



A study of the relationship between growth traits and carcass characteristics in beef cattle
by Richard Archie Henderson

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
MASTER OF SCIENCE in Animal Science
Montana State University
© Copyright by Richard Archie Henderson (1968)

Abstract:

Cattle records of the North Montana Branch Experiment Station at Havre, Montana covering a 15-year period (1952-1966) were analyzed by simple correlation and regression analyses to study the effect of growth traits on carcass characteristics. The study consists of two parts: (a) phenotypic correlations of 8 production traits of crossline Hereford steers with 27 of their slaughter or carcass traits ($n = 339$); (b) 78 sires and their respective steer progeny groups in which 10 sire production traits were correlated with 27 slaughter or carcass progeny group means. The two studies were each sub-grouped into two time periods: period 1 (1952-59) during which the animals were slaughtered after a time-constant feeding period, and period 2 (1960-66) during which they were slaughtered on a relatively weight-constant basis.

In (a) period 1, all growth traits were significantly ($P < .05$) correlated with carcass size. In (a) period 2, highly significant ($P < .01$) negative correlations were obtained between all growth traits and slaughter age. Birth weight was negatively correlated with carcass grade in both time periods. Weanling traits were positively correlated with grade in period I and negatively correlated in period 2, while feedlot traits were negatively correlated with grade in period 1 but positively correlated in period 2. All growth traits were positively correlated with measures of carcass fatness. Preweaning growth had a stronger influence on carcass fatness than did postweaning growth. During period 2 a negative relationship was found between daily gain and fat thickness. Growth traits had a highly significant positive ($P < .01$) effect on rib-eye area in period 1.

All growth traits were negatively correlated with rib-eye area per 100 pounds of carcass weight. Growth was negatively correlated with cutability and showed little relationship with marbling score.

In the study (b) sire feedlot, traits influenced progeny slaughter and carcass measurements more than did sire weanling traits. A positive relationship was found with area of rib-eye during period 1 with sire score at end of feed test and with sire gain per day of age, both being significantly ($P < .05$) correlated. Sire growth traits were also associated with a decrease in progeny fatness measured at the 12th rib. Faster-growing and higher-scoring bulls tended to produce offspring of higher cutability. Statistical relationships among sire growth rates and scores and their respective progeny carcass traits were somewhat divergent between period I and 2.

Heritability estimates were made for several production traits utilizing the regression of offspring on sire: birth weight, 50%; weaning weight, 6%; 180-day adjusted weaning weight, 1%; final weight, 53%; average daily gain on feed, 34%; and daily gain from birth to weaning, 4%..

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROWTH TRAITS
AND CARCASS CHARACTERISTICS IN BEEF CATTLE ,

by

RICHARD ARCHIE HENDERSON

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Animal Science

Approved:

R. Blackwell
Head, Major Department

Alva E. Flowers
Chairman, Examining Committee

R. Goering
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December, 1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author sincerely expresses his gratitude to all those individuals whose aid and association contributed to the completion of his graduate program. A special note of thanks is expressed to Mr. A. E. Flower, Associate Professor of Animal Genetics, for his advice, guidance and encouragement in the capacity of major advisor. Also, gratitude is expressed to Dr. R. L. Blackwell and Dr. E. P. Smith for their aid in preparing this thesis. The author also wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. C. W. Newman, Dr. P. J. Burfening and Professor R. F. Eslick for their advice and constructive criticism of this manuscript.

