price. In this way all lines were focused at a common point. This facilitated a direct comparison of the slopes of different lines.

The relative slopes of the straight lines so fitted indicate the average percentage change in the receipts of hogs corresponding to a given ab-


Fioure 42. relation of changes in the averioe price of hoos prom saturday to monday, to percentace changes in receipts prom monday to saturday, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of as cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of it per cent in Saturday's receipta; a decline of 25 cents was followed by a decrease of 7 per cent


Figure 43. relation of chanols in the AVERAOE PRICE OF HOGS TROM SATURDAY TO MONDAY, TO PERCEN TAOE CHANOES IN RECETPTS FROM MONDAY TO THE FOLLOWTNG MONDAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928

[^6]solute change in the price. Thus, for example, Tuesday's receipts changed 2.08 per cent, Wednesday's 4.39 per cent, and Thursday's 5.63 per cent, following a change of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday.

## DAILY VARIATIONS

The above-described procedure was followed in analyzing the effect of price changes each day of the week on subsequent receipts of hogs. On all days, advances in the price stimulated the movement of hogs to market, and declines in the price retarded the movement.

The percentage changes in the receipts of hogs on each of the six subsequent market days as related to a change of 5 cents in the average price are given in table 35. A change of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a change of 2.08 per cent in Tuesday's receipts. An advance was followed by a 2.08 -per-cent increase, and a decline by a similar decrease. The effect on Wednesday's receipts was more than twice as great, 4.39 per cent. Receipts on Thursday were affected the most, 5.63 per cent.

With the single exception of changes in the price from Friday to Saturday, the greatest effect was on receipts the third day after the price
table 35. Effect of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs on the Receipts One to Six Days Later, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | (tane $\begin{gathered}\text { One } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { later }\end{gathered}$ | (two | Three days later | Pour days later | Pive days later |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satardey to Mo |  |  |  | 3.41 | 1.80 | 3.10 |
| Tuonday to Tuesdisy ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | 1.71 | 3.93 4.36 5 | ${ }^{6.22}$ | 5. 31 | 3.93 | 1.86 |
| Wednesday to Thurvay | 1.23 |  | 5.40 | ${ }_{4}^{4.47}$ | 3.20 | 3.95 |
| Thurraday to friday | (0.48 | 3.85 2.54 |  | 3.18 | 3.43 3.92 | 3.71 |

change. Some shippers were sufficiently near the market to receive the daily price report, act upon it, and have the effect of their decision felt at the market on the following day. For others, two days were necessary. Three days were required by most shippers before the price stimulus produced the highest degree of response.

The lacking effectiveness of changes in the price of hogs from Friday to Saturday on later receipts can be accounted for by the character of the Saturday market. During the entire eight-year period from 1921 to 1928, only 3.5 per cent of the hogs received at Chicago were received on Saturday. From the standpoint of prices, Saturday was typically a poor market. As a consequence, changes in the price from Friday to Saturday were not considered indicative of the market condition for the following week. Undoubtedly a large part of the effect which changes in the price from Friday to Saturday had on later receipts were attributable to the correlative influence of price changes on. other days.

Monday's receipts of hogs varied principally in response to changes in the price from Wednesday to Thursday (table 36). In all cases, with

TABLE 36. Epfect of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs on the Receipts eace Day of the Week, Ceicago, 1921 to 1928

| With e change of 5 cents in price | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesdmy | Thursday | Friday | Saturdas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seturday to Monday | 3.10 | 2.08 | 4.39 | 5.63 | 3.44 | 1.80 |
| Monday to Tuesday... | 3.93 4.10 | 1.86 3.00 | 1.71 46 | 3.93 1.31 | 6.22 4.36 | 5.31 7.58 |
| Tuesinesday to Thednesday | 4.10 5.40 | 3.00 | 4.36 3.20 | $\frac{1}{3.95}$ | 1.23 | 5.39 |
| Thurnday to Priday... | 3.85 | 5.74 | 3.71 | 3.43 | 3.88 | 0.48 |
| Friday to Saturday............... | 1.22 | 2.54 | 2.61 | 3.18 | 3.92 | 3.71 |

the exception of Wednesday, the price change three days before was the most effective. The number of hogs received on Wednesday was affected more by changes in the price from Saturday to Monday than by changes from Friday to Saturday.

The greatest effect of any price change was the response of Saturday's receipts to changes in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday. Each 5 -cent change was followed by a change of 7.58 per cent in the number of hogs received. Saturday's receipts were least affected by changes in
the price from Thursday to Friday. That number varied less than onehalf of one per cent following a change of 5 cents in the price.

The relative effect of various changes in the price, both advances and declines, on receipts one, two, and three days later, is shown in figures 44 to 49 , inclusive. In all cases the effect of the change in the price was greater on receipts three days later than on receipts two days later. Moreover, the effect was greater two days later than one day later.

It should be noted also that the lag is measured in the number of market days. This means that the insertion of a Sunday, with no market, did not alter the order of responses, the number of days with markets remaining constant.


Ficure 44. relation of changes in the AVERAGZ PRICE OP Hocs Trom saturday to monday, to pricentage ceanges in receipts prom monday to tuleday, monday to wednesday, and monday to thursday chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday, to Monday was followed by an imcrease of 10 per cent io Tuesday's receiptes 22 per cent in Wednenday': reccipt, and 28 per cent in Thurday'A recipte


Fioure 45. ridation of changes in the AVERAOE PRICE OF HOGB TROM MONDAY TO TUESDAX, TO PERCENTAGR CHANGFS IN RECEIPTS FROM TUESDAY TO WEDNESDAY, TURSDAY TO THURGDAY, AND TUESDAY TO HIDAY, CRICACO, I921 TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Monday to Tuesday was followed by on tho crease of 9 per cent in Wednemdari' rocelpte, to per cent in Thuriday's seceipts, and it per cent in Friday's receipts

## CHANGES IN TOP AND AVERAGE PRICES COMPARED

Although, in general, top and average prices move together from day to day, the size of such changes often differs, and sometimes the direction as well. Seasonal, cyclical, and even daily differentials in the spread between the two prices are evidences of the lack of complete sympathetic movement in both.


Figure 46. retation of changes in the average price of hogs prom tuesdat to wednesdat, to percentage changes In receipts prom wednespay to thursday, wednesday to priday, and wednesday to saturday, chicaco, 192I to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Truesday to Wednesday was followed by an increase of 7 , per cent in Thursday's receipts, 12 per cent in Priday's receipts, and 38 per cent in Saturday's reccipta


Figure 47. pelation of changes in the average price or hogs from wednesday to thursdat, to percentage changes in recripts from thursday to prday, thursday to saturday, and thursday to monday, cricaco, i921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Wednesday to Thursday was followed by an increase of 6 per cent in Friday's reccipec, 26.9 per cent in Saturday's receipts, and ay per cent in Monday's receipts

Hog shippers act on the basis of the general tone of the market rather than according to any particular quoted price. In measuring responses, the question arises as to what price best reflects this general tone. If one price is appreciably better than another, there should be significant differences in the responses made to the two prices.

The relative effect of changes in the top and the average prices of hogs from Saturday to Monday during the 1921-1928 period, upon the receipts on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, is shown in table 37. Each additional change of 5 cents in the top price increased or decreased Tuesday's receipts 2.35 per cent. A corresponding change in the average price affected Tuesday's receipts by 2.08 per cent, or somewhat more than one-fourth of one per cent less. The differences in the effect on Wednesday's and Thursday's receipts were 0.08 and 0.21 per cent, respectively, for each change of 5 cents in the two prices from Saturday to Monday.

On each of the three days-Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursdayreceipts fluctuated more with changes in the top price than with changes


Figure 48. rezation of changes in the average price of hogs from thursoay TO FRDAY, TO PERCENTAGE CHANGES IN RECEIPTS FROM FRIDAY TO SATURDAY, friday to monday, and riday to TUESDAY, CEICACO, 1921 TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Thursday to Friday was followed by an increase of 2 per cent in Saturday's receipts, 19 per cent in Monday's receipts, and 29 per cent in Tuesday's receipte


Figure 49. melation of changide in the averace price of hocs from yriday to saturdat, to percentace chanops in RECEIPTS TROM SATVRDAY 70 MONDAY, SATURDAT TO TUESDAT, aND satumday to WEDNESDAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
An adrance of 25 eenta in the price of hose from Friday to Saturday was followed by an increase of 6 per cent in Monday's receipts, 13.7 per cent in Tueydar'o receiptis, and is per cent in Wednesday's receipts

TAble 37. Relative Effect of Changes in Top and Average Pricrs of Hogs prom Saturday to Monday, upon Receipts on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, Chicago

| With a change of 5 cents in price |
| :---: |

in the average price. However, this fact is not particularly significant, since the differences were small.

A comparison of the relation of changes in top and average prices from Saturday to Monday ranging from declines of 40 cents to advances of the same amount, to changes in Wednesday's receipts, is presented in figure 50. The relation of the same changes in the prices to changes in


Figure 50. relative eppect of changes in top and average prices of hogs yrom saturday to monday, on wednesday's receipts, chicago, 1921 to 1928 A change of 40 cents in the top price changed Wednesday's receipts 36 per cent. A change of 40 cents in the average price changed Wednetday ${ }^{\text {cosen }}$


Figure 51. redattve efpect of changes in top and average prices of hogs from saturday to monday, on thursday's receipts, chicago, 1921 to 1928
A change of 40 cents in the top price of hogs from Saturday to Monday changed Thursday's receipts 47 per cent. A change of 40 cents in the average price changed Thursday's receipts 45 per cent

Thursday's receipts is shown in figure 51. Differences in the slopes of the two sets of lines are slight and not significant.

During an earlier period, 1910 to 1913, the effect of changes in the average price from Saturday to Monday was greater than that of changes in the top price (table 37, and figures 52 and 53 ). This was directly opposite to the situation in the later period. Moreover, the difference in the effectiveness of the two prices was about the same. Each additional change of 5 cents in the top price of hogs before the war affected Tuesday's receipts by 7.50 per cent. A similan change in the average price was approximately one-fourth of one per cent more effective. The greatest difference in effectiveness was on Thursday, when receipts fluctuated one-half of one per cent more with a change of 5 cents in the average price than with a change of 5 cents in the top price.

The foregoing illustrations for two different periods serve to bring out the fact that top and average prices are equally satisfactory for use in measuring price responses. Over a long period of time the two price quotations fluctuate together sufficiently to insure no significant differences in their effects on later receipts.


Figure 52. rahative etpict or changes in top and averace pricis of hocs prou saturday to monday, on wednesDAY'S RECEIPTS, CHICNGO, 1910 то 1913
A change, of 20 cents in the top price changed Wednesday's receipto as per cent A change of 20 cents in the average price changed Wednesday's receipts 35 per cent


Figure 53. Relative emtict of chamozs IN TOP AND ayERAOE PRICRS OP HOOS pROM SATURDAY to monday, on thutlDAY's RECETPT8, CEICAOO, 1910 TO 1913
A change of 30 cents in the top prica changed Thuraday's receipts 38 per cent. A change of 20 cents in the average price changed Thuraday's receipts 40 per cant

## RELATIVE EFFECT OF DAILY PRICE CHANGES ON LATER RECEIPTS

## BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR

The war period altered many economic relationships. The price mechanism, especially, was subjected to much change. The general level of prices rose very high, dropped abruptly, and remained for a long time at a level approximately 50 per cent above that of the pre-war years.

The hog market, in addition to price-level fluctuations, was subjected to alterations of various sorts. Among other things, attempts were made to stabilize market movement by such means as zoning systems, referred to on page 11.

Because of the somewhat abnormal conditions of the post-war period used in this study, it seemed desirable to make a few comparisons with pre-war data. The four-year period from 1910 to 1913 was used. It is comparable with the 1921-1924 period in so far as the phase of the hog-price cycle is concerned.

In terms of cents per hundredweight, hog prices fluctuated from day to day through a range approximately twice as great after the war at before. Also, the general level of hog prices was higher during the latte1 period.

As might be expected with prices fluctuating half as violently in the pre-war period, the same price change affected receipts almost twice
as much before as after the war. That is to say, a change of 20 cents in the price of hogs before the war was about iwice as effective as a change of 20 cents after the war, or about equally effective as a change of 40 cents.

A change of 5 cents in price from Saturday to Monday during the 1910-1913 period was followed by a change of 7.72 per cent in Tuesday's receipts of hogs, 8.82 per cent in Wednesday's, and 9.92 per cent in
table 38. Relative Effect of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs proy Saturday to Monday, upon the Reckipts on Tuesday Wednesday, and Thursday, bepore and after the War, Chicago, 1910-1913 and 1921-1924

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Tuesdey | Wednesdiay | Thursday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipls |  |  |
| Before the war (1910-1913) After the war (1921-1924). | 7.72 1.56 | 8.82 4.02 | 9.92 5.42 |

Thursday's (table 38). The same price change in the 1921-1924 period was followed by changes of $1.56,4.02$, and 5.42 per cent, respectively, in receipts on the three following days.

Before the war, an advance of 20 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday increased Thursday's receipts 40 per cent. After the war a 20 -cent change increased Thursday's receipts only 22 per cent. A change of 37 cents in the price was required for the same effect on receipts after the war as a change of 20 cents had before the war.

The essential differences between the two periods 1910 to 1913 and 1921 to 1924 were as follows: the general price level was approximately 50 per cent higher; prices at Chicago averaged about 7 per cent higher; and the prices fluctuated twice as violently from day to day in the later period as in the earlier.

Even with these factors taken into account, price changes affected later receipts more before the war than they did after.

## AT THE BOTTOM AND THE TOP OF THE CYCLE

During the first half of the 19211928 period, the number of hogs received at Chicago was large and


Figure 54. relative epfect of ceinnges in the average price of hogs from SATURDAY TO mONDAY ON THURSDAY'S RECEIPTS BEFORE AND AFTER TEE WAR, CHICACO, 1910 TO 1913 AND 1921 TO 1924
Similar price changes were much more effective in increasing and decreasing receipts of hogs before the war than after. However, prices fluctuated less, violently from day to day in the earlier period
prices were low. During the second half, the receipts were much less and prices were on a higher level. Hogs were at the bottom of their price cycle during the first period, and at the top in the second.

A given change in the price affected later receipts somewhat more at the top of the cycle than at the bottom (table 39 and figure 55). A change of 5 cents from Saturday to Monday affected Tuesday's receipts by 1.56 per cent at the bottom of the cycle and by 2.94 per cent at the top. Receipts on Wednesday and Thursday showed differences of 0.89 and 0.47 per cent, respectively, during the two periods.

TABLE 39. Relative Effect of Changes in the Average Price of Hoge mon Saturday to Monday, upon the Receipts on Tuesday, Wepnhiday, and Thursday, at the Bottom and at the Top of the hog-Price Crole, Chicaco,
1921-1924 and $1925-1928$ 1921-1924 AND 1925-1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price |
| :--- |



Figure 55. relative efyect of changes in the averace price of hocs from saturday to monday on thursday's receipts at the botton and at the TOP of the hoc-price cycie, chicaco, 1921 то 1924 AND 1925 TO 1928

[^7]Since a price change of 40 cents a a high price level is proportionately smaller than the same change at : low level, it would normally bi expected that the effect on late receipts would be greater at the lowe, level. However, such was not thi case. Price changes were more effec tive at the top of the hog-price cycle Apparently, when farmers havi fewer hogs to market and prices ari high, they follow the market some what more closely.

