



# Comparative Analysis of Livestock Industry Chains: China vs. the United States

## Insights from Wens and Tyson Foods

Guancheng Chen<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Affiliated High School of South China Normal University, GuangZhou, 510630, China

*\*Corresponding author. Email: alex06121@163.com*

**Abstract.** This paper examines the livestock industry chains of China and the United States, focusing on the comparative analysis of Wens Foodstuff Group Co., Ltd. (Wens) and Tyson Foods, Inc. (Tyson Food). The study aims to identify the differences in their industry roles, financial performance, and business models, and to propose strategies for Chinese livestock enterprises to enhance their international competitiveness. By analyzing financial data and business practices, the paper highlights the strengths and weaknesses of each company, and the impact of consumer preferences and labor costs on their operations. The findings are significant for understanding the dynamics of the global livestock industry and guiding the strategic development of Chinese enterprises in the international market.

**Keywords:** Livestock Industry, Comparative Analysis, Financial Performance, Business Models, International Competitiveness

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The livestock sector provides people with food of animal origin such as meat, dairy products and eggs. Building a sound and stable livestock industry chain is not only contributing to the reliability of the global protein supply, but also providing the basis for the price stability of meat food. After the reform and opening up, China's livestock breeding and raising technology began to develop comprehensively as the country began to import breeding chickens and pigs from abroad. This process also attracted more investors' attention; thus China's livestock industry entered a positive cycle. The supply of meat continues to improve, and meat, eggs and milk have long been a regular feature on people's tables. When the Chinese people to eat meat needs to be satisfied, meat, eggs and milk price level is stable, the society can be stable, the economy can be developed.

In 2022, the consumer price indexes (previous year=100) for meat and poultry were 95.7 and 104.0 respectively (data from China Statistics Bureau), showing relative price

relative price stability. And behind the price stability is the stability of China's meat supply, China's national meat production in 2022 grew to 93,284,400 tons. From the total consumption of 97.32 million tons of livestock and poultry meat in China in 2022, per capita possession of 68.93 kilograms (from the news) can be seen that despite China's meat consumption market is strong, but still need to import meat to meet domestic demand. U.S. consumers ate an average of 227 pounds (about 102 kilograms) of poultry, beef and pork in 2022. In comparison, my per capita consumption is still far below the United States. It is evident that our meat production still needs to be increased and the supply chain needs to be upgraded.

In the face of the predicament of China's animal husbandry industry, finding out the different characteristics of the animal husbandry industry chain between China and the United States and analyzing the reasons for it can effectively point out the direction for the development of China's breeding enterprises and their food products going to the sea, find out the characteristics of China's enterprises, and combined with my national conditions, put forward the feasible, scientific, reasonable and effective countermeasures to improve the international competitiveness of China's protein products.

## **1.2 Related Research**

The study by Shi et al. analyzes four aspects of China's livestock industry: supply security, science and technology equipment, industrial resilience, and competitiveness[1]. The researchers utilized specific indicators for each aspect, such as global share, per capita production, self-sufficiency rate, and international market share to construct an evaluation index system and used the entropy method to comparatively assess the strength of China's livestock industry. This study showed that China's livestock industry ranked fifth in terms of overall global strength, especially in the egg industry and some subsectors (e.g., pigs, sheep and broilers). However, there are weaknesses in the beef and dairy sectors. Despite the strong performance of China's livestock sector in terms of production, there is a gap with countries such as the United States in terms of per capita production and self-sufficiency. The study emphasizes the need to strengthen supply security capacity, particularly in terms of per capita production and self-sufficiency rates for various livestock products. China's livestock sector performs well in some areas, but faces challenges in others, and improvements are needed to increase overall industry competitiveness and resilience.

Yao's study analyzed the international market share (MS), the coefficient of demonstrated comparative advantage (CA), and the trade competitiveness index (TC) of China's chicken meat products to assess the international competitiveness of Chinese chicken meat products. The trade competitiveness index and the index of demonstrated comparative advantage of China's chicken meat products show that in the 1990s, China's chicken meat products still had a relatively strong competitive advantage in the international market, but after entering the twenty-first century, the overall advantage of China's chicken meat products in international competitiveness is gradually weakening and is still in a continuous decline. Yao also conducted an

empirical analysis of the factors affecting the international competitiveness of China's chicken products. Xue Yao also analyzed the factors affecting the international competitiveness of Chinese chicken meat products empirically. The results show that chicken production cost and export price have the most significant influence on the international competitiveness of Chinese chicken meat products, and the influence is negatively correlated