Appreciation is expressed to Mr. Claude Windecker, Superintendent, North Montana Branch Experiment Station, and his staff for their help in collecting the data. Also, thanks is extended to Mr. Walt Schaff for his technical assistance in the computer analysis of the data.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to my wife Janice for her help, understanding and encouragement during the preparation of this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VITA	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
INDEX TO TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	2
Phenotypic Correlations	2
Genetic Correlations	19
Heritability Estimates	26
EXPERIMENTAL METHODS AND PROCEDURES	29
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	36
Phenotypic Correlations	36
Sire-offspring Study	48
Heritability Estimates	57
SUMMARY	60
Phenotypic Correlations Study	60
Sire-offspring Study	62
Heritability Estimates	63
LITERATURE CITED	65

INDEX TO TABLES

TABLE	Page
I. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BIRTH WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	3
II. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WEANING WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	5
III. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FINAL WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	8
IV. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AVERAGE DAILY GAIN ON FEED AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	13
V. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GAIN PER DAY OF AGE AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	17
VI. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BIRTH WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	20
VII. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WEANLING TRAITS AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	21
VIII. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AVERAGE DAILY GAIN AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	23
IX. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FINAL WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	24
X. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GAIN PER DAY OF AGE AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS	25
XI. HERITABILITY ESTIMATES REPORTED FOR VARIOUS PRODUCTION TRAITS	27
XII. DEGREES OF FREEDOM BY TIME PERIODS FOR PHENOTYPIC CORRELATION STUDY AND SIRE-OFFSPRING STUDY	31
XIII. SIMPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION BETWEEN PRODUCTION TRAITS AND VARIOUS WEIGHT, AGE AND LINEAR CARCASS MEASUREMENTS OF 339 CROSSLINE HEREFORD STEERS	37
XIV. SIMPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN PRODUCTION TRAITS AND VARIOUS MEASURES OF CARCASS QUALITY OF 339 CROSSLINE HEREFORD STEERS	40

TABLE	Page
XV. SIMPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN TEN SIRE TRAITS AND VARIOUS WEIGHT, AGE AND LINEAR CARCASS MEASUREMENTS OF CROSSLINE HEREFORD STEER PROGENY	49
XVI. SIMPLE CORRELATIONS AND REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN TEN SIRE TRAITS AND VARIOUS MEASURES OF CARCASS QUALITY OF CROSSLINE HEREFORD STEER PROGENY	52
XVII. HERITABILITY ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS PRODUCTION TRAITS AS ESTIMATED FROM REGRESSION OF OFFSPRING ON SIRE	57

ABSTRACT

Cattle records of the North Montana Branch Experiment Station at Havre, Montana covering a 15-year period (1952-1966) were analyzed by simple correlation and regression analyses to study the effect of growth traits on carcass characteristics. The study consists of two parts: (a) phenotypic correlations of 8 production traits of crossline Hereford steers with 27 of their slaughter or carcass traits ($n = 339$); (b) 78 sires and their respective steer progeny groups in which 10 sire production traits were correlated with 27 slaughter or carcass progeny group means. The two studies were each sub-grouped into two time periods: period 1 (1952-59) during which the animals were slaughtered after a time-constant feeding period, and period 2 (1960-66) during which they were slaughtered on a relatively weight-constant basis.

In (a) period 1, all growth traits were significantly ($P < .05$) correlated with carcass size. In (a) period 2, highly significant ($P < .01$) negative correlations were obtained between all growth traits and slaughter age. Birth weight was negatively correlated with carcass grade in both time periods. Weanling traits were positively correlated with grade in period 1 and negatively correlated in period 2, while feedlot traits were negatively correlated with grade in period 1 but positively correlated in period 2. All growth traits were positively correlated with measures of carcass fatness. Preweaning growth had a stronger influence on carcass fatness than did postweaning growth. During period 2 a negative relationship was found between daily gain and fat thickness. Growth traits had a highly significant positive ($P < .01$) effect on rib-eye area in period 1. All growth traits were negatively correlated with rib-eye area per 100 pounds of carcass weight. Growth was negatively correlated with cutability and showed little relationship with marbling score.

In the study (b) sire feedlot traits influenced progeny slaughter and carcass measurements more than did sire weanling traits. A positive relationship was found with area of rib-eye during period 1 with sire score at end of feed test and with sire gain per day of age, both being significantly ($P < .05$) correlated. Sire growth traits were also associated with a decrease in progeny fatness measured at the 12th rib. Faster-growing and higher-scoring bulls tended to produce offspring of higher cutability. Statistical relationships among sire growth rates and scores and their respective progeny carcass traits were somewhat divergent between period 1 and 2.

