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#### Abstract

The size of the 1998 Texas-Oklahoma cotton crop decreased considerably from the previous year and the average producer price declined for the third year in a row. The average price received by producers during the 1998/99 marketing year was 51.14 cents/lb., which was 6.85 cents/lb. lower than the previous marketing year. The 1998 crop was generally of good quality. With the exception of the first digit of the color grade, staple, and strength, the average quality showed improvement over the 1997 crop. With the exception of level 2 bark and the first digit of the color grade, price discounts for the 1998 crop increased for all quality attributes, while premiums for staple and strength both increased.


## Introduction

The Daily Price Estimation System (DPES) is maintained and operated by the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Texas Tech University. The DPES is a computerized, econometric price analysis system that evaluates cotton sales and estimates quality premiums and discounts for the West Texas and East Texas/Oklahoma marketing regions on a daily basis (Brown et al.; Brown and Ethridge). All results are based on the official HVI standards used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with respect to staple length, color grade, micronaire, leaf grade, bark, other extraneous matter, and strength. The information presented here is a summary of results for the entire 1998/99 marketing year (1998 crop).

## 1998/99 Statistics

A total of 798,187 bales $(718,508$ from West Texas and 79,679 from East Texas/Oklahoma), and 9,660 sales transactions were used in DPES computations. Total volume decreased by about $57 \%$ over that of the 1997 crop, partially because of a decrease in crop size and a $15 \%$ increase in forward contracting. Overall, the DPES used an estimated $50 \%$ of producers' cash market sales in 1998/99.

Table 1 provides the simple averages for the 1998/99 and 1997/98 marketing years. The 1998 crop was of high quality. Overall, quality and variation in quality improved slightly
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from the previous year. However, average prices continued to fall for the fourth year in a row.

Tables 2 and 3 consist of weighted average base prices and quality premiums and discounts for West Texas and East Texas-Oklahoma. The base price is shown at staple length 34 and color grade 41.

## Patterns of Sales Activity and Base Prices

The 1998/99 marketing year covered a shorter time period (mid October to mid March) than the previous year. The majority of the sales took place between the end of October and the end of January. After February 1, sales dropped off sharply, and, with the exception of occasional surges, the market remained largely inactive until the end of the season (Figure 1).

The average price received by producers for 1998/99 was 51.14 cents/lb. (Table 1), down from the previous three years. The pattern of base price movements throughout the first half of the year revealed a distinct downward trend (Figure 2) which continued throughout the duration of the marketing year. This was in contrast to the previous year in which prices exhibited a similar downward pattern but picked up slightly towards the end of the marketing year.

## Patterns of Premiums and Discounts

When analyzing specific attributes, all other attributes are held at their base levels. In the explanations that follow, quality attribute premiums and discounts for West Texas are used; however, they are not appreciably different from those for East Texas-Oklahoma.

## Leaf Grade

Average premiums for leaf grade in 1998/99 did not exhibit any significant change over those of the 1997/98 marketing year (Figure 3). Discounts, however, increased considerably over the previous year for increasing levels of leaf content. Variations in leaf grade premiums showed little change from the 1997/98 marketing year.

## Color Grade

Discounts for color fluctuated widely throughout the entire 1998/99 season. Both average premiums and discounts for the first digit of the color grade remained virtually identical to those of the previous marketing year (Figure 4). Discounts for the second digit of the color grade increased significantly, exhibiting a discount upwards of 1000 points/lb. for a grade 4 (Figure 5).

## Staple

Discounts for staple remained relatively stable throughout most of the year with a slight upward trend beginning at the
end of November and continuing throughout remainder of the year. Premiums for 1998/99 increased slightly while discounts increased dramatically over those of 1997/98, reaching a difference of almost 750 points/lb. towards the high end of the discount range (Figure 6).

## Strength

Discounts and premiums for strength were erratic throughout the entire 1998/99 season, never revealing any discernable pattern. Both premiums and discounts increased over 1997/98 levels (Figure 7). There were several days, as in previous years, in which strength did not affect price.