## during the winter and the SUMMER MONTHS

Price changes affected later receipt: more in the winter than in the summer months (table 40 and figure 56) The winter months included Octobe1 to March, inclusive, and the summes months the remaining six.
In the winter a 5 -cent change in price from Saturday to Monday wat followed by a change of 2.95 per cent in Tuesday's receipts, 4.75 per cent in Wednesday's, and 6.54 per cent in Thursday's. In the summer the corresponding percentages were 2.77, 4.32, and 5.78.
table 40. Relative Effect of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, upon the Recetpts on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, during the Winter and the Summer Months, Chicago, 1921 T0 1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipts |  |  |
| In winter months. . . In summer months.. | 2.95 2.77 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.75 \\ & 4.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.54 \\ & 5.78 \end{aligned}$ |

The fact that price changes were more effective in increasing and decreasing later receipts in the winter than in the summer, can be explained on the basis of the relative opportunities which farmers have of responding to the price stimulus in the two seasons. In the summer, farm operations are of such a nature that hogs cannot be shipped to market in response to the price stimulus alone. Hogs are often shipped when farm work can afford the time. In the winter, on the other hand, the factor determining when hogs shall be sent to market is not so much a matter of task conflicts. The market condition, as reflected in prices, is relatively more important.

WHEN THE SPREAD BETWEEN TOP
and average prices was large
and when it was small
The difference, or spread, between the average and the top prices of hogs is a rough measure of the degree of uniformity in the quality of hogs marketed. When the spread is small, the quality of all hogs sold is fairly uniform. When the spread is large, the quality is highly variable.

In comparing the effect of price


Figure 56. belative epfect of changes in the average price of hogs from SATURDAY TO MONDAY ON THURSDAY'S receipts during the winter and the SUMMER MONTHS, CHLCAGO, 1921 TO 1928
Receipts on Thursday were affected by changes in the price from Saturday to Monday to a greater extent during the winter than during the summer changes on later receipts, with different spreads between the two price quotations, a difference of less than 60 cents per hundredweight was considered a small spread. A difference of 60 cents or more was considered a large spread.

Equal changes in price were more effective when the spread between the two prices was small than when it was large. When the spread was small, a change of 5 cents in the average price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a change of 4.25 per cent in Tuesday's receipts, 6.16 per cent in Wednesday's, and 8.74 per cent in Thursday's (table 41). When the spread was large, the corresponding percentages were 2.41, 4.06, and 4.66.

TABLE 41. Relattve Eytict of Changes in Top and Avzange Priczs or Hoos from Saturday to Monday, upon tere Recripts on Tursday, Wedmeday, and Thursday, whem the Spread betwern the Pricis Was Lakge and when It Was Small, Chicacg, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 conta in price | Tumeday | Wedineed | Thuredey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Por cent change in recelpes |  |  |
| Average prices: |  |  |  |
| Large epread. | 2.41 4.25 | 4.06 6.16 | 6.06 |
| Top prices: |  |  |  |
| Large spread. | 2.47 | 4.99 5.28 | 6.08 |

These differences are, to a large extent, attributable to the quality factor. Producers follow the market more closely when they are marketing a high-quality product than when they are marketing a product of low quality.

Moreover, since the price spread is normally very large in July and August, two summer months when much of the low-grade breeding stock is sent to market, the difference in the effectiveness of price changes in the winter and in the summer (figure 56) can be explained, at least in part, by this factor. The difference in the price spread is the major influence, however, as evidenced by


Figure 57. melative eftict of changrs in the average price of hoos trox SATURDAY to monday on thursday's RECEIPTS WHEN THE SPREAD BETWEEA the top and the avernge praces was large and when it was smacl, chicaco, 1921 то 1928
Changen in the average price affected later
reccipts more when the spread was emall thrin when it wial large
the relative slope of the lines in figures 56 and 57.

Further proof of the significance of quality is shown in figures 58 and 59. Whereas responses to changes in the average price were greater than to changes in the top price when the spread was small, the reverse was the case when the spread was large. In other words, the top price was more indicative than the average price of what might be expected for good hogs when the quality was highly variable. Since responses were greater for relatively high-quality than for low-quality hogs, top-price changes were more effective.
during periods of palling and of RISING PRICES
In measuring the relative effect of price changes on later receipts of hogs during periods of falling and of rising prices, the two periods were defined as follows: periods of falling prices were those in which


Figure 58. relative empect of changes in top and average prices of hoos from saturday to monday on thursdAy's receipts when the spread between ther two prices was small, снесаоо, 2921 то 1928
When the spread was amall, changea in average prices were more effective than changes


Ftgure 59. retative efpect of changes in tor AND AVERAGE prtces or hogs from saturday to monday on thursday's recerpts when the sprend between the two prices was rarge, chicago, 1921 to 1928
When the spread was large, changes in top prices were more effective than changea in average prices
the net change in the average price for the six market days directly preceding the price change was a decline of 5 cents or more; periods of rising prices were those in which the net change was an advance of 5 cents or more.

Straight lines fitted to the data for the two periods showed that price changes were about equally effective on later receipts both times (table 42

TABle 42. Relative Effbct of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, upon Receipts on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, during Periods or Falling and of Rising Prices, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of $\mathbf{S}$ cents in price | Tuesdsy | Wedneeday | Thursdey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipta |  |  |
| Prices falling. | 2.63 | 4.28 | 6.01 |
|  | 2.61 2.38 | 5.23 3.90 | 6.01 |
| Advances during rising prices and declines during faling prices. Advences during falling prices and declines during rising prices. | 2.38 3.18. | 5.90 5.90 | 5.27 7.61 |

and figure 60). When prices were falling, a 5 -cent change in the price from Saturday to Monday affected Thursday's receipts 6.01 per cent. When prices were rising, the same change affected Thursday's receipts by exactly the same percentage.

By fitting a straight line to the percentage changes in Thursday's receipts when the price advanced following rising prices and declined


Figure 60. preative epfect of changes in the avernge price of hogs prom saturday to monday on thursoay's peceipts durdng pertods of phlling and of rising prices, ceicaco, 1921 to 1928

[^8]

Figure 61. melative effect ot advancea and declines in the aveange pricz or hoos mom saturday to monday on thurspay's recitis durina periops of palimgo and of ristac prices, chicaco, 1921 то 1928
Price advances were more effective in etimos. lating mariket tmovement during periods of falling pricea than during periods of rising prices. Price declines were more effective during periode of gining prices
following falling prices, and another when the price advanced following falling prices and declined following rising prices, significant results were obtained (table 42 and figure 61 ). When the price changed in the direction opposite to that of the trend in prices at the time, the effect on later receipts was greater than when it changed in the same direction.

A decline in price retarded market movement more in a period of rising prices than in a period of falling prices. A rise in the price stimulated the movement more in a period of falling prices than in a period of rising prices. A change in the price directly opposite to the trend of prices at the time was most effective.
In a period of rising prices, an advance of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday increased receipts on Thursday 5.27 per cent while a decline of 5 cents decreased them 7.61 per cent. In a period of falling prices, a decline of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday decreased receipts on Thursday 5.27 per cent while an advance of 5 cents increased them 7.61 per cent.

## following price changes in the same and in the opposite DIRECTION

On the average, regardless of what happened to the price of hogs on preceding days, advances from one day to the next stimulated later receipts, and declines retarded the movement.

Whether successive advances or declines are more effective than single changes in the price, is important. When the price advances two, three, four, or more days in succession, are receipts stimulated more than when it advances after a decline on the preceding day?

During the period from 1921 to 1928, when the average price of hogs at Chicago advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, receipts on Thursday were increased by 30 per cent (figure 40, page 47). When this advance followed a decline in the price from Friday to Saturday, the number of hogs received on Thursday was increased by 33 per cent (figure 62). When the advance followed an advance on the preceding day, Thursday's receipts were increased by 66 per cent (figure 63).


Figure 62. effect of celanges in the AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS FROM SATURDAX TO MONDAY FOLIOWING CEANGES IN TEE OPPOSITE DLRECTION PROM PRIDAY TO SATURDAY, ON THURSDAY'S RECETPTS, CHICACO, 1921 101928
When the price declined from Friday to Saturday, an advance of 25 cents from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 33 per cent in Thursody's receipts


Figure 63. effect of cenanges in tere AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS PROM SATURDAY TO MONDAY FOLLOWING CHANGES IN TEE SAME DIRECTION FROM FRIDAY TO SATURDAY, ON THURSDAY'S RECEIPTS, CEICAGO, 192I To 1928
When the price advanced from Friday to Saturday, an advance of 25 centa from Saturday to Monday. was followed by an increase of 66 per cent in Thursday's receipts

A comparison of the relative effects of changes in the price from each day of the week to the next, following both opposite and similar changes (in direction only) in the price on the preceding day, is shown in table 43. With the exception of price changes from Friday to Saturday, receipts of hogs were stimulated more when the price advanced two days in succession than when the advance followed a decline, and were retarded more when the price declined two days in succession than when the decline followed an advance.

TABLE 43. Relative Effect of Cbanges in the Price of Hogs yrom Day to Day on the Receipts One, Two, and Three Days Later, Founowing Paice Changes on the Preceding Day in the Same and in the Ofposite Drikction, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 centa in the average price | One day inters | Two days linter | Three daye jater |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Por cent change in recaipta |  |  |
| Saturday to Monday: |  |  |  |
| Following opposita price changes | 2.87 2.83 | 5.03 | 6.84 |
| Monday to Tuesday: |  |  |  |
| Following opposite price changen | 0.20 | 0.38 | 5.44 |
| Following gimilar price changes. | 3.09 | 7.04 | 8.10 |
| Tuesday to Wednesdiay: |  |  |  |
| Following similar price changes., | 2.29 | 7.96 | 12.11 |
| Wedneedisy to Thursday: |  |  |  |
| Following opposite price changes. | -0.99 | 2.47 | 3.18 |
| Thursday to Priday: |  | 6.45 | .90 |
| Following opporite price changes. | -4.07 | 1.78 | 5.91 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 5.36 -3.41 | 10.18 -1.00 | 7.83 -0.23 |



Figure 64. relative effect of changes in the averace price of hoos trom SATURDAY TO MONDAY TOLLOWING changes in the same and in the oppostre direction prom triday to baturday, on thursday's recelpts, chiCACO, 1921 то 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday increased Thursday's receipts 19 per cent more when it followed an advance from Friday to Saturday than when is followed a decline


Fiourg 65, mplative eytict of cenancet is the avernoz price on hoos trox MONDAY TO TUESDAY JOLLOWTNG changes tiv the same and di the opPOSITE DTRECTION TROM BATURDAY TO moziday, on miday's secetpts, chichoo, 1921 T0 1928
An advance of 25 centt in the price from Monday to Tuenday increased Friday's re ceipts 13 per cent more when it followed an advance from Saturday to Momday than when it followed a decline


Figure 66. rezative efyect of changes in the avernce price of hocs prom tuespay to wednesday poliowing changes in the samar and in the opposite dirbction from monday to tuesday, on saturday's recelpts, chiCACO, 1921 to 1928
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Figure 67. relative effect of changes in the avernge pricz of hogs from wednesday to thursday rollowng changes in tee same and in the oppostre direction yrom tuesday to wednesday, on monday's receipts, chicaco, rg21 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Wednesday to Thursday increased Monday's receipts 28 per cent more when it followed an advance from Tuesdzy to Wednesday than when it followed a decline

A change of 5 cents in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday following a change in the opposite direction from Monday to Tuesday, affected Thursday's receipts by 0.96 per cent, Friday's by 2.42 per cent, and Saturday's by 7.10 per cent. A change following a change in the same direction affected receipts by $2.29,7.96$, and 12.11 per cent, respectively, on the succeeding days.

Comparisons of the relative effects of changes in price each day of the week following changes in the same and in the opposite direction on the preceding day, upon receipts three days later, are shown in figures 64 to 69. Successive advances stimulated, and successive declines retarded, the movement of hogs to Chicago more than did single price changes in either direction.

Whereas two successive price changes in the same direction were more effective than one, three or more were less effective than either two or one (table 44 and figure 71). When the price advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday following an advance from Friday to Saturday, receipts on Thursday were increased 53 per cent. When the price advanced 25 cents following advances for two or more days, Thursday's receipts were increased only 26 per cent, or less than half as much.


Figure 68. relative effect of ceanoes in the avernoz price of hocs prom thursday to prddy pollowing changes in tie samb and in the opposite drection prom wrdnesday to thursday, on tuesday's recerpts, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of as centa in the price from Thursday to Friday increased Tuesday's receipts 7 per cent more when it followed an advance from Wednesday to Thursday than when it followed a decline


Figure 69. rezative mytect of changue IN TEE AVRRaOE PRICE of hoos yrom FRIDAY TO SATURDAY GOLLOWING CHANOES IN THE sAME AND IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION TROM THURSDAY TO friday, on wednrgiay's rectepts, chiCACO, 1921 To 1928
An advance of as cents in the price from Friday to Saturday increased Wednenday'a roceipta 40 per cent more when it followed decline from Thursday to Priday than when it followed an advance

TABLE 44. Relative Effect of Cbanges in the Price of Hocs from Saturday to Monday Following Various Changes on Preceding Days, upon Receipts in the Following Week, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 centa in the average price from Saturday to Monday | Tuesday | Wednes day | Thurs day | Priday | Saturday | Monday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipta |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pollowing changes in the price from Priday to Saturday in the opposite direction |  |  |  | 3.75 | 2.34 | 4.12 |
| Following changes in the price from Friday to | 2.87 | 5.03 | 6.84 | 3.75 | 2.34 | 4.12 |
| Saturday in the same direction..... | 2.73 | 7.74 | 10.60 | 8.96 | 8.67 | 9.20 |
| Following changes in the price for two or more | 4.88 | 5.26 | 5.11 | 4.45 | 2.88 | 3.42 |
| Regardiess of changes in the price on preceding days. | 2.08 | 4.39 | 5.63 | 3.46 | 1.80 | 3.10 |

Apparently, advancing prices for several days in succession lead shippers to hold hogs from the market in the hope of getting still higher prices. An advance in the price following a decline stimulates receipts. An advance in the price following an advance is even more stimulating. An advance following several other advances is not so effective, although it is still a stimulant.


Figure 70. efyect of changes in the average price of hogs prom saturday to monday regardless of changes on the preceding days, on thursday's receipts, chicico, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from
Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 28 per cent in Thursday's receipts


Figure 71. relative effect of ceanges in the average price of hogs prom SATURDAY TO MONDAY WHEN THESE CHANGES WERE IN tHE SAME DIRECTION ONE, TWO, OR THREE OR MORE DAYS, ON thursday's receipts, chicaco, 192I To 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday increased Thursday's receipts 34 per cent if it was preceded by a decline, 53 per cent if it was preceded by single advance, and 26 per cent if it was preceded by two or more advances

A change of 5 cents in price from Saturday to Monday, regardless of changes on preceding days, affected Thursday's receipts by 5.63 per cent. A change of 5 cents following a change from Friday to Saturday in the opposite direction, affected receipts on Thursday by 6.84 per cent. A 5 -cent change following a change from Friday to Saturday in the same direction, affected Thursday's receipts by 10.60 per cent. Receipts on Thursday were affected by 5.11 per cent with a 5 -cent change in the price from Saturday to Monday following two or more changes in the same direction on the days immediately preceding.