Heritability estimates were made for several production traits utilizing the regression of offspring on sire: birth weight, 50%; weaning weight, 6%; 180-day adjusted weaning weight, 1%; final weight, 53%; average daily gain on feed, 34%; and daily gain from birth to weaning, 4%.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the importance of records of performance in the beef cattle industry has become increasingly evident. This has been brought about primarily by increased competition within the meat production industry plus an ever-narrowing profit margin to the beef producer due to increased operating costs.

Of equal importance is the relationship between these various records of performance and measures of carcass quality. Since the beef carcass is essentially the end product or result of the production process, and since the ultimate criterion of the worth of a beef animal is the value of its carcass, the producer must concern himself with those factors which most affect the quality of that carcass. Competition dictates that the retailer pay more for good cutting carcasses than for those of lower yield. This in turn influences the price paid the feeder and, consequently, the cow-calf operator.

It is important to know the relative weight to place on the various measures of production in our selection indexes in order to make the most rapid progress in beef cattle carcass improvement. Close relationships between any of the live animal characteristics and one or more important carcass traits could afford an opportunity for carcass improvement through established records of performance. Considerable work has been done concerning the analysis of these relationships between production and carcass measurements. The purpose of this study is to add knowledge to that obtained by previous workers with the hope of establishing a clearer understanding of these relationships.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Considerable research has been accomplished concerning the relationships among production traits and carcass quality. It becomes apparent upon review of the literature that for some of the relationships, both positive and negative results can be cited. Consequently, it is difficult to organize the findings into concise clear-cut pictures.

This review examines a portion of the phenotypic and genetic correlations reported among production traits and carcass traits and some heritability estimates advanced for certain of these production traits. Due to the large number of authors and results, this review is presented in table form for brevity and ease of examination.

Phenotypic Correlations

Tables I, II, III, IV and V present reported phenotypic correlations of various carcass traits with birth weight, weaning weight (actual and 180-day adjusted), final weight, average daily gain on feed and gain per day of age, respectively. A brief notation on each study concerning materials and methods, etc. is presented the first time the study is quoted.

TABLE I. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BIRTH WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Slaughter weight	.48	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Time constant feed period of 252 days. Involves records from 635 steers from the U.S. Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Montana.
	.46	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). Involves 616 steers, time constant feeding period of 252 days. Also contains data from the Miles City Station and probably uses some records common to Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954) and Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Days to slaughter	-.39	Yao <u>et al.</u> (1953). Involves 101 beef Shorthorn and 62 Milking Shorthorn steers. Cattle were slaughtered at 900 pounds.
Carcass grade	-.18	Yao <u>et al.</u> (1953).
	-.04	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	.08	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Continuation of Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Involves 210 steers. 9-10-11th rib separations were done on 56 of these. Feed period was 252 days.
	-.09	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962). Time constant feeding trial. Involves only 11 animals.
	-.05	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Carcass weight	.40	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Dressing percent	-.13	Yao <u>et al.</u> (1953).
	-.05	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.00	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	-.02	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Rib-eye area	.26	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .07.
	.12	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	-.03	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.17	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).

TABLE I. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Fat thickness	-.07	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was -.24.
	.05	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	-.04	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Width of round	.21	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Width of shoulder	.24	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Depth of body	.30	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Circumference of round	.10	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Plumpness index	-.14	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Length of body	.40	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .06.
	.42	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.36	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Length of leg	.45	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .23.
	.43	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.44	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Shear force	.09	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	-.03	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962).
Percent lean	.07	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Percent fat	-.06	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Percent bone	.10	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).

The magnitude of the correlations reported indicate that birth weight is not a strong indicator of future performance as far as carcass traits are concerned. The strongest relationships appear to be with slaughter weight, carcass weight, length of body and length of leg. Thus, it appears birth weight is more indicative of future growth and size than it is of eventual carcass quality as determined by present quality standards.

