# The Comparative Value of Steer or Heifer Calves As Feeders Under Varying Feeding Programs 

SPECIAL REPORT 247
FEBRUARY 1968

Agricultural Experiment Station
Oregon State University
Corvallis


AUTHORS: A. T. Ralston is Professor of Animal Science, W. H. Kennick is Assistant Professor of Animal Science, D. C. Church is Associate Professor of Animal Nutrition, and T. P. Davidson is Assistant Professor of Horticulture and Superintendent of Umatilla Experiment Station, Oregon State University.

THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF STEER OR HEIFER CALVES
AS FEEDERS UNDER VARYING FEEDING PROGRAMS

A. T. Ralston, W. H. Kennick, D. C. Church, and T. P. Davidson

Criticism of the carcass value of slaughter heifers by packers and retailers can no doubt justify the present spread in slaughter prices. This approximate spread in price has been used to establish the relative value of feeder calves. There is a constant complaint from feedlot operators that heifers are unprofitable when compared to steers of similar quality.

This study was designed to compare the economic advantages and/or disadvantages of steers or heifers using variable but acceptable prefinishing treatments and a common proven finishing treatment. The objectives of this trial were: 1) to compare the response of heifers and steers to varying prefinishing treatments; 2) to determine any sex-treatment interaction; 3) to determine the carry-over effect of prefinishing treatment upon finishing performance; and 4) to determine the justifiable spread in feeder cattle prices for differing sexes under similar conditions.

## Methods

Sixty steer and sixty heifer calves of similar quality were randomly assigned to one of five prefinishing treatments, as shown in Table 1. The calves remained on the prefinishing treatments until they reached an average of 625 and 725 pounds for the heifers and steers, respectively. Upon reaching the required weights, all calves were placed on a common finishing ration of $74.5 \%$ steam rolled barley, $10 \%$ ground alfalfa, $10 \%$ beet pulp, $5 \%$ molasses, and $0.5 \%$ trace mineralized salt.

The steers were implanted with Synovex $S$ and the heifers implanted with Synovex $H$ at the beginning of the finishing phase of the trial.

Steers were marketed at an average weight of 1,081 pounds and the heifers at 917 pounds. Current market prices were used in the economic analysis, realizing that statements made concerning respective values would necessarily change as any of the prices used tended to change.

## Results

There were significant differences in average daily gain (ADG) due to sex, rations fed, and sex-ration interactions.

Sex. During the prefinishing phase, when the energy intakes were somewhat limited, the steers gained significantly faster than the heifers ( $P<0.05$ ), as shown in Table 2. However, during the finishing period, when energy intakes were unlimited, the steers increased their advantage in gain over the heifers ( $\mathrm{P}<0.01$ ) . This might be interpreted to mean that the prefinishing rations more closely satisfied the heifers' requirements for maximum gains than they did for the steers.

The heifers were more efficient in the prefinishing period but were less efficient during the finishing period.

The steers spent 132, 108, and 240 days and the heifers 105, 101, and 206 days on the prefinishing , finishing and total feed periods, respectively.

Comparison of feed costs (Table 3) with the actual profits made by each sex (Table 4) seems out of line unless these feed costs are related to the value of each pound of meat produced. When this is done, it is apparent that prices for feeder cattle must do more than simply reflect the differences in slaughter prices. Under the conditions of this trial, if feeder steers were worth $\$ 28.50$ per hundredweight, the feeder heifers were worth only about $\$ 21.40$ per hundredweight. In other words, the spread between feeder heifers and steers must be greater if the feeding of heifers is to be as profitable as that of steers.

There were only minor differences in carcass characteristics. The heifers had slightly higher marbling scores and graded slightly higher. However, they had slightly less back fat and a somewhat greater area of ribeye per hundredweight of carcass. Because of lighter carcasses and the slight advantage in ribeye area and back fat, the slaughter value of the heifers should, no doubt, have been closer to the steers but the actual returns were used in this study. This poses the question, "Do current steer carcasses excel heifers in dressing percent and cut out value enough to warrant the spread in slaughter prices?"

Rations. There were significant differences in ADG among rations during the prefinishing period. There were also rations carry-over effects expressed during the finishing phase. The major portion of the differences during the finishing phase (when a common ration was fed) could be attributed to the level of gains made during the prefinishing period. Many of the prefinishing gains were in excess of 1.65 pounds per day. Gains over 1.65 pounds per day have a depressing effect upon subsequent gains in the feedlot or on pasture.