A comparison of the relative effects of various changes in price from Saturday to Monday, upon receipts of hogs on each of the six following market days, is shown in figure 72. When the price advanced 40 cents, receipts on Tuesday were increased by 17 per cent, on Wednesday by 35 per cent, on Thursday by 45 per cent, on Friday by 28 per cent, on Saturday by 14 per cent, and on Monday by 25 per cent.
Evidences of undulatory or cyclical movements, wave-like in character, are apparent. Of course a definite periodicity, such as seasonal variations possess, is lacking. Definite periodicity occurs only where the major influence affecting fluctuations is predominantly either one or sev-


Figure 72. relative epprct of various changes in the price of hocs prom SATURDAY TO monday on subsequent RECETPTS, CHICACO, 1921 T0 1928
Advances in the price atimulated the movement of hous to market; the peak war reached three daya later. Decinea returded the movement; the trough came three days later
hogs from Saturday to Monday following changes from Friday to Saturday in the same and in the opposite direction, upon receipts on each of the six following market days, exemplifies the influence of successive changes in the price on fluctuations in daily receipts (figure 73). The range of fluctuations in receipts was greatly increased by two consecutive price changes in the same direction. The timing of maximum and minimum responses was unaltered.
The percentage changes in receipts from Monday to Thursday following different combinations of price changes from Saturday to Monday, from Monday to Tuesday, and from Tuesday to Wednesday, were calculated (table 45). Changes of 5 cents or less in the price were considered
eral highly correlated influences. In the case of the effect of price changes on later receipts, as has been shown, the degree of effectiveness is varied. Changes in the price on preceding days, the general trend of prices, the season of the year, the stage of the hog cycle, and other factors, exert an influence.
"Average" relationships, which assume that the influence of other factors is nullified, reflect the tendencies toward periodic vibrations in the number of hogs marketed in response to changes in the price on preceding days.

A comparison of the relative effect of changes in the price of


Flours 73. priative etpect of advascres and prcines or 25 cemts dm the paice OP Hocs trom baturday to monday pollowing changes in thi simi axd in the oppostre dizectow prom tridat to saturday, om subszquext rectipts, cHicaco, 1921 to 1928

[^10]TABLE 45. Effect of Difperent Combinations of Changes in the Average Price of hogs from Saturday to Monday, from Monday to Tuesday, and from Tuesday to Wednesday, on the Change in Receipts from Monday to Thursday, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Saturday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Mondey } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tuesday } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Tuesday } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wedresday } \end{array}\right\|$ | Receipts on Thursday in per cent of those on Mondey | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Saturdey } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Monday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tueadsy } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuesday } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednesday } \end{gathered}$ | Receipts on Thursday in per cent of thome on Monday | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Saturday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Monday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tuesday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuesday } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednesday } \end{gathered}$ | Receipt on Thurudsy in per cent of those on Monday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Down. | Down....... | Down.... | 50 | Down...... | Down...... | Stationary. . | 52 | Down. | Down...... |  | 54 |
| Down. | Stationary.. | Down.... | 62 | Down....... | Stativnary.. | Stationary.. | 54 | Down...... | Stationary. | Up....... | 53 |
| Down... | Up......... | Down.... | 54 | Down....... | Up........ | Stationary.. | 58 | Down....... | Up......... | Up. . . . . | 55 |
| Stationary. | Down..... | Down.... | 67 | Stationary. | Down ..... | Stationary. | 76 | Stationary. | Down...... | Up....... | 71 |
| Stationary. | Stationary.. | Down.... | 69 | Stationary.. | Statior*ary.. | Stationary. | 70 | Stationary. | Stationary.. | Up...... | 68 |
| Stationary. | Up......... | Down.... | 74 | Stationary.. | Up......... | Stationsry. ${ }^{\text {Stationary }}$ | 70 88 | Stationary. | Up......... | Up...... | 69 87 |
| Up........ | Down....... | Down.... | 91 | Up.... . . . . | Down...... | Stationary.. | 88 88 | Up........ | Down...... | Up....... | 87 |
| Up....... | Up........ | Down | 93 | Up......... | Up......... | Stationary... | 78 | Up. . . . . . | Up......... | Up. . . . | 81 |

stationary movements. Advances of from 5 to 20 cents and declines of the same amounts were taken as measures of upward and downward movements in prices.
When the price declined from Saturday to Monday, from Monday to Tuesday, and from Tuesday to Wednesday, receipts on Thursday were 50 per cent of Monday's receipts. When the price advanced from Saturday to Monday and from Monday to Tuesday, but declined from Tuesday to Wednesday, Thursday's receipts were 93 per cent of Monday's. Thursday's receipts were 86 per cent greater under the latter conditions than under the former.

## EFFECT OF DAILY PRICE CHANGES ON RESHIPMENTS

Advances in the price of hogs greatly stimulated later receipts, while declines retarded the movement. Accordingly, price served as an important regulator of the rate at which hogs were marketed at Chicago.

A large number of the hogs shipped to Chicago were reshipped, as live hogs, to other markets. The actual number of reshipments varied with the day of the week, the season of the year, the phase of the hog-price cycle, and other factors.

The effect of changes in the price of hogs on the rate of reshipment was, of course, dependent partly on changes in the price at Chicago and partly on changes at the other markets to which the hogs were consigned. Price differences between the markets, rather than price changes at either Chicago or the other markets, were probably the controlling factors of most importance.

Since price data comparable to those at Chicago were not available for other markets, only the effect of changes in the price at Chicago on reshipments could be measured. The proportion of the hogs received at the yards which was reshipped, was taken as a measure of variances in the amount of reshipments. The conversion of the actual numbers to this basis partly removed the influence of season and cycle, and took account of the fact that the actual number reshipped tended to fluctuate with the number received.

## METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The average price of hogs declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday twice during the eight-year period from 1921 to 1928 (table 46). The total number of hogs received on Monday following those declines was 134,300 , on Tuesday 63,400 , on Wednesday 40,400 , and on Thursday 44,300 . The numbers reshipped on those days were $23,900,13,400$, 13,100 , and 12,500 .

The percentage of the number of hogs received on Monday which was reshipped on the same day, following the 40 -cent declines, was 17.8 (table 47). The percentage on Tuesday was 21.1, on Wednesday 32.4, and on Thursday 28.2. The percentage of Monday's receipts which was reshipped when the price advanced 40 cents from Saturday to Monday was 37.9 . Reshipments on Tuesday were 23.8 per cent of Tuesday's receipts, those on Wednesday were 35 per cent of Wednesday's receipts, and those on Thursday were 22.4 per cent of Thursday's receipts.

TAblé 46. Relation of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, to the Total Number Received and Reshipped on Each of the Three Succeeding Days, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fre- } \\ & \text { quency } \end{aligned}$ | Mondey | Tuesday | Wednesday | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thurs- } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thưrser } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monday |  | Total daily receipts (hundreds) |  |  |  | Total daily reshipments (hundreds) |  |  |  |
| (Cents) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & -40 . . . . . . \\ & -35 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 1,343 2,891 | 2, 634 | 1,052 | $\begin{array}{r}1,438 \\ \hline 143\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}239 \\ 635 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{6} 134$ | 131 339 | 125 |
| -30 | 9 | 5,287 | 3,075 | 1.910 | 2,792 | 1,130 | 910 | 508 | 682 |
| -25. | 10 | 5.875 | 3,653 | 1.771 | 3.036 | 1.397 | 1.092 | 609 | 884 |
|  | 22 | 14,060 | 7.447 | 4.662 | 6.731 | 3.027 | 2,107 | 1,217 | 1,610 |
|  | 36 | 20,604 | 8.936 11.552 | 7.380 | 8,672 12,070 | 3.203 4.716 | 2.251 3.079 | 1,417 2,093 | 1.901 2.849 |
|  | 38 | 19,521 | 12.366 | 7,464 | 12,834 | 4,461 | 3,003 | 1,932 | 2.864 |
| + | 27 | 13,761 | 7,867 | 5,561 | 9,269 | 3,224 | 2.070 | 1,303 | 1,767 |
| $+5$ |  | 14.248 | 9,381 | 5.996 | 10.617 | 3,493 | 2,330 | 1,608 | 2,254 |
| +10. | 40 42 | 18,677 17.906 | 11,508 | 8.476 9.444 | 13,987 | 4,704 4,410 | 2,977 $\mathbf{3 , 1 6 0}$ | 1.962 1.998 | 2,981 |
| $+20$. | 27 | 17,906 | 13,474 | 9,444 | 16,946 8,888 | 4.410 2.977 | 3,160 1,857 | 1,998 | 3,512 $\mathbf{2}, 107$ |
| $+25$ | 20 | 6.773 | 4.960 | 3,686 | 6,049 | 1,661 | 1,036 | 696 | 1,108 |
| +30 | 11 | 4,202 | 2,381 | 1,917 | 3,177 | 1,257 | 775 | 446 | 810 |
| +35. +40 | 2 | 2.514 | 1.571 | 1,445 | $\begin{array}{r}2,116 \\ \hline 826\end{array}$ | 732 297 | 374 157 | 301 143 | 477 185 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLe 47. Relátion of Ceanges in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday, to Daily Reshipments, in Percentage of Receipts on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thusiday, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Change in avorace
pirce from
Soturny to
Monday} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pre } \\
& \text { quency }
\end{aligned}
$$} \& Monday \& Tuesday \& Wednee
day \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Thurs- } \\
& \text { day }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& Monday \& Tuesday \& Wednes \& Thurs <br>
\hline \& \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Daily reshipmenta, in per cent of receipta} \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Daily reshipmenta, in per cont of receipts (normal $=100$ )} <br>
\hline - ${ }^{\text {(Cents) }}$ \& \& 17.8 \& 21.1 \& 32.4 \& \& 74 \& \& 132 \& <br>
\hline -35............. \& 9 \& 22.0
21.0 \& 行 30.0 \& 32.4
32.2
26.6

20, \& 23.2
24.2
24.4 \& ${ }_{89}^{92}$ \& ${ }_{115}^{116}$ \& 132
108
108 \& ${ }_{108}^{112}$ <br>
\hline -25. \& 10 \& 23.8 \& 29.8 \& 36.4
34.4 \& ${ }^{24.4} 2$. \& 100 \& 115 \& 140 \& 129 <br>
\hline -20. \& ${ }_{28}^{22}$ \& 21.5 \& 28.3 \& ${ }_{22}^{26.1}$ \& ${ }_{21}^{23.9}$ \& ${ }_{85}^{90}$ \& ${ }^{109}$ \& ${ }_{91}^{106}$ \& ${ }_{97}^{106}$ <br>
\hline -10 \& 36 \& ${ }_{23}^{23.3}$ \& 27.0 \& 26.7 \& 24.1 \& 97 \& 104 \& 109 \& 107 <br>

\hline 0. \& | 38 |
| :---: |
| 28 |
| 8 | \& ${ }_{23.7}^{23.1}$ \& 24.5

26.8 \& 26.0
24.0 \& 22.5
20.0 \& 97 \& 95
103 \& ${ }_{98}^{106}$ \& 100
89 <br>
\hline $\pm$ \& 30

30 \& 24.5 \& 24.8 \&  \& | 21.2 |
| :---: |
| $\substack{21.2}$ |
| $\substack{\text { 2, }}$ | \& ${ }_{105}^{103}$ \& 96

99 \& 109 \& 94 <br>
\hline +15. \& 42 \& 24.7 \& ${ }_{23.3}^{23.7}$ \& 221.3. \& ${ }_{20}^{21.9}$ \& 103 \& ${ }_{90}$ \& ${ }_{87}$ \& 93 <br>
\hline +20. \& 27

20 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
27.4 <br>
24.5 <br>
\hline

 \& 

24.5 <br>
20.9 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular} \& 23.1

18.9 \& | 23.4 |
| :--- |
| 18.3 | \& 115

103 \& ${ }_{81} 9$ \& 94 \& ${ }_{81}^{104}$ <br>
\hline  \& 11 \& 24.
30.1
30.1
30 \&  \&  \& ${ }_{\text {cker }}^{26.1}$ \& 126
126
126 \& 125 \& ${ }_{89}^{93}$ \& 116 <br>
\hline +40............. \& 2 \& 30.2
37.9 \& 23.7 ${ }_{2}^{23.8}$ \& 21.8
35.0 \& 22.4 \& ${ }_{159}^{126}$ \& 92 \& -8989 \& 100 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

The average proportion of the number of hogs received which was reshipped during the entire period was 23.9 per cent on Monday, 25.9 per cent on Tuesday, 24.6 per cent on Wednesday, and 22.5 per cent on Thursday. These average percentages were considered normal for the respective days. In order to make the percentages in table 47 comparable for all days, they were divided by these normals. The results appear in the last four columns of table 47. On this basis, when the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday the number of hogs reshipped from Chicago to other markets on Monday was 74 per cent of the normally expected number. When the price advanced 40 cents, the percentage reshipped was 159 . Or, in other words, reshipments of hogs on Mon-
day were 26 per cent below normal when the price declined 40 cents from Saturday to Monday, and 59 per cent above normal when the price advanced 40 cents (table 48).
table 48. Relation of Changes in the Anreage Peice of Hoge mom Saturday to Monday, to the Percentage Chinnges in Recripts Resitppid ox Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Saturday to Monday | Prequency | Monday | Tuasday | Wedneeday | Thursiay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Per cent change in recoipta reahipped |  |  |  |
| -40(Cents) |  |  |  |  |  |
| -40... | ${ }_{5}$ | -26 | -19 +16 | $\pm 32$ | $\pm 15$ |
| -30... | ${ }^{9}$ | -11 | +15 | F | 7 |
| -25. | 10 | 0 | +15 | +40 | 48 |
| -15... | 28 | -15 | $\pm 3$ | $\pm 9$ | $\pm 8$ |
| -10.. | 36 | - 3 | $+4$ | $\pm 9$ | $+7$ |
| - 5. | 38 | - 3 | $\pm 3$ | $\pm 6$ | -11 |
| + $5 \ldots$ | 30 | + ${ }^{-1}$ | $\pm$ | $+8$ | - 6 |
| +10.. | 40 | $\pm 3$ | -10 | - 3 | - 5 |
| +20.. | 27 | f15 | -10 | -18 | - 7 |
| +25... | 20 | $\pm 3$ | -19 | -23 | $\pm 19$ |
| +30.. | 11 | +26 | $\underline{+25}$ | -11 | $\pm 16$ |
| +40. | 2 | +59 | -8 | +42 | 0 |

$\dot{S}$ traight lines were fitted to these percentages by the method of least squares, to measure average relationships (figures 74 to 77 ). Each per-


Fioure 74. relation of changes on tier averace price of hocs prom saturday to monday, to percentaot changes in the recripts reshtpped on mondax, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cent in the price from Saturday to Monday, was followed by an increage of 13 per cent in the proportion of Mouday's receipts that were reshipped

PER CENT CHANGE IN


Figure 75. belation of chanozs dithe the averace prace of hoos prove baturday TO MONDAT, to praceminot changes pr THE RECEIPTS RESHIPPED ON TURSDAY, CRICA00, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 eents in the price from Saturdey to Monday wai followed by e de crease of 7 per cent in the proportion of Tueday't receipts that were resbipped


Fibuiz 76. bechition of chances in the avernce peice oe hocs prom saturday To mondat, to phicentace changes mi tim becimpts reshipped on wednespay, CHBCACO, 1921 то 1928
The percentige of Wednexday's receipts reabipped was 14 per cent greater when the price deetined 30 eentis than then it did not change


Figure 77. remation of changes in teis averace price of mocs from saturday TO MONDAT, TO PERCERNTAGT CHANGES IN THE RECETPTS PESHIPFRD ONT THORSDAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
The proportion of Thursday's receiples that were reshipped decreased when the price adranced from Saturday to Monday, and increased then the price declined
centage was weighted according to the frequency of the corresponding price change, in making the necessary calculations.