TABLE II. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WEANING WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Slaughter weight	.60	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	.63	Lindholm and Stonaker (1957). This study involved 118 Hereford steers slaughtered at a live grade of Low Choice.
	.62	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Weaning weight was adjusted to 180 days.
	.53	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962). This study involved slaughter data from 421 steers killed at the conclusion of a 168 day fattening period. The steers were approximately 2 years old at the time of slaughter.
	.58	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	.55	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965). This study involves carcass data on 64 steers and heifers slaughtered at an estimated live grade of High Choice.
	.83	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight. Involved 231 crossbred calves slaughtered after a 140-day gain test. Average slaughter age was 424 days.
Slaughter age	-.40	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965).
Carcass grade	.15	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1965). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .06.
	.23	Carter and Kincaid (1959). Weaning weight was expressed as 182 day weight. The study involved 195 Hereford and crossbred steers

TABLE II. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Carcass grade (Continued)	.03	slaughtered at the end of a 200 day test. Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.11	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.09	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	-.26	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	.06	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965). This study involved 480 steers, bulls and heifers slaughtered after a time constant feed period. Some of the animals were straightbred and some were crossbreds.
	.05	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Carcass weight	.54	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.57	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	.70	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Dressing percent	.12	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.14	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.18	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
Rib-eye area	.30	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .26.
	.17	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.60	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.24	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	.52	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	.29	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Fat thickness	.12	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was .25.
	.19	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.14	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	-.02	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	.18	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	.02	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.

TABLE II. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Width of round	.40	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.32	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Width of shoulder	.38	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Depth of body	.29	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Circumference of round	.26	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Plumpness index	-.07	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Length of body	.57	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.51	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	.69	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Length of leg	.59	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
	.50	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180 day weaning weight.
	.50	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). 180 day weaning weight.
Cutability	-.18	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
Shear force	.05	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Marbling score	-.36	Christian <u>et al.</u> (1965).

TABLE II. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Percent lean	.08	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Percent fat	.12	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.
Percent bone	-.14	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 180 day weaning weight.

The correlations reported indicate that weaning weight has more predictive value than does birth weight for certain carcass traits. The correlations indicate weaning weight to be more indicative of future size and growth than of future carcass quality. The trend of the correlations between birth weight and carcass grade was negative but weaning weight tended to be positively correlated with carcass grade. Weaning weight was also more strongly correlated with measures of carcass lean such as area of rib-eye and percent separable lean in the 9-10-11th rib section. The literature reviewed indicates that weaning weight is more predictive of future growth and carcass traits than is birth weight.

TABLE III. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FINAL WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Carcass grade	.54	Knapp and Nordskog (1946). This study was done at the Miles City Station and involved 177 steer calves. They were all slaughtered at the end of the feed trial after being shipped to South St. Paul or Chicago.
	.40	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).

TABLE III. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Carcass grade (Continued)	.52	Magee <u>et al.</u> (1958). This study involved steers from two different sources. The total number involved was 104. They were slaughtered at the end of time constant feeding periods.
	.21	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.36	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.52	Matthews and Bennett (1962). This study involved a total of 24 steers and heifers and utilized varying feed rations. It was designed primarily to study the effect of rate of gain on carcass traits. The cattle were slaughtered after a time-constant feeding period. Carcass weight, a function of final weight, was correlated with various carcass measures and these values are reported here.
	.49	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). This experiment was conducted in Georgia and involved 98 steers and heifers. The cattle were fattened on experimental rations on winter pasture of oats and ryegrass for 132 days.
	.35	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.16	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
.09	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).	
Carcass weight	.95	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.93	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.96	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.86	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Dressing percent	.25	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	.03	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.26	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.54	Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x dressing percent.
	.19	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Rib-eye area	.14	Knapp and Nordskog (1946).
	.44	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).