The fact that heifers responded somewhat differently than steers to the prefinishing rations is hard to explain. Sex-ration interactions were significant during all phases of the study.

Greatest overall profits resulted from the long hay prefinishing ration for the steers and the 80:20 hay: grain pellet for the heifers.

## Summary

One of five different prefinishing rations was fed to 10 steers and 10 heifers. Upon reaching 725 and 625 pounds in weight for the steers and heifers, respectively, they were placed on a common finishing ration. Significant differences in average daily gains due to sex, prefinishing ration, and sexration interactions resulted. Carcass characteristics of the steers and heifers were quite similar. Under the conditions of this study, there must be a greater price variation between feeder steers and heifers if the feeding of heifers is to be as profitable as feeding steers. This, of course, would be subject to change as feed, beef, labor, and/or interest prices vary.

Table 1. Prefinishing Treatment Design

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pen } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Steers to 725 pounds | Pen <br> No. | Heifers to 625 pounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Corn silage (ad lib.) plus $1 \%$ of body weight in chopped alfalfa hay plus $1 \%$ weight in concentrate (1) | 6 | Corn silage (ad lib.) plus $1 \%$ of bodyweight in chopped alfalfa hay plus $1 \%$ weight in concentrate |
| 2 | Hay cubes (ad lib.) | 7 | Long alfalfa hay (ad lib.) plus $1 \%$ of body weight in concentrate |
| 3 | Long alfalfa hay (ad lib.) plus $1 \%$ of body weight in concentrate | 8 | Hay cubes (ad 1ib.) |
| 4 | Pelleted alfalfa (ad lib.) | 9 | Pelleted alfalfa (ad 1ib.) |
| 5 | 80:20 pellet of alfalfa hay and steam rolled barley (ad lib.) | 10 | 80:20 pellet of alfalfa hay and steam rolled barley (ad lib.) |

(1) Concentrate $=10 \%$ cull peas, $15 \%$ beet pulp, $5 \%$ molasses, and $70 \%$ steam rolled barley.
Table 2. Average Daily Gains, Feed Efficiencies, and Cost of Gain by Periods

| Prefinish treatment | Prefinishing Period |  |  |  | Finishing Period |  |  |  | Overall |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Days } \\ \text { fed } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ADG ${ }^{(1)}$ | FE ${ }^{(2)}$ | Cost/ cwt. gain | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Days } \\ & \text { fed } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{ADG}^{(1)}$ | $\mathrm{FE}^{(2)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost// } \\ & \text { cwt. gain } \end{aligned}$ | Days fed | $\mathrm{ADG}^{\text {(1) }}$ | $\mathrm{FE}^{(2)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cost/ } \\ & \text { cwt. gain } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | no. | 1bs. | lbs. | \$ | no. | lbs. | lbs. | S | no. | lbs. | lbs. | S |
|  | STEERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | 113 | $2.18{ }^{\text {ab }}$ | 718 | 15.15 | 121 | $309{ }^{\text {bc }}$ | 722 | 20.30 | 234 | $2.66^{\text {a }}$ | 720 | 18.25 |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alfalfa | 141 | $1.79{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 875 | 16.38 | 103 | $3.74{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 673 | 18.72 | 244 | 2.63 ab | 753 | 17.80 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll}\text { cubes } & 141 & 1.83\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $80: 20$ <br> pellets | 134 | 2.02 bcd | 786 | 16.60 | 107 | $2.98{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 788 | 21.88 | 241 | $246{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 787 | 19.46 |
| Steer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| average | 133 | 1.98 | 855 | 16.18 | 108 | 3.29 | 741 | 20.50 | 240 | 2.59 | 289 | 18.65 |
|  | HEIFERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alfalfa | 113 | $1.64{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 865 | 16.11 | 96 | $3.04{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 729 | 19.97 | 209 | $2.28{ }^{\text {cd }}$ | 782 | 18.46 |
|  | 113 | $1.69{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 939 | 15.33 | 96 | $2.68{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 832 | 22.77 | 209 | $2.14{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 887 | 19.56 |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pellets | 99 | $1.97{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 931 | 17.36 | 104 | $2.72{ }^{\text {bc }}$ | 856 | 23.08 | 203 | $2.36{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 887 | 20.73 |
| 80:20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heifer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| average | 101 | 1.89 | 838 | 15.86 | 101 | 2.90 abc | 770 | 21.21 | 206 | $2.38{ }^{\text {bc }}$ | 799 | 19.03 |
| (1) Average daily gains within columns and within sex groups having different supers are significantly different ( $\mathrm{P}<.05$ ) <br> (2) Feed efficiency in pounds of feed per hundredweight of gain. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Summary of Finishing Performance and Carcass Characteristics