As in the case of receipts, a further assumption was made that no change in reshipments should correspond to no change in the price. Adjustments were made to meet this assumption.

## DAILY VARIATIONS

Price changes from day to day affected the reshipment of hogs differently on different days of the week (table 49, and figures 78 and 79). An advance of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 2.56 per cent in the proportion of Monday's

TABLE 49. Relative Effbet of Daily Changes in the Average Price of Hogs on the Pemcentage Reshipped to Othei Marieets, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | $\begin{aligned} & \text { On mame } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | One diny later | Tro dinga later | Three days later |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in receipte rehipped |  |  |  |
| Saturdiay to Mondey. | +2.56 | -1.20 | -2.36 | $-1.20$ |
| Monday to Tupeminy. | +6.79 | +2.29 | +0.59 | -2.35 |
| Tuesday to Wedinesiay | +4.63 | +2.34 | -0.75 | -3.02 |
| Wedinediny to Thurtay | $+5.45$ | $+1.45$ | -2.89 | -0.13 |
| Thursday to Priday. . | $+3.63$ | $+1.35$ | -0.50 | -2.52 |
| Prider to Suturdey. | +6.50 | +2.91 | +0.63 | -0.06 |



Figure 78. prantive emfect of changes Dy the AvEbace peice of hocs prox SATURDAY TO MONDAT, MONDAY TO TUESDAY, AND TUESDAT TO WEDNESDAT, OY RRSHIPMENTS MONDAT, TUESDAY, AND wednesiat, ceidenco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 centa in the price from the preceding day was followed by an increate of 13 per cent in Monday's reshipments, 34 per cent in Tresdivis, and 23 per cent in Wodnesdis's


Figule 79. relative hifret of cenavga
 Whonispay to thurspat, hiunsoat ic triday, and miday to mitiont, on EESHITMEMTS TBURBDAY, FitDAY, ANI saturdat, cricaco, 1921 to 1908
An edvance of 25 cents fan the price from the preceding day was followed by at increan of 28 per cent in Thursoday's reahipmentan, 11 per cepe is Friday's, and 13 ter ceme in set arday'a
receipts that was reshipped on the same day to other markets. The same change from Monday to Tuesday was followed by an increase of 6.79 per cent in Tuesday's reshipments.

On all days of the week an advance in the price from the preceding day was followed by an increase in the proportion received at Chicago which was reshipped, and a decline in the price was followed by a decrease in the proportion reshipped.

In general, advances in price were followed by increases in the proportion of the number of hogs reshipped on the same day, increases in the proportion one day later, decreases in the proportion two days later, and decreases in the proportion three days later (table 49, and figures 80 to 85). Declines in the price were generally followed by the opposite conditions.

There were, however, a few exceptions. For example, advances in the price from Saturday to Monday were followed by decreases in the proportion reshipped on Tuesday. Also, price advances from Monday to Tuesday and from Friday to Saturday were followed by increases in the proportion reshipped two days later.


Figure, 80. priative effect of changes IN THE AVERAGE PRICE OF HOCS PROM SATURDAY TO MONDAX, ON RESEIPMENTS MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY, CRICACO, 1921 101928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 13 per cent in Monday's reshipments, a decrease of 6 per cent in Tuesday's, and a decrease of $1 / 2$ per cent in Wednesday's


Figurs 81, retative effect of changes IN THE AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS PROM MONDAY TO TUESDAY, ON RESHTPMENTS TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, AND TZURSDAY, CHICAGO, I92I TO 1928
An advance of 25 cento in the price from Monday to Tuesday was followed by an increase of 34 per cent in Tuesday's reshipmenta, 11 per cent in Wednesday's, and 3 per cent in Thursday's

The largest decrease in reshipments, following advances in the price three days before, was on Saturday. An advance of 5 cents in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday was followed by a 3 -per-cent decrease in the proportion of hogs reshipped on Saturday. The smallest decrease in reshipments was on Wednesday, following advances in the price from Friday to Saturday.

On referring to table 35 (page 49), the fact is noted that reshipments in percentage of receipts tended to increase and decrease inversely with fluctuations in receipts. That is to say, the actual number of hogs reshipped tended to fluctuate with the number received but fluctuated less violently. Hence, when the number of hogs received was large, the percentage reshipped tended to be small; and when the number received was small, the percentage reshipped tended to be large.

Despite these tendencies, there is some evidence that variations in the demand for hogs in markets nearer the consuming centers are reflected in prices at Chicago. When increased numbers of hogs leave Chicago immediately following price advances at that market, the price situation in the markets to which the hogs are shipped must be improved more than that at Chicago.


Figure 82. relative eftect of changes IV THE AVERAGE PRICE OT HOCS TROM TUESDAT $T 0$ WEDNESDAY, ON RESHIPMENTS WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND TRIDAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Tueaday to Wedneaday was followed by an increate of 23 per cent in Wedneaday's reabipments, an increate of 12 per cent in Thuriday' $a$, and an decrease of 4 per cent in Friday'a


Fioure 83. dehative eftict of canamon IN THE AVERAGE PHEC OT HOOC ThOI WLDNESDAY TO TEURSDAY, OF RESHy ments thureday, midat, and eatua DAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
An advance of as centa in the price fros Wedneeday to Thursday wat followed by a increase of 28 per cent in Thuriday's reahij menta, an increate of 7 per cent in Friday and a decreme of 14 per cent tin Saturday's

## RELATIVE EFFECT OF DAILY PRICE CHANGES ON RESHIPMENTS

## BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR

During the pre-war period, from 1910 to 1913, an advance of 5 cent in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday was associated with al increase of 7.19 per cent in the proportion of receipts reshipped on Mon day (table 50 and figure 86). After the war, from 1921 to 1924, th corresponding percentage was 1.85 .

Whereas, before the war, reshipments in percentage of receipti increased on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday following advances it

TABLE 50. Relative Effect of Changes in the Avfrage Price of Hogs prom
Saturday to Monday on the Percentace Reshipped to Other Marketi before and after the War, Chicaco, 1910-1913 and 1921-1924

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Monday | Tuendey | Wedoenday | Thumalay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in ruceipte reahipped |  |  |  |
| Before the whr (1910-1913). After the war (1921-1924).. | +7.19 | $\begin{aligned} & +2.09 \\ & -2.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1.70 \\ & -3.10 \end{aligned}$ | $+0.96$ |



Figurs 84. relative eppect of changes in .tite avirage price of hogs from thutspay to friday, on reshipments TRIDAY, SATURDAY, AND MONDAY, CHICAGO, 1921 To 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Thursday to Friday was followed by an increase of 18 per cent in Friday's reshipments an increase of 7 per cent in Saturday's, and a decrease of a per cent in Monday's


Figure 85. reyative epfect of changes in the average price of hogs from yRIDAY TO SATURDAY, ON RESHIPMENTS SATURDAY, MONDAY, AND TUESDAY, CHICACO, 1921 TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Friday to Saturday was followed by an increase of 33 per cent in Saturday's reahipments, 14 per cent in Mondar's, and 3 per cent in Tuesday's
the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday, they decreased with such price changes after the war. Before the war, the increases in reshipments following an advance of 5 cents in the price were 2.69 per cent on Tuesday, 1.70 per cent on Wednesday, and 0.56 per cent on Thursday. After the war, the decreases were $2.28,3.10$, and 1.71 per cent, respectively.

With larger increases in receipts three days following advances in the price before the war than after, it was to be expected that reshipments in percentage of receipts would decrease more in the earlier period. However, as a matter of fact, the percentage reshipped increased slightly, despite much larger receipts.

## AT THE BOTTOM AND THE TOP OF THE CYCLE

When the price of hogs was low, as in the 1921-1924 period, an advance of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 1.85 per cent in the proportion reshipped on Monday (table 51 and figure 87). When prices were high, as in the period from 1925 to 1928, the percentage increase in reshipments following a 5 -cent advance was 2.89 .


Figure 86. relative effect of changes in the average price of hogs prom SATURDAY TO MONDAY ON MONDAY's reSHIPMENTS BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR, CHICACO, 1910 TO 1913 AND I921 To 1924
Changes in price affected reshipments more before the war than after


Figure 87. relative mptict of ceanozi in ter averaos price of hoos trow saturday to monday on monday's ny shipments at the gottom and at thi TOP OP THE HOO-FRICR CYCLE, CHICAOO 1921 to 1924 AND 1925 T0 1928
Changes in prica affected reshipments mort at the top of the cycle than at the bottom

TABLE 51. Relative Epfect of Changes in the Average Price op Hogs rrom Saturday to Monday on the Pegcentage Reshipped to Other Markets at the Bottom and at the Top of the Hog-Price Cycle, Chicaco, 1921-1024 And 1925-1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Monday | Tueedey | Wednadiay | Thurnday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in recaipta reahipped |  |  |  |
| Bottom of the cycle (1921-1924). Top of the cycle (1925-1928).... | +1.85 +2.89 | $\begin{aligned} & -2.28 \\ & -0.56 \end{aligned}$ | -3.10 -1.74 | $\begin{aligned} & -1.71 \\ & -0.91 \end{aligned}$ |

Although the difference in the effect of price changes on later receipts at the bottom and the top of the hog cycle was not great, the corresponding changes in reshipments differed widely. Reshipments in percentage of receipts decreased much more with advances in the price at the bottom than at the top of the cycle.

When the price advanced 5 cents from Saturday to Monday at the top of the cycle, Tuesday's reshipments decreased 0.56 per cent, Wednesday's decreased 1.74 per cent, and Thursday's decreased 0.91 per cent. At the bottom of the cycle, the corresponding percentages were 2.28, 3.10, and 1.71 .

Apparently there is more of a tendency to keep hogs at Chicago when the price advances at that market during a period of low prices than during a period of high prices. Conversely, there is more of a tendency to reship hogs to other markets following price advances at Chicago when the level of hog prices is high than when it is low.

## DURING THE WINTER AND THE SUMMER MONTHS

During the winter months, an advance of 5 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 1.31 per cent in the proportion reshipped on Monday (table 52 and figure 88). During the summer months the corresponding percentage was 3.81 .

TABLE 52. Relative Effect of Changes in the Average Pruce of Hogs from Saturday to Monday on the Percentage Reshipped to Other Markets during the Winter and the Summer Months, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Monday | Tuesday | Wednosday | Thursday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in recoipts reshipped |  |  |  |
| In winter months. . | +1.31 +3.81 | -3.32 +0.63 | -4.78 +0.92 | +3.04 |

Advances of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday in the winter were followed by decreases in the percentage of receipts reshipped on subsequent days - 3.32 per cent on Tuesday, 4.78 per cent on Wednesday, and 3.04 per cent on Thursday. In the summer, 5 -cent advances were followed by increases of $0.63,0.92$, and 0.82 per cent, respectively.

As was the case in different phases of the hog cycle, there was more of a tendency to reship hogs to other markets following price advances at Chicago when prices were low than when they were high.

WHEN THE SPREAD BETWEEN TOP
AND AVERAGE PRICES WAS LARGE
AND WHEN IT WAS SMALL
When the spread between top and average prices of hogs was large, an


Figure 88. relative effect of changes in the avirage price of hogs prom SATURDAY TO MONDAY ON MONDAY'S RESHETPMENTS DURING THE WRNTER AND THE SUMMER MONTES, CHICAGO, Ig2I TO 1928
Changes in price affected reshipments more during the summer than during the winter advance of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by an increase of 1 per cent in the number of hogs reshipped on Monday from Chicago to other markets (table 53 and figure 89). When the spread was small, the percentage was 3.07 , three times as great.

Following advances of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday when the spread was large, the proportion of Tuesday's receipts of hogs which was reshipped decreased 1.70 per cent, Wednesday's decreased 0.80 per cent, and Thursday's decreased 2.23 per cent. When the spread was small, the decreases were 2.15 per cent on Tuesday, 4.91 per cent on Wednesday, and 3.42 per cent on Thursday.

TABLE 53. Relattye Effict of Changes in the Aveange Patce of Hoge mom Saturday to Monday on the Pescentage Reshipped to Othee Marketh when tere Spread between Top and Averace Prices Was Laroz and whrn It Was Smali, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Witha change of 5 cents in price | Mondey | Tuenday | Wedneeday | Thurndey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cont change in receipto reahipped |  |  |  |
| Large apread. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | +1.00 +3.07 | -1.70 -2.15 | $\xrightarrow{-0.90}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -2.23 \\ -3.62 \end{array}$ |



Figure 89. relative effect of changes in the averace price of hocs jrom SATURDAY TO MONDAY ON MONDAY's RESHIPMENTS WHEN THE SPREAD bETWEEN tere top and the average prices was Large and when it was small, chiCAGO, 1921 то 1928
Changea in price affected reahipmenta more when the spread between the top and the average prices was emall than when it was large

These results give further evidence of the tendency for reshipments of hogs from Chicago to decrease more with price advances during times when the supply is large and prices are low, than when the supply is small and prices are high.
following price changes in the SAME AND IN THR OPPOSITE DIRECTION
When the price of hogs advanced 5 cents from Saturday to Monday following a decline from Friday to Saturday, the proportion of Monday's receipts that was reshipped increased 1.11 per cent (table 54, and figures 90 and 91). When the 5-cent advance followed an advance in the price from Friday to Saturday (two successive changes in the same direction), the percentage reshipped on Monday increased 6.72 per cent. The increase was more than six times as great in the latter case as in the former.