TABLE III. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Rib-eye area (Continued)	.38	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959a). This study was composed of 8 Angus and 23 Hereford steers. They apparently were not slaughtered after a time constant feed period but the authors did not report what the slaughter conditions were, ie., weight or grade-constant.
	.20	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.64	Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x rib-eye area.
	.02	Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x rib-eye area/100 pounds carcass weight.
	.41	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.31	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
	.75	Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). This study examined the relationships between carcass weight and measures of carcass merit. The carcass measurements were taken as described by Orts (1962). This study involved 835 steers of several breeds and crossbreeds from varying sources and slaughter conditions.
Length of leg	.70	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	.71	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.70	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.54	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
	.67	Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). Carcass weight x length of leg.
Length of loin	.49	Birkett <u>et al.</u> (1965). This study involved 32 steers killed as a group. The carcasses ranged from 498 to 749 pounds. The steers were about 18 months old when slaughtered and were all Herefords. Carcass measurements were taken as described by Naumann (1952).
Cutability	-.21	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	-.52	Birkett <u>et al.</u> (1965). Carcass weight x percent trimmed round, loin, rib, and chuck.

TABLE III. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Marbling score	.58	Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x marbling score.
Shear force	.10 .34	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x shear force.
Percent lean	-.06 -.28	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 9-10-11th rib separation. Brackelsburg and Willham (1968). This study involved 51 bulls, steers and heifers killed at the end of a 168-day feed trial. Percent lean, fat and bone estimates were made following separations of the entire carcass. Correlations are with carcass weight.
Percent fat	.30 .18	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 9-10-11th rib separation. Brackelsburg and Willham (1968). Carcass weight.
Percent bone	-.31 -.33	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). 9-10-11th rib separation. Brackelsburg and Willham (1968). Carcass weight.
Fat thickness	.33 .33 .31 .27 .13 .34 .01 .60 .47	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965). Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967). Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x fat thickness. Matthews and Bennett (1962). Carcass weight x fat thickness/100 pounds carcass weight. Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). Carcass weight x average fat thickness. Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). Carcass weight x single fat thickness.

TABLE III. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Authors and remarks
Width of round	.80	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959). The animals used in this study were the same ones used in the study by Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959a). Carcass measurements were taken on the unsplit carcass.
	.55	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.32	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
	.74	Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). Carcass weight x width of round.
Circumference of round	.44	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959). Unsplit carcass.
	.56	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Width of shoulder	.79	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959). Unsplit carcass.
	.68	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Depth of body	.67	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959). Unsplit carcass.
	.48	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Measured at 7th rib.
Length of body	.78	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	.66	Orme <u>et al.</u> (1959). Unsplit carcass.
	.68	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.76	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.79	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
	.80	Abraham <u>et al.</u> (1968). Carcass weight x length of body.

TABLE IV. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AVERAGE DAILY GAIN ON FEED AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Slaughter weight	.53	Lindholm and Stonaker (1957).
	.89	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.19	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.81	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.86	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
	.66	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Slaughter age	-.16	Lindholm and Stonaker (1957). This was expressed as "days on feed x slaughter age" and is not a true picture of the relationship between daily gain and slaughter age. It actually says that older animals required fewer days on feed to reach a live grade of Low Choice than did younger animals.
Carcass grade	.37	Hankins and Burk (1932). This study involved 2,073 cattle from experiment stations in 18 states. It contained both steers and heifers from varying environments.
	.25	Durham and Knox (1953). This study involved 59 steers which were fed for 196 days prior to slaughter.
	.08	Yao <u>et al.</u> (1953).
	.40	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954).
	-.31	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). This study involved 18 Hereford and 20 Brahman x Hereford steers randomly assorted to two feed rations. The correlations are pooled for breeds and rations. The negative relationship with carcass grade actually indicates a favorable relationship since a decreasing numerical score indicates an increase in carcass quality grade.
	.43	Magee <u>et al.</u> (1958).
	.31	Carter and Kincaid (1959).
	.27	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.43	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	-.05	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.24	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962).
.37	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).	
.17	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).	