## Micronaire

Micronaire discounts in 1998/99 were slightly more erratic than those seen in 1997/98, consistent with patterns seen in earlier years. Discounts for the 1998 crop increased for all ranges of micronaire, differing by as much as 400 points above the previous year's levels (Figure 8).

## Bark

Level 1 bark discounts fluctuated widely throughout the first of the season, but began to stabilize around the middle of December, after which they displayed a downward trend until the end of the marketing year. Average discounts for level 1 bark were similar to those seen the previous year, while average level 2 bark discounts decreased to around 800 points/lb. in 1998/99 (Figure 9).

## Conclusions

The 1998 crop was of generally high quality for Texas and Oklahoma and experienced no major change in quality from the previous year. However, once again, despite the overall quality of the cotton crop, the price decreased from the previous year. The volume of producer spot market sales showed a dramatic decrease of $57 \%$ from the volume recorded during the 1997/98 marketing year, possibly due to an increase in forward contracting, a decrease in the crop size, and an increase in marketing pool participation. Discounts for leaf grade, the second digit of the color grade, micronaire, and level 1 bark increased in 1998/99. Discounts for the first digit of the color grade remained similar to the previous year, while discounts for level 2 bark decreased. Both discounts and premiums for staple length and strength increased compared to the 1997/98 marketing year. The decrease in the size of the 1998 crop along with the increase in forward contracting would suggest that prices spot market prices should increase over those of the previous year. This, however, was not the case, as the average spot market price fell once again for the third year in a row. Of the cotton sold on the spot market, overall abundance of high quality cotton may have allowed buyers to be more discriminating with respect to quality, accounting for the increase in price differentials as the quality deviated from base levels. The
information gathered throughout the year, however, provides no explanation as to why prices have continued to remain on their downward trend.
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| Attribute | Average |  | 95\% Population Range ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998/99 | 1997/98 | 1998/99 | 1997/98 |
| Price (cents/lb.) | 51.14 | 57.99 | 44.05-58.23 | 49.87-66.10 |
| Bales per Sale | 82 | 87 | 1-281 | 1-347 |
| Leaf Grade | 3.29 | 3.40 | 1.40-5.19 | 1.37-5.43 |
| Color Grade (1) | 2.84 | 2.48 | 1.58-4.09 | 1.06-3.91 |
| Color Grade (2) | 1.37 | 1.70 | 1-2.25 | 1-3.15 |
| Staple | 33.21 | 33.57 | 30.86-35.56 | 31.31-35.83 |
| Strength | 27.70 | 28.68 | 25.30-30.06 | 25.49-31.87 |
| Micronaire | 4.17 | 3.95 | $3.25-5.10$ | 3.08-4.83 |
| Level 1 Bark (\%) | 11.90 | 22.74 | 0-49.67 | 0-80.57 |
| Level 2 Bark (\%) | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0-0.37 | 0-8.95 |
| Level 1 Other (\%) | 0.30 | 0.86 | 0-4.00 | 0-11.09 |
| Level 2 Other (\%) | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0-0.47 | 0-7.71 |

${ }^{3}$ The range within which $95 \%$ of the population will fall.

Table 2. 1998/99 Weighted Average Price Estimates from the DPES, West Texas


${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Base Price in cents/lb.