TABLE 54. Relative Eppect of Changes in the Average Paice of Hogs prom Saturday to Monday Following Changes in the Same and in the Opposite Direction pron Friday to Saturday, on the Percentage Reshippid to Other Markets, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 cents in price | Monday | Tuouday | Wedremay | Thursder |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per cent change in rectipta reehipped |  |  |  |
| Following opposite price changes Following similar price changea. . | +1.11 +6.72 | $\begin{aligned} & -1.97 \\ & -0.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -3.77 \\ +1.02 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -3.10 \\ +0.42 \end{array}$ |

Advances in the price following declines on the preceding day were followed by larger decreases in the percentage of reshipments on later days than were advances which followed advances. Two successive price


Figure 90. rblative epfect of changes in thr average price of hogs from sattrdat to monday poliowneg CHANGES IN THE OPPOSTTE DIRECTION from fripay to saturday, on reshipMENTS MONDAY, TUREDAY, AND WEDNESDAY, CHICACO, Ig2I TO 1928
An advance of 25 centa in the price from Saturday to Monday following a decline from Friday to Saturday, was followed by an increase of 6 per cent in Monday's reshipments, a decrease of 10 per cent in Tuesday's, and a decrease of 19 per cent in Wednesday's


Figure 91. reyative eyfect of changes in the average price of hogs from SATURDAY to monday roliowng cenanges in the same direction from frday to saturday, on reshipments MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY, CHICago, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday following an advance from Friday to Saturday, was followed by an increase of 34 per cent in Monday'd reshipments, no change in Tuesday's, and an increase of 5 per cent in Wedneaday's
advances encouraged reshipment more than did an advance following a decline. When the price advanced 5 cents from Saturday to Monday following a decline from Friday to Saturday, Tuesday's reshipments decreased 1.97 per cent, Wednesday's 3.77 per cent, and Thursday's 3.10 per cent. When the advance followed another advance, Tuesday's reshipments decreased only 0.08 per cent, Wednesday's increased 1.02 per cent, and Thursday's increased 0.42 per cent.

Rising prices, of course, encourage the reshipment of hogs to other markets, for the mere ownership of any product at such times means a profit. The longer the time elapsing before the product is actually sold, the larger will be this profit. Hence the trend of prices is important in determining the relative profitableness of selling hogs at Chicago or of taking chances on reshipping them to other markets.

## RELATION OF DAILY PRICE CHANGES TO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES IN THE PRICE

It has been found that when the price of hogs advanced from one day to the next at Chicago, the number of hogs received on later days of the week increased. Price declines were followed by reductions in the number of hogs received. The greatest effect was on receipts three days after the price change.

As a consequence of this effect of price changes on later receipts, it was to be expected that later movements in the price would be inversely related.

An advance in the price from one day to the next, resulting in increase receipts three days later, should be followed by price declines because a such increases in the supply. Also, declines in the price should be followe by advances, resulting from reductions in the supply.

In order to test the accuracy of the above statements and to determin the amount of such expected changes in the price, daily changes in th price of hogs at Chicago were studied in relation to subsequent changes i: the price.

## METHOD OF ANALYSIS

On the two occasions when the price of hogs declined 40 cents pe hundredweight from Saturday to Monday, an additional decline of 40 cent from Monday to Tuesday followed (table 55). The average decline wa 20 cents. From Tuesday to Wednesday the price advanced 10 cents, an from Wednesday to Thursday 40 cents. The average advances were 5 an 20 cents, respectively. Hence the net change in the price from Monday ti Thursday was a 5 -cent advance.
table 55. Relation of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs pron Satuin day to Monday, to Cenanges in the Price fron Monday to Tuksday, proi Tuesday to Wednesday, from Wednesday to Thursday, and prom Mon day to Thursday, Chicago, 1921 to 1928

| Change in average price from Saturdey to Monday | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pre- } \\ & \text { quency } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mon- } \\ \text { dyy } \\ \text { Tot } \\ \text { Tuet } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuce } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednee } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Wednee } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Thurs- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mon- } \\ & \text { day } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tuey } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tyee } \\ \text { dey } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wedsen- } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wednew- } \\ \text { do } \\ \text { Thurw } \\ \text { day } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mon- } \\ \text { day } \\ \text { tho } \\ \text { Thury } \\ \text { dey } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total change in price (centa) |  |  | Average change in price (cente) |  |  |  |
| -40 (Conts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -40......... | 2 | -40 | + 10 | +40 +80 | -20.0 | +3.0 | +20.0 +16.0 | $\pm 8.8$ |
| -30 | 9 | - 53 | + 80 | + 75 | - 6.1 | +8.9 | + 8.3 | fil: |
| -25 | 10 | -105 | + 35 | + 55 | -10.3 | +3.3 | + 3.5 | -1. |
| -20 | 22 | - 55 | +105 | +185 | -2.5 | $+48$ | + 8.4 | 410 . |
| -15 | 28 36 | -270 -60 | $\begin{array}{r}+93 \\ +95 \\ \hline 65\end{array}$ | +190 $+\quad 10$ | - 9.6 | - 3.4 | $\pm 3.2$ | - 0.1 |
| - -5 | 36 38 | - 60 | -65 $+\quad 20$ | +110 +40 | - 1.7 | -1.8 +0.5 | +8.1 | - 0 |
|  | 27 | -100 -25 | +820 +35 | +40 | - 2.6 | +0.3 +1.3 | $\pm \begin{aligned} & +1.7 \\ & -1.7\end{aligned}$ | $=1$. |
| $\pm$ | 30 | - 30 | +115 | +140 | - 1.0 | + 3.8 | + 4.7 | + 71 |
| +10 +15 | 40 | +50 +80 | -125 -145 | +30 $+\quad 30$ -145 | +1.2 | - 3.1 | $\pm 0.8$ | - 11 |
| +20 | 27 | -80 | -190 | -190 | - 3.1 | -3.3 | - 7.5 | $-17$ |
| $+25$ | 20 | - 55 |  | - 33 | -2.8 | + 0.2 | - 1.8 | -41 |
| +30 +35 | 11 |  | + 35 | -25 +40 | +12.3 | +8.2 +3.2 -9.2 | -2.3 +0.7 | +132 |
|  | 2 | + | - 55 | +10 +10 | +1.7 +12.5 | -92.2 | +0.7 +3.0 | -6.8 |

An advance of 40 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Mondas was followed by an average advance of 12.5 cents from Monday to Tues day, a decline of 32.5 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday, and an advanct of 5 cents from Wednesday to Thursday. The net change from Monday to Thursday was a decline of 15 cents.

Lines of average relationship were fitted to these changes in the price Each change was weighted according to its frequency as given in thi second column of table 55. The group averages, together with the fitted lines, are plotted in figures 92 to 95 , inclusive. On the average, advances of 25 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday were followed


Figure 92. belation of changes in tek average price of hogs prom saturday to monday, to ceanges prom monday to tuesday, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
On the average, a change of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a change of approximately 1 cent in the same direction from Mondiny to Tuesday


Figure 94. rechation of changes in theie anerage prics or hogs from saturday TO MONDAY, TO CEANOES YROM WEDNESdAy to thursday, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
On the average, a change of $s$ cento th the price from Saturday to Monday wan followed by a change of a cent in the opposito direction from Wednesday to Thuradey


Figure 93. retation of changes in the average price of hogs from satURDAY TO MONDAY, TO CHANGES FROM tUESDAY TO WEDNESDAY, CEICAGO, 1921 T0 1928
On the average, a change of 5 centa in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a change of 0.8 cent in the opposite direction from Tuesday to Wednesday


Figure 95. pelation of changes in the average prict of hogs proy saturday to monday, to ceanges from monday to thursday, chicaco, 1921 201928
On the average, a change of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a change of 0.8 cent in the opposite direction from Monday to Tharraday
by prices about 2 cents higher on Tuesday than on Monday, 5 cents lower on Wednesday than on Tuesday, and 4 cents lower on Thursday than or Wednesday.

In order to facilitate a comparison of the slopes of different lines adjustments were made which focused all lines at a common point. It was assumed that no changes in the price were followed by no changes.

## DAILY VARIATIONS

Just as changes in the price of hogs on different days of the week varied in their effect on later receipts and reshipments, subsequent changes in the price also differed. On some days, advances in the price were followed by further advances. On other days, the same advances were followed by declines.
A change of 5 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed, on the average, by a change of 0.96 cent in the same direction from Monday to Tuesday (table 56). The same change in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday was followed by a change of 1.61 cents in the same direction from Wednesday to Thursday.

On all days of the week, changes in the price from one day to the next were followed by further changes in the same direction on the following


Figure 96. relation of changes tif the avernce price of hocs prom saturday TO MONDAY, TO CHANGES RROM MONDAY to tuesday, tulsday to wednesony, and wednesoat to thutsoat, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents from Satardey to Monday was followed by min edvance of 5 cents from Monday to Tuessay, a decline of 4 cents from Tuesing to Wedineadary and a decline of 5 cents from Wednenday to Thurnday


Figuse 97. hehation of chances di jait averace paice of hoos mox monday to tuesoay, to chances men tuesoat TO wEDNESOAT, WEDTRSDAY TO THORSdat, and thusiday to priday, ceicaco, 1921 то 1928
An adrance of 25 cente froce Monday to Tver day was followed by an advance of $s$ cents from Tuesday to Wedneaday, a declint of: cents from Wedmenday to Thareday, and a do clise of 4.5 centr frome Tbaraday to Iriday

TABLE 56 Relation of Daily Changes ma tee Average Price of Hogs to Sursequent Changes in the Price, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| Writh a change of 5 cents in price | Cents change in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Same day } \\ & \text { to one } \\ & \text { day hater } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { One day } \\ & \text { po two } \\ & \text { days later } \end{aligned}$ | Two days to three days later | Same day to three days later |
| Santurday to Moodey . . | +0.96 | -0.80 | -1.02 |  |
| Mondey to Tuesday........ | +0.96 | -0.40 | -0.89 | -0.25 |
| Tvesiay to Wredivesday. | +1.61 | -0.32 | -0. 39 | +0.84 |
| Wednestay to Thurnday | +1.33 | -0.73 | -0.19 | +0.45 |
| Thurroday to Pridey. | +0.71 +0.81 | +0.60 +0.88 | -0.35 -0.84 | +0.99 |

day. These latter changes varied from 0.71 cent to 1.61 cents with each additional 5-cent change in the price.

The price changed in the opposite direction from the second to the third day following a given change in the price. This was true for all days of the week. For example, an advance in the price from Saturday to Monday was'followed by a decline from Wednesday to Thursday,


Figure 98. rechition of changes in the avizace prict of hocs prom tubsday to mednasday, to changes froy wednisdat to thursday, thtirsday to miday, and priday to satcrday, chiCACO, 1921 T0 1928
An sdiance of 35 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday was followed by en advance of 8 cents from Wednesday to Thursday, a dective of a cents from Thursday to Friday, and a decline of a cent from Fridiny to Saturday


Figure 99. retation of changes in the AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS YROML WEDNESDAY TO THGREDAY, $T 0$ CEANGES FROM TEURSDAY TO FRIDAY, FRIDAT TO SATURDAY, AND SATURDAY $T 0$ MONDAY, CEICAGO, 1921701928
An advance of 35 eents from Wednesday to Thursday was followed by an advance of 7 cents from Thursday to Friday, a decline of 4 cents from Friday to Saturday, and a decline of a cent from Satarday to Monday
and an advance from Wednesday to Thursday was followed by a declir from Saturday to Monday.

Comparisons of changes in the price of hogs from one day to $t$ next, in relation to the average changes on subsequent days, are show in figures 96 to 101. Advances in the price from Saturday to Monda and from Monday to Tuesday were followed by further advances or day later, declines two days later, and declines three days later. Advanct from Tuesday to Wednesday and from Wednesday to Thursday wes followed by large advances one day later, and small declines two an three days later. Advances from Thursday to Friday and from Frida to Saturday were followed by further advances the next two days an declines three days later.


Figure 100. relation of changes in the average price of hogs from thursDAY TO PRDAY, TO CHANGES FROM PRIday to saturday, saturday to monday, aND MONDAY TO TLESDAX, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
An advance of 25 cents from Thuraday to Friday was followed by an advance of 4 centa from Friday to Saturday, an edvance of 3 cents from Saturday to Moaday, and a decline of $a$ cents from Monday to Tueaday


Figure 101. melation of chanole 1 THE AVERAGE PRICE of HOCS FROM PRIDA TO SATURDAY, TO CHANGES WROM BATUI DAY TO MONDAY, MONDAY TO TURADA! and tuesday to wednesday, chicach 1921701928
An advance of as centa from Friday to $\mathrm{Sa}_{\mathrm{n}}$ urday wan followed by an advance of 4 cen from Saturday to Mondar, an advance of cente from Monday to Tuewry, and a declin of a cents from Tuesday to Wedneday

The net change in the price of hogs from the day of the price chang to the third day following, when receipts were affected the most, is measure of the effect of such changes in receipts on the price. A com parison of these net changes for each day of the week is made in tabl 56 and figures 102 and 103.

When the price of hogs advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday the number of hogs received at Chicago increased 28 per cent from Mon


Figure 102. relation of changes in the average price of hogs from satURDAY to monday to ceanges from monday to thursday, of changes from monday to tuesday to changes from tuesday to friday, and of changes from tuesday to wednespay to CRANGES FROM WEDNESDAY TO SATURDAY, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
Advances in the price from Saturday to Monday and from Monday to Tuesday were followed by net price declines three days later. Advances from Tuesday to Wednesday were followed by further advances


Figure 103. relation of changes in the ayerage price of hogs from WEDNESDAY TO THURSDAY TO CEANGES from thursday to monday, of CHANGES FROM THURSDAY TO FRIDAY to Changes from friday to tuesday, and of changes from prday to saturday to changes from saturday to WEDNESDAY, CHICAGO, 1921 TO 1928
Advances in the price from Wednesday to Thursday, from Thursday to Friday, and from Friday to Saturday, were followed by still higher prices three days later
day to Thursday. This increase was accompanied by a decline of 4 cents in the price. When the price declined 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, receipts decreased 28 per cent from Monday to Thursday and the price advanced 4 cents.

An advance of 25 cents in the price from Thursday to Friday was followed by an increase of 29 per cent in Tuesday's receipts. Despite such an increase in the supply, the price was 5 cents higher on Tuesday than on Friday.

Apparently, fluctuations in the price of hogs reflect the varying needs of the market to a remarkable degree; for, although price advances bring in larger supplies and price declines bring in smaller supplies, the effects of the latter on the price are comparatively negligible.

## BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR

During the pre-war period, from 1910 to 1913, an advance of 20 cents in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday was followed by an advance of 1.9 cents from Monday to Tuesday, a decline of 2.1 cents
from Tuesday to Wednesday, and a decline of 1.9 cents from Wednesda: to Thursday (table 57). After the war, the changes following the sam
table 57. Relation of Ceanges in the Aperage Phice of Hogs prom Satim day to Monday to Subsequent Changes in the Price aefour and aptei the War, Chicaco, 1910-1913 and 1921-1924

| With a change of 5 centa in price | Cents change in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { Tuedeley } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Widneedey } \\ & \text { Thuradey } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Before the war (1910-1913)... <br> After the war (1921-1924)..... | +0.48 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.52 \\ & -0.92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.48 \\ & -1.14 \end{aligned}$ | -0.70 -1.01 |

advance were an advance of 3.3 cents from Monday to Tuesday, a declinu of 3.7 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday, and a decline of 4.6 cents fror Wednesday to Thursday.

The net change in the price from Monday to Thursday following ar advance of 20 cents from Saturday to Monday, was a decline of 2.8 cents before the war and 4 cents after the war (figure 104).

Although a given price change was twice as effective in stimulating and retarding the movement of hogs to market before the war as after the price declined more, as the resul


Figure 104. relition of cennges in the averace pricz of hocs prom satURDAY $T 0$ MONDAY TO CRANGES FROM MONDAY TO THIRSDAY BEFORE AND ATTER TRE WAR, CHICACO, 1910 TO 1913 AND 1921 то 1924
The price declived from Monday to Thursday following an advance from Satarday to Mor day to a greater extent after the war that of such supply changes, after thu war.