Deng's studies explored the multifaceted nature of green development in animal husbandry in China. This paper comprehensively evaluates the green development of agriculture from 2010 to 2020 through three dimensions: economy, society and environment.<sup>20</sup> Research has shown a steady improvement in overall green development levels during this period, with economic benefits outperforming environmental and social benefits. However, significant regional disparities have been observed, characterized by a "strong in north and weak in south" and "strong in west and weak in east" pattern. The coupling coordination degree among these three dimensions has been found to be at a rudimentary level, albeit with a gradual upward trend. Spatial analysis has revealed an agglomeration pattern centered around Beijing, with the northeastern region being a focal point. The Dagum Gini coefficient has been employed to examine regional disparities, highlighting significant differences between the northeastern region and both the central and eastern regions. Spatial autocorrelation studies using Moran's I have identified "high-high" aggregation areas primarily in the northeastern region. These findings underscore the complex interplay of factors influencing green development in animal husbandry and the importance of addressing regional imbalances to promote sustainable practices across China [2].

Chen et al. quantitatively analyze the livestock industry data of China and the United States from 1996 to 2010 using the C-D production function to explore the key factors affecting the output of the livestock industry in the two countries. The study found that China's livestock industry is in the transition stage from labor-intensive to capital-intensive, with labor driving output significantly. The authors also put forward suggestions to improve the development of the livestock industry, including changing attitudes, increasing financial support, and accelerating scientific and technological innovation. In addition, Zhou, et al. also analyzed the production status score and trade status analysis of major livestock products between China and the United States. The study found that China's livestock industry has "one high and two low" production problems, namely, high total production, low per capita level, low technological content, and high external dependence on trade[3].

Beal et al. conducted Techno-Economic Analysis (TEA) and Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) to evaluate the sustainability performance of the U.S. broiler industry, including costs, greenhouse gas emissions, energy, water, land, fertilizer, and respiratory impacts. Their study found that some scenarios like Large Farm, Large Bird, and High Temperature showed minimal or no LCA improvements over the Baseline Case, while Renewable Energy, Sustainable Corn, and Low-GHG cases demonstrated significant sustainability benefits. They mentioned that implementing low-GHG scenarios presents significant opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability in the U.S. broiler industry, although it may come with increased production costs. Moreover, Colin M. Beal et al. analyzed 7 broiler production

scenarios, including Grower, Integrator, and Combined control volume. They discovered that Integrators' profitability is mainly influenced by the cost of corn and soybean meal feeds, payments to Growers, and revenue from live broilers. Environmental impacts were primarily associated with upstream feed production (approximately 65% to 80% of total impacts) and on-site fuel consumption (around 20% to 35% of total impacts). So, they concluded that the U.S. broiler industry is heavily reliant on feed costs and broiler sale prices. And, Environmental burden is shared by Integrators and Growers, primarily driven by upstream feed production and on-farm energy consumption [4].

**1.3 Objective**

Therefore, it has become particularly important to analyze the differences in the role of livestock enterprises in the industry chain between China and other agricultural countries. However, there are few studies on the comparison of the livestock industry chain between China and the United States, not only because of the differences in population density and geographic structure between China and the United States, but also because of the differences in the meat consumption market and consumption preferences between China and the United States.

In this paper, we will compare the two Chinese and American livestock companies from the perspective and business perspective, so as to find out the differences between the Chinese and American livestock industry chains. It will also analyze the reasons for such differences, and finally make suggestions to Chinese livestock companies to go overseas.

**2 Financial and Operation Analysis**

Next, this paper will analyze Wens Group (referred to as Wens in the text), a well-known Chinese livestock company, and Tyson Food (referred to as Tyson Food in the text), a well-known American livestock company. The financial data as well as the business models of Wens and Tyson Food for the last three years will be analyzed in order to find out their differences and strengths and weaknesses.

**2.1 Financial Analysis**

From the financial point of view, this paper will analyze the profitability, operating capacity, solvency and growth capacity of Wens and Tyson Food.

In this paper, gross and net margins are adopted as the criteria to assess the profitability of the two companies, and the following table shows the gross and net margins of t Wens & Tyson Food for the last three years.