Table 3. 1998/99 Weighted Average Price Estimates from the DPES, East Texas/Oklahoma
Yearly Weighted Average of the Daily Spot Cotton Price Estimates Dept. of Ag. and Applied Econ., Texas Tech Univ. \# Sales: 1,501 Date: 1998 Crop Region: East Texas/Oklahoma \# Bales: 79,679 Color Grade and Staple Premiums and Discounts in Points/lb. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Staple Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Color <br> Grade | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 |  |
| 11 | -- | -991 | -713 | -459 | -235 | -47 | 100 | 203 | 258 | 265 | -- |  |
| 21 | -- | -991 | -713 | -459 | -235 | -47 | 100 | 203 | 258 | 265 | -- |  |
| 31 | -- | -1005 | -728 | -475 | -252 | -64 | 82 | 185 | 240 | 247 | -- |  |
| 41 | -- | -1070 | -797 | -548 | -329 | -144 | $51.11^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 101 | 155 | 162 | -- |  |
| 51 | -- | -1184 | -919 | -677 | -464 | -284 | -144 | -46 | 7 | 13 | -- |  |
| 61 | -- | -1342 | -1088 | -856 | -651 | -479 | -344 | -250 | -200 | -194 | -- |  |
| 71 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |
| 12 | -- | -1104 | -834 | -587 | -369 | -186 | -43 | 57 | 111 | 117 | -- |  |
| 22 | -- | -1104 | -834 | -587 | -369 | -186 | -43 | 57 | 111 | 117 | -- |  |
| 32 | -- | -1118 | -848 | -602 | -385 | -203 | -60 | 39 | 93 | 99 | -- |  |
| 42 | -- | -1181 | -916 | -674 | -460 | -281 | -140 | -42 | 10 | 17 | -- |  |
| 52 | -- | -1292 | -1034 | -799 | -591 | -417 | -280 | -185 | -134 | -128 | -- |  |
| 62 | -- | -1446 | -1198 | -973 | -773 | -606 | -475 | -384 | -335 | -329 | -- |  |
| 23 | -- | -1407 | -1157 | -929 | -728 | -559 | -426 | -334 | -284 | -278 | -- |  |
| 33 | -- | -1420 | -1171 | -943 | -743 | -574 | -442 | -350 | -301 | -295 | -- |  |
| 43 | -- | -1478 | -1233 | -1009 | -812 | -646 | -516 | -426 | -377 | -371 | -- |  |
| 53 | -- | -1580 | -1342 | -1125 | -933 | -772 | -646 | -558 | -510 | -505 | -- |  |
| 63 | -- | -1723 | -1494 | -1285 | -1101 | -947 | -826 | -741 | -696 | -690 | -- |  |
| 34 | -- | -1868 | -1649 | -1449 | -1273 | -1125 | -1009 | -928 | -884 | -879 | -- |  |
| 44 | -- | -1919 | -1704 | -1507 | -1334 | -1188 | -1074 | -994 | -951 | -946 | -- |  |
| 54 | -- | -2009 | -1800 | -1608 | -1440 | -1298 | -1188 | -1110 | -1068 | -1064 | -- |  |


| Micronaire Differences Points/lb. |  | Leaf Grade Differences Points/lb. |  | Bark <br> Discounts <br> Points/lb. |  | Strength Differences Points/lb. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mike |  | Leaf | Disc./ | Bark |  | Grams/ | Disc./ |
| Range |  | Grade | Prem. | Code | Disc | Tex. | Prem. |
| 24\&below | -- | 1 | -- | Level | -180 | 18\&below | -- |
| 25-26 | -849 | 2 | 106 | Level | -818 | 19 | -- |
| 27-29 | -612 | 3 | 87 |  |  | 20 | -- |
| 30-32 | -370 | 4 | 0 | Other |  | 21 | -- |
| 33-34 | -210 | 5 | -152 | Discou |  | 22 | -191 |
| 35-49 | 0 | 6 | -363 | Points/ |  | 23 | -106 |
| 50-52 | -371 | 7 | -625 |  |  | 24 \& 25 | 0 |
| 53\&above - | -527 |  |  | Other |  | 26 | 78 |
|  |  |  |  | Code | Disc. | 27 | 113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 135 |
|  |  |  |  | Level 1 | -1247 | 29 | 143 |
|  |  |  |  | Level 2 | -- | 30 | 143 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }} 100$ points $=1$ cent |  |  |  |  |  | 31\&above | 143 |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Base Price in cents/lb. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1. Daily Volume of Transactions for the 1998/99 Marketing Year, West Texas.


Figure 2. Movement of Base Price for the 1998/99 Marketing Year, West Texas.


Figure 3. Leaf Grade Premiums/Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.


Figure 4. First Digit of the Color Grade Premiums/Discounts 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.


Figure 5. 2nd Digit of the Color Grade Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.


Figure 6. Staple Length Premiums/Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas


Figure 7. Strength Premiums/Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.


Figure 8. Micronaire Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.


Figure 9. Bark Discounts, 1997/98 and 1998/99, West Texas.