## at the bottom and the top of THE CYCLE

At the bottom of the cycle, wher prices were low, an advance of 2 ! cents in the price of hogs from Satur. day to Monday was followed by ar advance of 4.2 cents from Monda) to Tuesday (table 58). From Tuesday to Wednesday and from Wednesday to Thursday the price declined 4.6 and 5.7 cents, respectively.

At the top of the cycle, when the price advanced 25 cents from Saturday to Monday it advanced an additional 6.2 cents from Monday to Tuesday. It then declined 3 cents from Tuesday to Wednesday and 4.7 cents from Wednesday to Thursday.

The net change in the price from Monday to Thursday following an advance of 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, was a decline of 5 cents

TABLE 58. Relation of Changes in the Avirage Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday to Subsequent Changes in the Price at the Botrom and at the Tof of the Hog-Price Cycle, Chicago, 1921-1924 and 1925-1928

| - With a change of 5 cents is price | Cents change in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tresiay } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tuesiay } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Wednesiay } \end{gathered}$ | Wednesdiay to Thursilay | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Thursday } \end{aligned}$ |
| Bottom of the cycie (1921-1924) Top of the cycio (1925-1928)... | $\begin{aligned} & +0.83 \\ & +1.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.92 \\ & -0.59 \end{aligned}$ | -1.14 | $\begin{aligned} & -1.01 \\ & -0.05 \end{aligned}$ |

at the bottom of the cycle and no change in the price at the top of the cycle (figure 105).

Although price advances stimulated receipts slightly more at the top than at the bottom of the cycle, the price declined more, as a consequence of increased receipts, at the bottom of the cycle.

## DURING THE WINTER AND THE SUMMER MONTES

During both the winter and the summer months, advances in the price of hogs from Saturday to Monday were followed by further advances from Monday to Tuesday, declines from Tuesday to Wednesday and from Wednesday to Thursday, and net declines from Monday to Thursday (table 59 and figure 106).


Figure 105. retation of changes in the hivenge price or hocs from satURDAY to monday to changes rrom monday to thursday at the bottom and at the top of the hoc-prece CYCIR, CHICACO, 1921 To 1924 aND 1925 T0 1908
The price declined froma Monday to Thurs day folloving an advance from Saturday to Monday to a treater extent at the bottom of the cycle than the top


Figure 106. relition of changes in the average peice of hocs from saxurday to monday to ceanges from monday to thursday dering the hinter and the somider months, cricaco, 1921 to 1928
The price declined from Monday to Thureday following an advance from Saturday to Monday to a greater extent during the winter than during the summer

TABle 59. Relation of Changes in thr Averagr Prtce of Hifen prom Sattin day to Monday to Subsequent Changes in the Prick durina the Wintal and the Summer Months, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 centa in price | Cente change in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tueday } \\ & \text { Wedinceday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wedneaday } \\ & \text { Tho to } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { Thur } \\ & \text { Thurmiay } \end{aligned}$ |
| In wrumer months.. | +0.12 +0.69 | -0.31 -0.31 | -1.38 -0.92 | -1.62 |

The net decline from Monday to Thursday was somewhat greater dur. ing the winter than during the summer. When the price advanced 2 ! cents from Saturday to Monday in the winter, it declined 8.1 cents from Monday to Thursday. The same price advance in the summer was followed by a decline of 4.3 cents.

Price advances stimulated the movement of hogs to market more during the winter than during the summer. Also, the price declined more with such increases in the supply, in the winter than in the summer.

## WHEN THE SPREAD BETWEEN TOP AND AVERAGE PRICES WAS LARGE AND WHEN IT WAS SMALL

When the difference between the top and average prices was large, an advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday was followed by a further advance of 0.6 cent from Monday to Tuesday (table 60). When the difference between the two prices was small, a 25 -cent advance was followed by a further advance of 5.6 cents.

TABLE 60. Rexation of Changes im the Averacz Paice of Hogs trom Sattrday to Monday to Subsequent Changes in the Price when the Spread between Top and Average Peicrs Was Largr and when It Was Smali, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 centa in price | Cents change in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday } \\ & \text { Wedneaday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wedpeeday } \\ & \text { Thurudey } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { Thuriday } \end{aligned}$ |
| Large spread........................ | +0.13 +1.11 | -0.50 -0.58 | -0.63 | -1.12 -1.35 |

In both cases the decline in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday was nearly the same - 2.5 cents with a large spread and 2.9 cents with a small spread. From Wednesday to Thursday the price declined 3.2 cents when the spread was large and 9.3 cents when it was small.

The net change in the price from Monday to Thursday following an advance of 25 cents from Saturday to Monday, was a 5.6 -cent decline when the spread was large and a 6.8 -cent decline when it was small (figure 107).

Changes in the price from Saturday to Monday affected later receipts more when the difference between the two price quotations was small

## Dally Prices and the Marketing of Hogs

han when it was large. Also, the rice fluctuated more, as a conseuence of such responses, when the pread was small than when it was arge.

## ollowing price changes in the SAME AND IN TEE OPPOSITE DIRECTION

When the price of hogs advanced 5 cents from Saturday to Monday ollowing declines from Friday to aturday, an average advance of 2.4 ents from Monday to Tuesday folswed (table 61). From Tuesday to Vednesday and from Wednesday to 'hursday, the price declined 1.0 cent nd 8.5 cents, respectively. The net hange in the price from Monday to hursday was a decline of 7.6 cents figure 108).
When the price advanced 25 cents rom Saturday to Monday following dvances from Friday to Saturday, n average advance of 8.4 cents from Ionday to Tuesday followed. From uesday to Wednesday and from Vednesday to Thursday, the price


Figure 107. pelition of changes in thi avebace pricz of hocs prom satteday to monday to changes frow monday to thursday wien the SPREAD RETWEEN THE TOP AND THE ATERage paces was large and when it was swal, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
The price declined from Monday to Thursoay following an adrance from Saturdy to Mooday to 2 greater extent when the spread be tween the top and the averase prices was small than when it was large
'ABLE 61. Relation of Changes in the Average Price of Hogs from Saturday to Monday Following Changes in the Same and in the Opposite Direction froy Friday to Saturday, to Subsequent Changes in the Price, Chicaco, 1921 to 1928

| With a change of 5 eents in price | Cents chapge in the price from |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Tresiay } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday } \\ & \text { Wedneeday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wedneoday } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Thursday } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mondisy } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { Thursday } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mlowing opposite price changes Nlowing amilar price changes. | $\begin{aligned} & +0.48 \\ & +1.69 \end{aligned}$ | -0.21 -1.40 | -1.70 -1.23 | $\begin{aligned} & -1.52 \\ & -1.04 \end{aligned}$ |

eclined 7 cents and 6.2 cents, respectively. The net change in the price rom Monday to Thursday was a decline of 5.2 cents (figure 109).
Even though the receipts of hogs increased much more from Monday , Thursday when advances in the price from Saturday to Monday folرwed advances from Friday to Saturday than when they followed eclines, the price declined less from Monday to Thursday in the former 2se.


Figure 108. relation of changes in the average price of hogs prom satURDAY to monday following ceanges in texe opposite direction prom triday to saturday, to changes tiv tere prict mbom monday to tuesday and trom monday to thirsdat, chicaco, 1921 to 1928
An advance of 25 cents in the price from Saturday to Monday following a decline from Friday to Saturday, was followed by an advance of 2.4 cente from Monday to Tuesda and a net decline of 7.6 cents from Monday to Thursday


Froure 109. relation of chanoes a tere avernor price of hois trom sal URDAY TO MONDAY yollowing changi in the same drection hrom prida to saturday, to changes in the pric prom monday to tursday and mol mondat to thursdax, chicnoo, 1921 t 1928
An advance of as eenta fin the price frol Saturday to Monday following nice dracic from Friday to Saturday, wac followed by : advance of 8.4 cente from Monday to Tueenda and a net decline of 3.2 cents írom Monday Thureday

## SUMMARY

In the following paragraphs a summary is given of the results of a analysis of the Chicago hog market for the years 1910 to 1913 and 192 to 1928, inclusive.

Weekly receipts of hogs at Chicago were very unevenly distributed practically one-half reaching the market on Monday and Thursday From 3 to 4 per cent arrived on Saturday.

Weekly reshipments of hogs from Chicago to other markets were some what more evenly distributed than were receipts. A relatively large proportion of the hogs received during the latter part of the week wert reshipped than of those that arrived early in the week.
The supply of hogs remaining for slaughter in Chicago was vers unevenly distributed, there being more than 30 per cent on Monday alone
Weekly receipts were much more unevenly distributed before the wal than after.
Both top and average prices averaged higher on Monday than on any other day of the week. Prices averaged lowest on Wednesday anc Saturday.

Differences in the proportion of hogs received and reshipped, and in the prices paid on different days of the week, varied with the hog cych and with the season of the year.

Daily changes in the price of hogs were largest from Saturday to Monfay and smallest from Friday to Saturday.
Both top and average prices fluctuated about 1.25 per cent of the price from day to day.
Daily variability of prices was dependent upon the phase of the hog :ycle and the season of the year.
The bulk of changes in hog prices from one day to the next were thanges of 25 cents per hundredweight or less.

Different price changes were typical for different days of the week. From Saturday to Monday the most frequent change was a 15 -cent sdvance. From Tuesday to Wednesday it was a 10 -cent decline.
Top and average prices fluctuated most nearly together from Saturday o Monday. From Friday to Saturday the correlation was much less.
Monday's receipts of hogs were the least variable. Saturday's receipts showed the most variation.
Adjustment of daily prices to the number of hogs received was greatest in Wednesday and least on Saturday. In general, the more variable were 1 day's receipts, the less was the adjustment of prices to fluctuations in he receipts.

The adjustmert of prices to receipts for the week as a whole was yreater than for any single day.
When the period of time was extended to a year, the adjustment of orices to receipts was complete. For individual years, however, prices were not completely adjusted to receipts. Going up the hog-price cycle, orices were too high; going down the cycle, they were too low.
The adjustment of prices to receipts on Thursday was greater before he war than after; it was greater at the top of the hog cycle than at the sottom; and it was greater in the summer than in the winter.

Prices changed more in accordance with fluctuations in receipts on Monday and Thursday than on the other days of the week. Fluctuations in Saturday's receipts were the least effective.
On all days of the week, advances in the price stimulated the movement of hogs to market, and declines in the price retarded the movement.

With the single exception of changes in the price from Friday to Satarday, the greatest effect was on receipts the third day after the price thange.

The greatest effect of any price change was the response of Saturday's receipts to changes in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday.

There was no significant difference in the effect of changes in the top price as compared with changes in the average price. Both were equally satisfactory measures.

Price changes affected later receipts more before the war than after. The same absolute change was nearly twice as effective.

Price changes affected later receipts more at the top of the hog-price zycle than at the bottom. However, the difference was not significant.

Price changes affected later receipts more in the winter than in the summer. Conflict with farm work in the summer prevented the shipment of hogs in response to the price stimulus alone.

Price changes affected later receipts more when the spread between top and average prices was small than when it was large. Producers followed
the market more closely when they were marketing a high-quality produ than when they were marketing one of low quality.

When the price changed in the direction opposite to that of the tren in prices at the time, the effect on later receipts was greater than when changed in the same direction.

Receipts were affected more when the price changed in the same dire tion two days in succession than when it advanced or declined only o day.

Although two successive price changes in the same direction were mo effective than one, three or more were less effective than either two or or

On all days of the week, an advance in the price of hogs over that ; the preceding day was accompanied by an increase in the proportion whi was reshipped on that day.

On all days of the week, an advance in the price of hogs over that on $t \mid$ preceding day was followed by a decrease in the proportion which $\mathbf{w}$ reshipped three days later.

In general, reshipments, in percentage of receipts, tended to fluctua inversely with receipts. When the number of hogs received was large, $\mathrm{t} \mid$ percentage reshipped tended to be small, and vice versa.

There was more of a tendency to reship hogs to other markets follo ing price advances at Chicago when the level of hog prices was high thi when it was low.

Two successive price advances stimulated the movement of hogs fro Chicago to other markets more than did an advance following a decline.

On all days of the week, changes in the price of hogs from one day the next were followed by further changes in the same direction on $t \mid$ following day.

Although price advances stimulated and price declines retarded $t$ movement of hogs to market on later days of the week, the average effe of such increases and decreases in the supply on the price was not great

Although a given price change was twice as effective in stimulating at in retarding the movement of hogs to market before the war as after, t | price declined more, as the result of such supply changes, in the peric after the war.

Although price advances stimulated receipts slightly more at the to than at the bottom of the cycle, the price declined more, as a consequen of increased receipts, at the bottom of the cycle.

Price advances stimulated the movement of hogs to market more durit the winter than during the summer. Also, the price declined more, wi such increases in the supply, in the winter than in the summer.

Even though the receipts of hogs increased much more from Monday Thursday when advances in the price from Saturday to Monday follow advances from Friday to Saturday than when they followed declines, t$]$ price declined less from Monday to Thursday in the former case.