| Prefinish <br> Treatment | Initial weight | Final <br> weight | Average <br> daily <br> gain | Warm carcass weight | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Marbling } \\ & \text { score }(1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { USDA } \\ & \text { grade } \end{aligned}$ | Back <br> fat | Ribeye |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1bs. | 1bs. | 1bs. | 1bs. |  |  | in. | sq. in. |
|  |  |  |  | STEERS |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| silage | 714 | 1,086 | 3.09 | 652 | 12.7 | 16.1 | . 47 | 11.4 |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alfalfa | 720 | 1,108 | 3.74 | 665 | 13.8 | 16.5 | . 48 | 11.5 |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.4 |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pellets | 746 | 1,076 | 3.29 | 646 | 14.4 | 16.6 | . 47 | 11.3 |
| 80:20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pellets | 735 | 1,055 | 2.98 | 633 | 14.7 | 16.8 | . 48 | 11.2 |
| Steer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| average | 728 | 1,081 | 3.29 | 649 | 13.3 | 16.3 | .45 | 11.4 |
|  |  |  |  | HEIFERS |  |  |  |  |
| Corn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| silage | 637 | 950 | 2.97 | 570 | 14.8 | 16.6 | . 41 | 11.7 |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| alfalfa | 615 | 904 | 3.04 | 542 | 13.3 | 16.2 | . 43 | 11.1 |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cubes | 623 | 874 | 2.68 | 524 | 12.9 | 16.2 | . 35 | 11.0 |
| Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pellets | 627 | 906 | 2.72 | 544 | 13.9 | 16.3 | . 49 | 11.3 |
| 80:20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pellets | 635 | 949 | 3.11 | 570 | 14.3 | 16.8 | . 41 | 11.9 |
| Heifer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| average | 627 | 917 | 2.90 | 550 | 13.8 | 16.4 | . 42 | 11.4 |
| (1) $9=$ Traces, $12=$ Small, and $15=$ Modest. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (2) $14=$ | and 17 | hoice. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4. Financial Summary

| Prefinish treatment | Cost/ head | Selling value/cwt | Value/ head | Feed cost/ <br> head | Yardage/ head | Interest/ <br> head | Profit/ <br> head | Suggested <br> feeder value/cwt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | \$ | \$s | s | \$ | ss | \$s | \$ |
|  | STEERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | 133.38 | 28.00 | 304.08 | 112.79 | 11.70 | 9.90 | 36.31 | 28.50 |
| Long alfalfa | 133.38 | 28.06 | 310.90 | 113.92 | 12.20 | 10.41 | 41.01 | 28.50 |
| Alfalfa cubes | 133.38 | 27.75 | 299.98 | 112.91 | 12.40 | 10.55 | 30.74 | 28.50 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alfalfa } \\ & \text { pellets } \\ & 80: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 133.95 | 28.11 | 302.46 | 117.20 | 11.70 | 10.09 | 29.52 | 28.50 |
| pellets | 132.24 | 28.25 | 298.04 | 115.01 | 12.05 | 10.27 | 28.47 | 28.50 |
| HEIFERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn silage | 109.91 | 25.67 | 243.87 | 96.74 | 10.30 | 7.35 | 19.57 | 21.62 |
| Long alfalfa | 109.65 | 25.71 | 232.42 | 87.50 | 10.45 | 7.14 | 16.68 | 20.07 |
| Alfalfa cubes | 109.91 | 25.58 | 223.57 | 86.65 | 10.45 | 7.12 | 9.44 | 20.56 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alfalfa } \\ & \text { pellets } \end{aligned}$ | 109.91 | 25.67 | 232.57 | 98.47 | 10.15 | 7.30 | 6.74 | 20.21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80: 20 \\ & \text { pellets } \end{aligned}$ | 109.91 | 25.67 | 243.61 | 91.95 | 10.05 | 6.99 | 24.71 | 24.63 |

[^0]
[^0]:    EXPLANATION:
    Actual feeder steer costs, $\$ 28.50 / \mathrm{cwt}$; feeder heifer costs, $\$ 25.50 / \mathrm{cwt}$. Heifers sold for $\$ 25.25$ and $\$ 25.75 /$ cwt for good and choice, respectively. Yardage was figured at 5 cents per head daily and interest calculated on initial cost, feed cost, and yardage at the rate of $6 \%$ per annum.