**Table 1.** The gross profit margins of Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

|  |      |            |
|--|------|------------|
|  | Wens | Tyson Food |
|--|------|------------|

|      |        |        |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2021 | -8.32% | 13.87% |
| 2022 | 15.54% | 12.51% |
| 2023 | 0.84%  | 0.05%  |

Wens has shown significant fluctuations in net gross profit margin over the past three years, ranging from -8.32% to 15.54%. This indicates that the company's profitability has experienced notable volatility during this period, especially with a significant improvement from 2021 to 2022 followed by a decline in 2023. Tyson Food has maintained relatively stable net gross profit margins over the past three years from 2021 to 2022. However, it experiences a significant decline in 2023, due to a reduction in revenue and an increase in operating expense from 46.6 billion to 50.2 billion.

**Table 2.** The net profit margins of Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

|      | Wens    | Tyson Food |
|------|---------|------------|
| 2021 | -20.66% | 6.50%      |
| 2022 | 6.74%   | 6.10%      |
| 2023 | -7.11%  | -1.23%     |

Wens has also shown instability in net profit margin, ranging from -20.66% to 6.74% and ultimately dropping to -7.11%. This suggests that the company has faced profitability challenges over the past three years, particularly in 2021 and 2023. Tyson Food's net profit margin has decreased in 2023, because of increasing other expense from 0 to 0.781 billion, which changes net income to negative 0.72 billion. In summary, despite e-an important Tyson food's decline in 2023 profit margins, it has demonstrated more stable profitability over the past three years compared to Wens.

Also, the accounts receivable turnover ratio and inventory turnover ratio are used as the criteria to evaluate the operating capacity of the two companies, and the following table shows the gross profit margin and net profit margin of Wens & Tyson Food in the last three years.

**Table 3.** The accounts receivable turnover ratio for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| The accounts receivable turnover ratio (times) | Wens  | Tyson Food |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| 2021                                           | 172.2 | 21.62      |
| 2022                                           | 176.3 | 21.41      |
| 2023                                           | 168.7 | 20.93      |

The data shows that Wens has a significantly higher accounts receivable turnover ratio than Tyson Food, indicating that Wens is able to collect accounts receivable more quickly. Compared to Tyson Food, Wens is able to receive payments in a timelier manner after a sale, helping to maintain a healthy cash flow. The reason for

such a significant difference is that the average accounts receivable of Wens is much smaller than that of Tyson Foods. This significantly higher receivable turnover ratio also demonstrates that Wens may not need to provide products in advance to receive payment from customers. From the financial statements, it can be seen that Wens' sales model is based on cash transactions or quick payments.

**Table 4.** The Inventory turnover ratio for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| Inventory turnover ratio (times) | Wens | Tyson Food |
|----------------------------------|------|------------|
| 2021                             | 4.98 | 9.83       |
| 2022                             | 4.00 | 9.42       |
| 2023                             | 4.39 | 9.27       |

From the perspective of core operations, the difference in inventory turnover ratios between Wens and Tyson Food over the past three years may stem from their different business strategies and supply chain management practices. Wens has relatively lower inventory turnover ratios, indicating potential challenges in inventory management, possibly due to inventory build-up or sluggish sales. In contrast, Tyson Food's higher inventory turnover ratios demonstrate more effective inventory management, likely achieved through precise demand forecasting, supply chain optimization, and timely inventory controls. Therefore, the disparity in inventory turnover ratios between the two companies may reflect differences in their supply chain management and operational efficiency, directly impacting their profitability and capital utilization efficiency.

In addition, debt ratio, current ratio and quick ratio are used as the criteria for evaluating the solvency of the two companies, and the following table shows the debt ratio, current ratio and quick ratio of Wens & Tyson Food in the last three years.

**Table 5.** The debt ratio for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| Year | Wens   | Tyson Food |
|------|--------|------------|
| 2021 | 64.10% | 50.83%     |
| 2022 | 56.25% | 46.20%     |
| 2023 | 61.41% | 49.64%     |

Wens consistently shows higher debt ratios than Tyson Food over the past three years. This suggests that Wens relies more on debt financing compared to Tyson Food, potentially increasing its debt repayment risks, especially during economic uncertainties. Nevertheless, both Wens's and Tyson Food's debt ratios were stable.