## APPENDIX

TABLE 62. Equations: Relation of Average Prices to Receipts of Hogs af Chicago

| When $x$ equals receipts, and $y$ equals the average price of hogs in percentage of normal | Equation |
| :---: | :---: |
| Monday | $\log y=2.552-0.276 \log x$ |
| Tuesdry... | $\log y=2.492-0.246 \log x$ |
| Wednesday. | $\log y=2.710-0.355 \log x$ $\log y=2.454-0.227 \log x$ |
| Friday... | $\log y=2.470-0.235 \log x$ |
| Saturdsy. | $\log y=2.344-0.172 \log x$ |
| Thursday, 1910-1913 | $\log y=2.404-0.202 \log x$ |
| Thursday, 1921-1924. | log $y=2.302-0.151 \log x$ |
| Thursday, 1925-1928. | log $y=2.410-0.205 \log x$ |
| Thursday, winter. | $\log y=2.446-0.223 \log x$ |
| Thursday, summer | $\log y=2.714-0.357 \log x$ |
| Year... | $\log y=2.812-0.406 \log x$ $\log y=4.000-1.000 \log x$ |

table 63. Equations: Relatton of Daily Receipts of Hogs to Daily Changes in the Average Price at Chicago

| Whan $x$ equale a 5 -cent change in the price of hogs | When $y$ equals receipts in percentage of normal | Equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saturday to Monday. | Mondsy ... | $\log y=2.0048-0.0202 \log x$ |
| Monday to Tuesday.. | Tuesday......... | $\log y=1.9935-0.0097 \log x$ |
| Tuesday to Wednesday | Wednesday..... | $\log y=1.9992-0.0154 \log x$ |
| Thursday to Friday... | Thursday....... | $\log y=1.9962-0.0228 \log x$ $\log y=2.0059-0.0165 \log x$ |
| Friday, to Saturday. | Saturday..... | $\log y=2.0047-0.0051 \log ^{2} x$ |

table 64. Equations: Relation of Daily Peice Cbanges to Latea Recrit of Hogs

| When I equele of b-eent change in the priow of boen | Then y mpuan the prowatage obange in reocipty | Unedinutived quation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Adjumeta } \\ & \text { equatio } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average prious: |  |  |  |
| Saturday to Monday Baturday to Monday | Tueday (oos day letar)... Wedneoday (two dars letar) | $\begin{aligned} & y=+0.4+8.002 \\ & y=f 0.47+120 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Eaturday to Mondy | Thuroday (throo dayy later) | y:F1.41 |  |
| Esturday to Monday | Priday (lour dnyo istar)... | y- 1.20 - 888 |  |
| Satarday to Monde | Baturday (Ave day later) | $=+1.87+1008$ |  |
| Saturday to M | Monday (aix dayi latar). |  |  |
| Monday to Tueeda | Widneeday (one day lat | $y=-036+1.701$ |  |
| Monday to Tuesday | Thumaday (two days later) |  |  |
| Monday to Tuendas Monday to Tuenday | Priday (throe deye later) Saturday (four daso later) |  |  |
| Monday to Tuenday <br> Monday to Tuesday | Smaturday (four dasy leter) | 7*+1.29+8.887 |  |
| Monday to Tueddy. | Tueday (aix day liter) | 7- - $1.39+1.84$ |  |
| Tuenday to Wedneedsy | Thursday (one disy later) | $y 0+0.32+1.82 \mathrm{z}$ |  |
| Tueendy to Wedneeday | Friday (ivo dagh later). | $y=+2.00+4.48 \mathrm{z}$ |  |
| Tueddey to Wednetay | Saturday (three dayn letes | $y=+401+78$ |  |
| Tuemdis to Wedaeday | Mondey ( (our dayi later) | $y=+182$ |  |
| Tuenday to Wedneeday Tuecday to Wedneeday | Tuegdsy (Ave dayn later). | 7*+0.23 ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| Wedneeday to Thuredis | Pridey (oun day liter) | 70+1.49-1.25x |  |
| Wednesday to Thurnday | 8aturday (two daye intor) | 70+4.32-6.62x |  |
| Wodneeday to Thursd | Monday (three dayl later) | $3=+8.48+8.892$ |  |
| Wedneeday to Thurade | Tuediny (four dayt later). | $y=-0.25+4.403$ |  |
| Wodneday to Thurndsy | Wedneddey (five daye hatee. | $y=+2.30 \pm 3.278$ |  |
| Wedneaday to Thuraday | Thuradey (oir daro later). Baturday (ons day later). |  |  |
| Thureday to Friday | Monday (two day liter) | $y=+0.0578 .85$ |  |
| Thurnday to Friday | Tueaday (three daye later) | $y=-0.80+8.008$ |  |
| Thursdey to Prides | Wedneedey (four dara late | $y=-0.88+8.00 \pi$ |  |
| Thuroday to Priday | Thunday (five daye lat | $y=-0.97+3$ 60x |  |
| Thursday to Friday | Friday (aix dsys later). | $y=-0.77+888$ |  |
| Friday to 8aturday | Monday (one day later) | $y=-0.02+1.22 x$ | $y=+1$ |
| Priday to saturday Priday to Saturday | Tueedsy (twra daya later) | y=+ $0.11 \pm 2.848$ |  |
| Friday to 8aturday | Wedneeday (three deyl Thuradey (four dags later) | y=+0.87+ ${ }^{2} .62 x$ |  |
| Priday to Aaturday | Friday (ive days later) | $y=+0.82+898{ }^{2}$ |  |
| Priday to Saturday | Saturday (ixix dajo latm) | $y=+1.18+2.78 x$ |  |
| Top prices, 1921-1928 | Tueday (one day liter) | $y=-0.88+3.4 x$ |  |
| Top prices, 1921-1928 | Wedneeday (two deys latar) | $y=-0.86+4.43 x$ |  |
| Top prices, 1921-1928. | Thuredey (hrees dany later) | $y=0.077$ |  |
| Averase prices, 1910-1018 <br> Averace pricen, 1910-1912 | Tueday (one day lever).. <br> Wedneedsy (two dara lete) |  |  |
| Average prices, 1010-1913. | Thuraday (three daya laver). | $y=+4.08$ - 10.32 x |  |
| Top prioses, 1910-1033. | Tuerday (one day later)... | y=-0.22+7.48x |  |
| Top prices, 1010-1913. | Wedreeday (two daso later) | $y=+0.75+870 x$ |  |
| Top prices, 1910-1913... | Thurday (tared days later) | $y=0.28+9878$ |  |
| Averace prioes, 1921-192 | Tueday (one day letar)... | $y=+1.05+1.88 \mathrm{sm}$ |  |
| Aversage prices, 1021-1924 | Wodneddey (two daye later) | $y=+1.41+4.088$ |  |
| Average prios, 1021-1924 | Thureday (three daya leter) | $y=+1.73+.5 .81 \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| Average prices, 1025-1029 <br> Average prices, 1925-1828 | Tuedday (ono day later)... | $y+0.10+3.042$ | 21 |
| Average prices, 1925-1928. <br> Average prices, 1925-1928 | Wedned lay (two dase later) Thurnday (threo disys ither) | $\begin{aligned} & y=0.48+8.80 x \\ & y=+0.11+8.00 x \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Average prices, winte.. | Tueeday (ove day liter)... | $y=+10.25+3.23 \mathrm{x}$ | y=+2 |
| average prices, wio | Wednedey (two daya leter) | $y=+1.00+3.80 x$ | y= 4.9 |
| Averago prices, wi | Thundey (threo daya leter) | y= 5 +10.10 + $720 \pi$ | \% |
| Average pricen, | Tueeday (one day later) ....) |  |  |
| Aversme prices, pur | Thursday (three days lettr) | $y=-11.25+8.13 x$ | \% $=15$ |
| Average pricea, large epi | Tuenday (one das late). | $y=-0.20+2.40 x$ | $y=+3.1$ |
| Averse pricen, lirge epre | Wedneedsy (two deys lites) | $y=+0.26+3.07 x$ | $y=+40$ |
| Average price, large app | Tbursday (three daya latee) |  |  |
| Averise pricen, mmall spre | Wedpesday (two days laté) | $y=+100+6.238$ |  |
| Average pricse, small | Thurnday ( (hreo dayt leter) | $y=+4.50+8.10 x$ | $y=+8.9$ |
| Top prives, large rpread. | Tuesday (ona day later). | $y=-0.08+245 x$ | $y=+21$ |
| Top priose, lerge npread | Wedneday (two daye liter) | $y=-106+4.94 x$ |  |
| Top prices, umal preea | Tuenday (ooe day later) | $y x+1.17+28 \mathrm{~m}$ | $y=+38$ |
| Top pricea, small spread. | Wedneday (two dayl liters) | $y=-000+523 x$ | \%+ 5 |
| Top pricen amall ept | Thuradey (three dayn leter). | $y=+335+767 x$ | at 78 |
| Average prices, pricea fin | Tueeday (one day later).. | $y=+007+3008$ | y= 318 |
| Average prices, pricee for | Thureday (three daya tation |  | $y=+5.0$ |

TABLE 64 (concluded)

| When x equals a 5 -oent change in the prioo of hogs | When y equald the percentage change in recoupte | Unadjusted equation | Adjusted equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iturday to Monda |  |  |  |
| A verage prices, $p$ | Tuesday (one day later) | $0.49+2.00 x$ |  |
| Average pricea, prioes ri | Wedreeday (two days | $y=-3.15+5.07 x$ | $y=+5.23 x$ |
| Average priceen prioes rining | Thursiday (three dayn inter) | $y=-1.28+5.93 x$ | $y=+6.01 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Averape prices advances during rising and | Tuesday (one day later) | $\mathrm{y}=+0.74+2.40 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+2.38 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Averse prioes advanses during raving and | Wedneeday (two days ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $y=+2.00+3.98 x$ | $y=+8.90 x$ |
| Average prioem edvanose during falling and | Tuesday (one day later). |  | $y=+5.27 x$ $y=+8.18 x$ |
|  | Wedincaday (two days later) | $y=-4.09+5.66 x$ | $y=+5.00 x$ |
| Average prioces <br> ollowing price ohanges on the preceding day in the opposite direotion: | Thursday (three daya later) | $y=-3.51+7.34 x$ | $y=+7.61 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Saturday to Monde | Tuesday (one | $\mathrm{y}=-0.60+2.85 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+2.87 x$ |
| Saturday to | Wedresday (two days lat | $y=-0.20+5.02 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+5.03 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Saturday to | Thursday (threo deyn lete) | $y=-0.80+6.79 \mathrm{z}$ | $y=+8.84 x$ |
| Saturday to Mondd |  | $y=-1.58+3.73 x$ | $y=+8.75 x$ |
| Saturday | Saturday (ivo dayn litaer) | $y=+1.00+2.38 x$ | $y=+2.84 x$ |
| Saturday to Monday | Mondsy (six daya later) | $y=-0.68+4.09 x$ | $y=+4.12 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Monday to Tuenda | Wedneaday (one day later) | $y=-2.69+0.10 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+0.20 x$ |
| Monday to Tuend | Thuradey (two days latar) | $y=-1.64+0.37 x$ | $y=+0.38 x$ |
| Monday to Tuenday | Priday (thrse days lator) | $y=-2.61+5.30 \mathrm{x}$ | y= + 5.44 x |
| Tuesday to Wednesd | Thursday (one day later) | $\mathrm{y}=+0.18+0.06 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+0.96 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tuesday to Wedneeday | Friday (two days later)............ | $y=+1.76{ }^{\text {a }}$ ( 2.48 x |  |
| Tuesday to Wednesday Wodneeday to Thurrd | Saturday (three days Later) <br> Friday (one day later). |  | $\begin{aligned} & y=+7.10 x \\ & y=-0.09 x \end{aligned}$ |
| Wedneeday to Thursday | Saturday (two days later) | $y=-2.45+2.418$ | $y=+2.47 x$ |
| Wodnesday to Thund | Monday (three daye later) | $y=-0.08+3.188$ | $y=+3.18 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tharsdey to Prida | Saturday (one day tater) | $y=+6.11-4.32 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=-4.07 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Thursiay to Frida | Monday ( (two days later) | $y=+1.01+1.81 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+1.78 \mathrm{z}$ |
| Thuredsy to Prida | Tuexdin (threo days later).......... | $y=-1.00+8.82 x$ | $y=+5.01 x$ |
| Friday to Saturday | Monday (one day later)............. | $y=+4.71+5.81 x$ | $y=+5.36 x$ |
| Friday to gaturday Priday to Saturday | Tuedday (tro days later)............ | $y=+4.23+10.81 x$ $y=-0.05+7.88 x$ | $y=+10.18 x$ |
| allowing price changes on the preopding day in the same direction: | Wedineday (three daya later) . . . . . | $y=-0.05+7.83 x$ | $y=+7.88 x$ |
| Saturday to Mon | Tueaday (one day later). | $\mathrm{y}=+1.00+2.76 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+2.73 x$ |
| Saturday to Mondd | Wednesday (two days later) . . . . . . | $y=+5.00+8.13 x$ |  |
| Saturday to Monde | Thursday (threo days later | $\mathrm{y}=+8.60+11.51 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+10.80 x$ |
| Satarday to Monda | Fridey ( lour days late | $y=+6.78+9.67 x$ | $\mathrm{y}=+8.88 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Soturday to Monday | Saturday (fivo days latar) . . . . . . . . | $y=+4.04+0.10 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+8.67 x$ |
| Saturday to | Monday (aix dayt hater)............ | $y=+6.91+9.84 x$ | $y=+9.20 x$ |
| Monday to Tueeday | Weduenday (one day later). ........ | $\mathrm{y}=+3.22+3.81 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=+8.69 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Monday to Tuenday | Thurnday (two daya latar)........... | $\mathrm{y}=+1.35+7.13 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=+7.04 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Monday to Tuedsy | Priday (three day later). . . . . . . . | $\mathrm{y}=+5.88{ }^{5}+8.57 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=+8.10 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tuenday to Wodneed | Thurdday (one day later)............ | $y=+2.18{ }^{\text {a }}$ + 2.34 x | $\mathrm{y}=+2.20 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tueseday to Wednoedx | Friday (two dayr later). . . . . . . . . | $\mathrm{y}=+1.20+8.08 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+7.96 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tuosdey to Wednend | Saturday (three dayt later),......... | $y=-0.58+12.04 x$ | $y=+12.11 x$ |
| Wedneodey to Thurs | Priday (ons day later) .............. | $y=-0.03+1.59 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+1.60 x$ |
| Wedineeday to Thun | Saturday (two daya liter)........... | $y=+5.05+6.78 x$ | $y=+6.45 x$ |
| Wedneeday to Thun | Monday (three day later) | $\mathrm{y}=+0.79+8.87 x$ | $y=+8.80 x$ |
| Tbursday to Priday | Saturday (one day leter) | $y=-2.16+1.26 x$ | $y=+1.29 x$ |
| Thuraday to Frida | Monday (two dayt later) | $y=-1.21+8.39 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+5.46 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Thurdiny to Friday | Tuenday (three daya late | $y=+4.72+7.68 x$ | $y=+7.33 x$ |
| Friday to Saturda | Monday (one day later) | $y=-8.83-8.28 x$ | $y=-3.41 x$ |
| Friday to Saturdny | Tuesday (two daya later) ... | $y=+0.82-1.61 x$ | $y=-1.60 x$ |
| Friday to Baturdny. | Wedncodis (threo dayn later) ........ | $y=+1.78-0.23 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-0.23 \mathrm{x}$ |
| ollowing priee ohangen two or mote dayt in the same direotion: |  |  |  |
| Saturday to Moaday | Tuesday (one day later) ............ | $y=-0.34+4.86 x$ | 5=+4.88z |
| Saturday to Mo | Wedneeday (two dayz latar) ......... | $y=+2.18+5.37 x$ | $y=+5.26 x$ |
| Saturday to M | Thursday (three daya later) | $y=+2.25+5.23 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+5.11 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Saturday to Mond | Priday (four day | $6.28+4.73 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+4.45 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Saturday to Monday | Saturday (five daya la | $3.66+2.47 x$ | $\mathrm{y}=+$ + 8.38 x |
| Saturday to Monday | Mondey (dix dayi latar)............. | $y=+3.31+3.63 x$ | $y=+3.49 x$ |