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Carcass grade (Continued)	.17	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Carcass weight	.51 .72 .19 .81 .59	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962). Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Dressing percent	-.32 -.09 .11 -.05 .26 .27 .10	Stroble <u>et al.</u> (1951). This study involved 75 cattle slaughtered at a constant weight of 900 pounds. Yao <u>et al.</u> (1953). Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962). Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962). Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Rib-eye area	.33 .39 .15 .72 -.04 .36 .23	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). The authors calculated the partial correlation holding final weight constant and found this correlation dropped to zero. Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962). Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). This correlation was between daily gain and rib-eye area/100 pound carcass. Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Fat thickness	.33 .26 .29 .30 .25 .06	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). The partial correlation holding final weight constant was -.21. Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965). Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Width of round	.47	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.31	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Circumference of round	.54	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Width of shoulder	.65	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Depth of body	.40	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959). Measured at 7th rib.
Length of body	.57	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was -.03.
	.54	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.60	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.61	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Length of leg	.49	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1954). Partial correlation holding final weight constant was -.09.
	.55	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.56	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.46	Dubose <u>et al.</u> (1967).
Plumpness index	.22	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Cutability	-.16	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
Marbling score	.20	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958).
Shear force		Marion <u>et al.</u> (1949) reported higher gaining steers produced more tender meat than lower gaining ones. The sample size was small in this study.
	.09	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.14	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962). Matthews and Bennett (1962) found no signifi-

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Shear force (Continued)		cant relationship between rate of gain and tenderness as measured organoleptically or with the Warner-Bratzler shear.
	-.15	Suess <u>et al.</u> (1966). This study involved 128 Angus steer and heifer progeny from six different herds.
Percent lean	-.24	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958).
	-.15	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
Percent fat	.30	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958).
	.34	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).
	.11	Brown <u>et al.</u> (1962). Chemical analysis.
Percent bone	-.33	Woodward <u>et al.</u> (1959).

TABLE V. PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GAIN PER DAY OF AGE AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Slaughter weight	.86	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). Wt./day of age at slaughter.
Carcass grade	-.34	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x carcass grade. (Decreasing score = increasing grade).
	-.35	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x carcass grade.
	.39	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). Wt./day of age at slaughter x carcass grade.
Carcass weight	.81	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x carcass weight.
	.79	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x carcass weight.
	.77	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). Wt./day of age at slaughter x carcass weight.
Rib-eye area	.31	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x rib-eye area.
	.38	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x rib-eye area.
	-.57	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x rib-eye area/100 lbs. carcass wt.
	-.46	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x rib-eye area/100 lbs. carcass wt.
	-.34	Neville <u>et al.</u> (1962). Wt./day of age at slaughter x rib-eye area/100 lbs. carcass wt.
Fat thickness	.56	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x fat thickness.
	.50	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x fat thickness.
Marbling score	.30	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1957). Gain to 180 days x estimated percent marbling.

TABLE V. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Marbling score (Continued)	.36	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x estimated percent marbling.
Shear force	.01	Suess <u>et al.</u> (1966). Wt./day of age at slaughter x shear force.
Percent lean	-.56	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x percent lean in 9-10-11th rib section.
	-.45	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of test x percent lean in 9-10-11th rib section.
Percent fat	.59	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Gain to 180 days x percent fat in 9-10-11th rib section.
	.52	Cartwright <u>et al.</u> (1958). Wt./day of age at end of feed test x percent fat in 9-10-11th rib section.

The phenotypic correlations reported concerning final weight and average daily gain as they are related to various measures of carcass quality, indicate they are of considerably higher predictive value than is birth weight or weaning weight.

If both final weight and average daily gain are available as selection tools it appears that final weight has somewhat more value in predicting carcass quality than does average daily gain. The magnitude of the correlations reported indicate final weight is more predictive than average daily gain of carcass grade, rib-eye area, fat thickness, most linear measurements (width, circumference and length), marbling score and shear force. These are characteristics which are all quite important in

determining overall carcass quality and composition. It should be pointed out however, that the differences in the magnitudes of the correlations produced by these two traits is not great in any instance.