**Table 6.** The current ratio for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| Year | Wens | Tyson Food |
|------|------|------------|
|------|------|------------|

|      |      |      |
|------|------|------|
| 2021 | 1.81 | 1.55 |
| 2022 | 1.47 | 1.81 |
| 2023 | 1.07 | 1.34 |

Examining the current ratios, Tyson Food had relatively higher ratios than Wens's. Tyson Food demonstrates better short-term debt repayment ability with higher current ratios. It's seen that Wens's quick ratio is decreasing at a rate of 0.4 per year. The financial report shows that not only did Wens' current assets decrease from 2022 to 2023, but the current liabilities increased at a rate of approximately 5 billion RMB per year from 2021 to 2023. This has led to a gradual decline in Wens' quick ratio.

**Table 7.** The quick ratio for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| Year | Wens | Tyson Food |
|------|------|------------|
| 2021 | 0.87 | 0.86       |
| 2022 | 0.51 | 0.77       |
| 2023 | 0.35 | 0.52       |

Lastly, looking at the quick ratios, which assess a company's ability to quickly repay short-term debts excluding inventory, Wens had quick ratios of 0.87, 0.51, and 0.35, while Tyson Food had ratios of 0.86, 0.77, and 0.52 over the same period. Despite fluctuations in Wens' quick ratios, overall, Tyson Food shows higher quick ratios, indicating better debt repayment capabilities.

In conclusion, although Wens excels in accounts receivable turnover ratio, Tyson Food appears to have stronger debt repayment capabilities based on debt ratios, current ratios, and quick ratios. Investors and stakeholders should consider these metrics collectively to make informed decisions regarding the financial health and debt risks of both companies.

This paper takes the growth rate of revenue and the growth rate of profit as the criteria for evaluating the development ability of the two companies, and the following table shows the growth rate of revenue and the growth rate of profit of the two companies in the past three years.

**Table 8.** The growth rate of operating income for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

| Year | Wens | Tyson Food |
|------|------|------------|
| 2021 | 0.87 | 0.86       |
| 2022 | 0.51 | 0.77       |
| 2023 | 0.35 | 0.52       |

Wens had operating growth rates of 0.87%, 0.51%, and 0.35% for 2021, 2022, and 2023, respectively. On the other hand, Tyson Food exhibited operating growth rates of 0.86%, 0.77%, and 0.52% for the same period. While both companies experienced

growth, Tyson Food generally demonstrated slightly higher revenue growth rates compared to Wens. This indicates that Tyson Food may have a stronger ability to increase its top line and expand its business operations. In addition, from 2021 to 2023, Wens's operating growth rate declines significantly each year proving that Wens, has little incentive to grow.

**Table 9.** The growth rate of operating profit for Wens & Tyson Food from 2021 to 2023

|      | Wens | Tyson Food |
|------|------|------------|
| 2021 | 0.87 | 0.86       |
| 2022 | 0.51 | 0.77       |
| 2023 | 0.35 | 0.52       |

Despite both companies seeing growth, Tyson Food generally displayed slightly higher revenue growth rates compared to Wens, suggesting a stronger ability to increase its top line and expand business operations. Furthermore, the significant annual decline in Wens's operating growth rates from 2021 to 2023 indicates a lack of incentive for growth. When considering the declining trend in operating growth rates alongside the lower inventory turnover ratios and negative profit margins of Wens, it is likely that inefficient inventory management and operational inefficiencies are contributing factors to the decline in Wens's profitability and growth potential.

## 2.2 Business Model

Wens' farming model is very special, and its model is called the close-knit “company + farmer” model. In this model, the company is responsible for the research and development of chicken and pig breeding, nutrition and disease prevention technologies, and produces chickens, piglets, feed, veterinary drugs and vaccines for the cooperative farmers to raise broilers and pigs until they are slaughtered. Therefore, Wens' main costs are in the commissioning fees for the farmers and the research and development of chicken and pig breeding, nutrition and vaccination technologies.

Tyson Food uses a purchasing method for cattle and pigs. Tyson Food has specialized buyers to purchase high quality cattle and pigs. Tyson Food vertically integrates its chicken farming by giving the breeder flocks to the independent contract farmers, and then processing the chickens into chicken meat at the factory. chickens into chicken meat. Tyson Food's main costs are therefore the cost of purchasing cattle and hogs, and the cost of raising the chickens (including corn, soybean meal, and other feeds, as well as wages to the farmers).

The two companies' annual reports also show that Wens and Tyson Food sell different products. The chart below shows the composition of Wens and Tyson Food's operating income.