## TAble 65. Equations: Ralation of Daily Price Changrs to Rebuipm or Hogs

| Whan x equale a b-aent change in the prive of hope | When $y$ equab the presontage change in revoipte rmhipped | Unedjumed - Guelvos | Adjual equat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ave |  |  |  |
| Saturday to Monday | Monday. | y- $+0.08+28 \mathrm{sm}$ | \% $0+8$ |
| Baturday to Monday. | Tueday (one day later).... | y=-0 $87-1.10 x$ |  |
| Saturidy to Monday. | Wednenday (two daye leter) |  |  |
| Mondey to Tueedey. | Tuesday. | $7=+364+7042$ | $y \mathrm{c}+0$ |
| Mondey to Tuesday | Wednendey (one day lit | $y=+040+8802$ | $y=+8$ |
| Monday to Tuesday | Thursday (two dayn later) | $y=-078+00^{60 n}$ | $y=+0$ |
| Monday to Tuemday. | Priday (thren daya litur). | $y=+078-237$ | y=-2 |
| Tuedey to Wedneeda | Wedneedny <br> Thuraday (one day litur) | $\begin{aligned} & y=+j 81+i k n z \\ & y=+080+3 s_{1} \end{aligned}$ | y= + |
| Tuesday to Wedineeda | Friday (two dayulater) |  |  |
| Tuedsy to Wedneeds | Beturdey (three daya leter) | $y=-383-1828$ |  |
| Wedneaday to Thureda | Thurady | $y=-018+848$ | $y=+8$ |
| Wedneeday to Thureday | Priday (one day lelor). | $y=+0.22+145 x$ | $y=+1$ |
| Wedneeday to Thurnday | Mondiny (throm dayn latar) |  |  |
| Thursday to Pridag | Priday | $y=+080+8.70 x$ | \% +8 |
| Thuraday to Friday | Saturday (one day later) | $y=-260+132 x$ | $y=+1$ |
| Thureday to Friday | Monday (two disy later). | $y=-1.08-0492$ |  |
| Thurdey to Pridey | Tuedsy (tbree dagn later) | $y=+134-285$ | - - -8 |
| Priday to gatorday Priday to Satarday | Saturday ........ |  | $y=+6$ |
| Friday to geturday | Tuonday (oxis day |  |  |
| Fridsy to Sqturdsy. | Wedneedey (threp dayn later). | $y=-0.92-0.008$ | \% $=-0$. |
| Eaturdsy to Mapday: | Monday | $y=+2.20+7.88 \mathrm{~s}$ |  |
| 1010-1013. | Tuedey | $y=+1.14+9.721$ |  |
| 1010-1913. | Wedreediny | $y=-005+1.70 x$ | $y=+1$. |
| 1910-1913. | Thunday. | $y=+0.77+0.50 x$ | $y=+0$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1021-1924 . \\ & 1021-1024 . \end{aligned}$ | Monday. | $y=-6{ }^{39}+1.73 \mathrm{y}$ | $y=+1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1921-1024. } \\ & \text { 1021-1924. } \end{aligned}$ | Tuesday. <br> Wednenda | $y=-7.92-2.10 \mathrm{y}$ |  |
| 1921-1924. | Thurday | $y=+8.00-8.64$ |  |
| 1025-1928. | Monday | $y=+6.54+300 x$ | $y=+8$ |
| 1925-1928. | Treaday | $y=+6.10-0.50 \mathrm{~K}$ | $y=0$. |
| ${ }_{1925-1028}$ | Wedreed | yx+0.18-1.78x | = $=1$ |
| Winter monthe | Thurnday | $y=+8.61-0.948$ |  |
| Winter month |  | $y=+8.34-8.831$ |  |
| Winter monthe | Wednemd | $y=+1125-832 x$ |  |
| Winter month | Thuroding | $y=+8.30-8.294$ |  |
| Summer month | Mondsy. | $y=-12.68+8.23 \mathrm{x}$ | 3 |
| Summer montha | Tuesdisy. |  | $y=+0$ |
| Summer months | Thursidy | $y=-16.22+0.778$ $y=0$ $=17.85$ 0.878 | $y=+0$ |
| Large apread between pric | Monday. | $y=+1.97+1.02 \mathrm{c}$ | $y=+1$ |
| Iarge apread between price | Tuedsy (oue day later) | $y=+2.15-174$ | 1*-1 |
| Latge spread between prices. | Wedneeday (two day later) | $y=+3.81-0838$ | $y=-0$ |
| Large spread betwean pric | Thursday (three dasa ieter) | $y^{\prime}=-0.81-2285$ | $y \pm-7$ |
| 8tasall spread between pp | Tueday (one day latar) | $y=-2.8 \pm 8000$ | $y=$ |
|  | Wedreeday (two dass liter) | y=-8.72-4.73n |  |
| Small apread between price |  | $y=-947-8.10 x$ |  |
| Foilowing opposite price cha | Monday | $y=-1.12+1.10 \mathrm{z}$ | $y=+1$ |
| Following opposito price ahs | Tueday (one dey liter) | $y=-3.83-19$ | y=-1 |
| Following oppomite price e | Wednemday (two dayd liter). | $y=-0.01-277 \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| Polowing similar price chan | Mondsy . . . . . . . | $y=+0.38+8.758$ | y= |
| Following similar price ehs | Tuedsy (one day liter) | $y=-385-008 \mathrm{x}$ | \% |
| Following eimily price ch | Wedneoday (two dayn later). | $y=+3.20+1005$ | $y=$ |
| Following imimar price changee | Thandey (turoe dasp latar).. | $y=-1.47+0.41 \mathrm{x}$ | $=+0$ |

## Able 66. Equations: Relation of Daily Price Ceanges to Subsequent Cbanges in the Pbice of Hocs

| When x equals a 5 -cent change in the prive of hage | When $y$ equalk the change in prives in eeats | 0 madjusted equation | Adjusted Equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| atardey to Mondey. | Monday to Toenday | $y=-3.07+0.938$ | $y=+0.968$ |
| atardey to Monday | Trueday to Wednesd | $y=-0.56-0.80 x$ | $y=-0.80 x$ |
| Catarisy to Moondsy | Wedneeduy to Thar | $y=+1.47-1.04 x$ $y=-1.89$ | $y=-1.02 x$ |
| Ionday to Tuesday | Tuesday to W | $y=-1.69-0.81 x$ $y=-0.4$ | $y=-0.82 x$ $y=+0.86 x$ |
| condiny to Toerd | Wedneodey to Thursc | $y=+0.63-0.40 x$ | $y=-0.40 \mathrm{x}$ |
| fonday to Tuesday. | Thursiay to Priday | $y=-2.08-0.87 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-0.89 \mathrm{x}$ |
| fonday to Tuesides | Tueeday to Priday | $y=+1.51-0.25 x$ | $y=-0.25 \mathrm{x}$ |
| ueeddy to Weadnesd | Fedoeday to Thur | $y=+1.48+1.63 \mathrm{z}$ | $y=+1.61 \mathrm{x}$ |
| needay to Wednee | Thursiay to Priday | $y=+1.46-0.32$ | $y=-0.32 \mathrm{x}$ |
| veedisy to Wedreed | Priday to Saturday | $y=-2.75-0.388$ | $y=-0.39 x$ |
| Tuediny to Fredine | Wedrendry to Satu | $y=-0.05+0.84 x$ | $y=+0.84 x$ |
| Vedneeday to Thurs | Thursody to Priday | $y=+1.15+1.35 x$ | $y=+1.33 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Fednesday to Thured | Priday to Setardi | $y=-2.88-0.71 x$ | $y=-0.73 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Vednecday to Thursiay | Saturdey to Manday .............. | $y=+1.62-0.19 x$ |  |
| Fednesiny to Thurndi | Thurreday to Monday | $y=-0.04+0.45 \mathrm{z}$ | $\mathrm{y}=+0.45 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Hureday to Priday | Priday to Saturday | $y=-3.08+0.69 \mathrm{z}$ | $y=+0.71 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Tursolay to Priday | Saturday to Monday . . . . . . . . . . | $y=+1.68+0.61 x$ |  |
| Thuraday to Friday | Monday to Tuesday | $y=-2.35-0.34 x$ | -0.35x |
| Tursoday to Priday | Priday to Tuesdar. | $y=-2.89+0.84 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=+0.98 \mathrm{z}$ |
| Triday to Setare | Saturday to M | $y=+2.40+0.83 x$ | $\mathrm{y}=+0.81 \mathrm{x}$ |
| riday to Se | Monday to To | $y=-2.05+0.868$ | $\mathrm{y}=+0.88 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Triday to Satardey | Tueedy to Wednenday. . . . . . . . . | $y=-1.23-0.83 x$ | $y=-0.84 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Miday to Satarday | Setarday to Wedinediaj............ | $y=-1.02+0.60 x$ | $y=+0.01 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1910-1913. |  | $y=-1.63+0.46 \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| 1910-1913 | Tueediay | $y=-1.32-0.50 \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| 1910-1913 | Wedineeday to Thursiay | $y=+0.81-0.49 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=-0.48 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1010-1913 | Mondey io Thurs | $y=-2.00-0.68 x$ | $y=-0.70 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1921-1024 | Manday to Tuesdis | $y=-1.20+0.82 x$ | $y=+0.83 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1921-1924 | Tuesday to Wednesday | $y=-0.28-0.82 x$ | $y=-0.92 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1021-1924 | Wednenday to Thursid | $y=+1.88-1.16 x$ | $y=-1.14 x$ |
| 1821-10 | Mondey to Thureday | $y=+0.23-1.01 x$ | $y=-1.01 \mathrm{x}$ |
|  | Mondsy to Tueedey. | $y=-4.30+1.20 \mathrm{x}$ | $\mathrm{y}=+1.25 \mathrm{z}$ |
| 1925-1928 | Wedneediy to Thuredis | $y=-1.08-0.53 x$ <br> $y=+1.08$ <br> $0.95 x$ | $y=-0.59 \mathrm{x}$ |
| 1025-1828. | Mooday to Ttrureday | $y=-3.22-0.05 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-0.05 \mathrm{z}$ |
| Winter mim | Moaday to Tuedidey | $y=-1.78+0.12 x$ | $y=+0.12 x$ |
| Winter ma | Tuedsy to Weinesta | $y=-1.68-0.50 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-0.51 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Winter month | Fednesiay to Thur | $y=-0.34-1.38 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-1.38 x$ |
| Winter mon | Monday to Thurrsiay | $y=-4.44-1.55 x$ | $y=-1.80 x^{2}$ |
| Sumamer | Monday to Tueeday | $y=-8.12+0.67 x$ | $y=+0.69 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Summer mauthe | Wedneeday to Thur | $y=+2.85-0.94 x$ | $y=-0.02 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Summer mont | Mondey to Thurriday | y- $-0.78-0.85 x$ | $y=-0.86 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Iarge epread best | Mondiy to Tuesing | $y=-1.47+0.12 x$ | $y=+0.13 x$ |
| Large spread between prichen | Tuediy to Fednenday | $y=-0.480 .50 x$ | $y=-0.50 x$ |
|  | Wednestay to Thurada | $y=+8.080 .0 .65 x$ | $y=-0.63 x$ |
| Bmatl apreead between prix | Moadiy to Thu | $y=-2.05-1.10 x$ $y=-0.87+1.10 x$ | $y=-1.12 x$ $y=+1.11 z$ |
| Small apread between priout | Tueday to Wedneed | $y=-1.58-0.57 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-0.58 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Stalil spread botween pri | Fednesday to Thurs | $y=-0.86-1.84 x$ | $y=-1.88 x$ |
| Email spread beemesa price | Monday to Thumeday | $y=-8.37-1.31 \mathrm{x}$ | $y=-1.55 x$ |
| Following opponite prise che | Morday to Tueeday | $y \pm-3.45+0.48 x$ | $y=+0.48 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Foillowing opposite prico et | Wedneeday to Thura | $y=-1.46$ <br> $y=+1.43$ <br> $1.72 x$ | $y=-0.21 x$ $y=-1.70 x$ |
| Following opprosite price ob | Mondoy to Thursdin | $y=-3.50-1.47 x$ | $y=-1.52 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Following mmilar prioe dha | Monday to Tuesia | $y=-3.69+1.63 x$ | $y=+1.88 \mathrm{x}$ |
| dlowipg gimiler prioe chn | Tuendis to Wedn | $y=-0.18-1.40 x$ | $y=-1.40 \mathrm{x}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Following similar priee chang } \\ & \text { Following ainilar priee chang } \end{aligned}$ | Wednesday to Thursed | $\begin{aligned} & y=+1.05-1.24 x \\ & y=-2.45-1.00 x \end{aligned}$ | $y=-1.23 x$ $y=-1.04 x$ |

## PRICES AND COSTS

TIME was when most of the information about agriculture had to do with producing crops. In more recent years the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State Colleges of Agriculture and State Experiment Stations, have recognized the great importance of marketing crops as well as growing them. Studies of the costs of growing crops and of the prices received for them now form a large part of the publication output.

Cornell has made many such studies. Among them are:

Wholesale prices and receipts of apples in Boston for thirty-six years (E 28) Rogers
A survey of some public produce markets in upstate New York (P 525) Weaver

Some facts concerning the distribution of fruits and vegetables by wholesalers and jobbers in large terminal markets ( P 494) Rasmussen

These and others may be obtained from the Office of Publication, College of Agriculture, Ithaca, New York.

They Are Free


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ Also presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Cornell University, September, 1930, as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy.
    AUtror's acknowledgaents. The writer is especially indebted to Professor F. A. Pearson, of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management at Cornell University, under whose personal direction the study was made. For sugrestions and other assistance. acknowledgment is due to J. S. Campbell, of the Chicago Branch Office of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture; to W. P. Dolan, of the Saint Paul tural Econotmics, United States Department of Agriculture; to W. P. Dolan, of the Saint Paul Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C.; and to H. R. Tolicy, of the Giannini Foundation, Berkeley. California.
    ${ }^{2}$ Hog producioa and marketing, p. 257. By E Z Russell and others. U. S. Agr. Dept Yearbook 1922. 1923.

[^1]:    -In 1927, 581,354 hoge, and in 1928. 977,464 hogs, which were consigned direct to perl were included in the official yard receipts since they were unloaded, weighed, and yarded at stock yarda. If these were included as "directs," the percentagea received by packers would be and 19.2, respectively.
    remaining 4 per cent were shipped direct to packers outside the yal In 1928, 91.3 per cent of the total Chicago receipts passed through yards, 80.8 per cent for sale on the open market and 10.5 per cent consignments direct to packers. An additional 8.7 per cent were recei'

[^2]:    Nearly one-half of the hogs sent to Chicneo arrive on either Monday or Thursday. Very few arrive on Saturday, and less than half at many are received on Wednesday as on Monday

[^3]:    *Calculated from the formula

[^4]:    When receipts for a week were 50 per cent below normal, the price was 31 per cent above normal

[^5]:    There is some evidence of flattening of the curves with farge price chamget Undoubtedty, very large changes are not to effective, proportionately, wit are malif changea. However, within the limits of the data used, the degree of curvilinearity was considered insufficiently pronounced to justify the use of mere complex mathematical relationship than etraight lines. The author first attempted the drawing of free-hand curves (Fasw Ecomomice, no. 53, pages 936 to 939 ), but later found linear relationships to be more sistisfactory.

[^6]:    Receipts of hoys one week following an advance of as cents in the price from Saturday to Monday were 19 per cent eremter than the receipta on Monday, the day of the change in price

[^7]:    The difference in the effect of a given change in price at the bottom and at the top of the hog-price cycle was not great. Changes at the top of the cycle were dightly more effective

[^8]:    Price changen were equally effective in stimulating and in retarding the movement of hogs to market during periods of falling and periods of rising price

[^9]:    An advance of 25 cents in the price from Tuesday to Wednesday increased Saturday's reccipts 24 per cent more when it followed an advance from Monday to Tuesdey than when it followed a dechine

[^10]:    An advance in the price following another udvance etimulated the movement of hosp to market much more than did an advance fol lowing a decline. A decline following a decline retarded the movement more than did a doclije following an advace