Gain or weight per day-of-age did not appear to be of any more value than either final weight or average daily gain as a selection tool in beef carcass improvement. They did appear, from the articles reviewed, to be somewhat more strongly related to fat content of the 9-10-11th rib section, both from the standpoint of fat thickness and percent fat. Many of the correlations quoted involved weight per day of age and it must be recognized that this value is influenced by birth weight where gain per day of age is not.

Genetic Correlations

A review is also presented of the genetic correlations reported between production and carcass traits. The present study includes calculation of correlation and regression values between the production traits of sires and the means of the carcass traits of their respective progeny. Although it is recognized that these correlations are not actually true genetic correlations since measurements of both production and carcass traits were not available on both sire and progeny, it was felt that the nearness of these values to true genetic correlations warranted this review.

Tables VI, VII, VIII, IX and X present genetic correlations reported between various carcass traits and birth weight, weaning weight (actual and adjusted 180-day), average daily gain, final weight and gain per day of age.

TABLE VI. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BIRTH WEIGHT AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Slaughter weight	.51	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). This study involves 616 steers slaughtered after a feed period of 252 days. The experiment was done at the U. S. Range Livestock Experiment Station at Miles City, Montana.
Yearling weight	.40	Koch and Clark (1955). This study involved comparisons of 1694 Hereford cattle at the Miles City, Montana Station. The data were adjusted to a heifer basis. This was the yearling weight and not the final or slaughter weight.
	.56	Brinks <u>et al.</u> (1964). All the animals used in this study were females. The study involves records on over 3500 females from the Miles City Experiment Station.
Final weight	.75	Brinks <u>et al.</u> (1962). This study involved 1029 bulls performance tested at Miles City, Montana. This correlation is between birth weight and final weight at the end of a 196 day feed trial.
Carcass grade	-.43	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Carcass weight	.39	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Dressing percent	-.25	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Area of rib-eye	-.01	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Fat thickness	-.16	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Length of body	.30	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Length of leg	.66	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).

TABLE VII. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WEANLING TRAITS AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Yearling weight	.54	Koch and Clark (1955). 182-day weaning weight.
	.71	Brinks <u>et al.</u> (1964). Trial involved only females.
Final weight	.67	Brinks <u>et al.</u> (1962). 180-day weaning weight x final weight at end of 196 day feed test.
Slaughter weight	.89	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Yearling weight	.31	Koch and Clark (1955). Weaning score x yearling weight.
Carcass grade	.84	Carter and Kincaid (1959). Weaning weight was expressed as 182-day weight. The study involves 195 steers fed for 200 days and slaughtered.
	.92	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962). This study involved data from 421 steers killed at the end of a 168 day fattening period. The steers were approximately 2 years old at slaughter.
	-.04	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
	-.43	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1945). Involves 480 steers, bulls and heifers slaughtered after a time-constant feed period. Includes both straight-bred and crossbred cattle.
Carcass weight	1.10	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.90	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Dressing percent	1.56	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.30	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Area of rib-eye	.40	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Fat thickness	.91	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
	-.29	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).

TABLE VII. (Continued)

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Length of body	.81	Shelby <u>et al.</u> , (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Length of leg	.92	Shelby <u>et al.</u> , (1963). 180-day weaning weight.
Percent retail prod. (cutability)	.09	Swiger <u>et al.</u> , (1965). This was expressed as percent of boneless closely trimmed retail cuts.

TABLE VIII. GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AVERAGE DAILY GAIN AND SLAUGHTER OR CARCASS TRAITS.

Slaughter or carcass trait	r	Author and remarks
Yearling weight	.83	Koch and Clark (1955). Gain wean to yearling x yearling weight.
Slaughter weight	.91	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Carcass grade	.85	Carter and Kincaid (1959).
	.78	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.25	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.08	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
Carcass weight	.98	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.90	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Dressing percent	.94	Blackwell <u>et al.</u> (1962).
	.01	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Area of rib-eye	-.10	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Fat thickness	.14	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
	.49	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965).
Length of body	.85	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Length of leg	.87	Shelby <u>et al.</u> (1963).
Cutability	-.45	Swiger <u>et al.</u> (1965). This correlation was between daily gain x percent retail product.