**Table 10.** Composition of 2022 Wens's operating income: Trillion RMB

| Product Categories      | Operating income<br>(in 100 million RMB) | Proportion of operating income | of margins |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| Meat pig                | 426.4                                    | 50.93%                         | 17.45%     |
| Broiler                 | 355.8                                    | 42.50%                         | 13.11%     |
| Processed Meat Products | 4.49                                     | 0.54%                          | 10.23%     |

**Table 11.** Composition of 2022 Tyson Food's operating income: Trillion RMB)

| Product Categories | Operating income | Proportion of operating | of margins |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| Beef               | 1412             | 37.26%                  | 12.60%     |
| Chicken            | 1207             | 31.83%                  | 5.60%      |
| Prepared Foods     | 689.2            | 18.18%                  | 7.70%      |
| Pork               | 456.3            | 12.04%                  | 3.00%      |

In terms of the type of products sold, Wens sells all live chickens and pigs, with slaughtering sales and cooked food processing accounting for only 0.54% of this total. Tyson Food, on the other hand, sells predominantly slaughtered and processed foods (18.18%). It can be seen that Tyson Food sells a much larger proportion of Prepared Foods than Wens sells Processed Meat Products.

In terms of the composition of products sold, Wnes sells the most Meat pig (50.93%), followed by Chicken Broiler 42.5%). On the other hand, Tyson Food sells the most Beef (37.26%), followed by Chicken (31.83%) and Prepared Foods (18.18%).

Translated with DeepL.com (free version)

**Table 12.** 2023 Tyson Food's Distribution channels

| Distribution channels<br>(in millions) | Ret ail   | Food service | Intern ational | Industrial and Other | Interse gment |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|
| sales                                  | \$23 ,285 | \$15,682     | \$8,104        | \$6,211              | \$1,991       |
| percentage                             | 43.       | 29.43        | 15.21          | 11.66%               | 3.74%         |

|  |     |   |   |  |  |
|--|-----|---|---|--|--|
|  | 70% | % | % |  |  |
|--|-----|---|---|--|--|

Wens and Tyson Food have different distribution paths due to the different products they sell. According to the Wens 2023 Annual Report, Wens sells mainly to wholesalers, supplemented by terminal retailers. Whereas, Tyson Foods' products are mainly slaughter sales and deli processing. Tyson Foods sells primarily to retailers, with the remainder supplying primarily to Foodservice, such as fast food restaurants. The following graph shows the sales of Tyson Foods by distribution channel and its share in 2023.

To summarize, from the perspective of the main business, Wens focuses on farming, which can better integrate farmers and resources, and the margin of profit improvement is to expand the integration of farmers, but also to reduce the cost of chickens, hogs and feed. Tyson Food, on the other hand, focuses on food processing, and the room for profit improvement is mainly in reducing the cost of purchasing pigs and cows and expanding the distribution channels mainly through Retail and Foodservice.

3 Reason Analysis

3.1 Human Capital Factor

In the main business, Wens' livestock supply comes from contracted farmers. Tyson Food, on the other hand, sources its livestock supply mainly from purchases. This means that the cost of Wens also includes wages paid to contracted farmers, while the cost of Tyson Food is the cost of purchasing livestock. The main reason for the difference in livestock supply between the two companies is the difference in labor costs.

According to the National Bureau of Statistics of China, the per capita disposable income of rural residents in 2023 will be 21,691 yuan.

USDA forecast that Median total farm household income will increase to \$99,523 in 2023. With an average household size of 2.56 people, the per capita income will be \$38,867. Based on the US dollar to RMB exchange rate in 2023 (1 US dollar to 7.1002 RMB), this equals about 276,020 RMB, which is much larger than the per capita disposable income of China's rural residents in that year. Therefore, Wens is able to take advantage of the relatively cheap Chinese rural labor force.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, the reason for the difference in the two companies' main sales products is the difference in consumer preferences between the two countries. In the Chinese market, most people will buy promptly slaughtered chicken, duck, cow and other meats in the bazaar rather than packaged meats offered in supermarkets. U.S. consumers, on the other hand, are more likely to buy packaged meats and prepared foods from the shelf.

Also in the U.S. market, a large number of fast food branded stores, and Limited service restaurant (LSR), the demand for prepared food also has a huge impact on the meat supply of both companies. According to a survey by 36Kr, in the U.S., there are currently 360,000 limited service restaurant stores out of 660,000, accounting for about 53% of the total number of limited service restaurant stores. In China, there are

1.83 million limited service restaurant (LSR) outlets, accounting for only about 19% of the total. These limited service restaurants (LSRs) often need cheaper and easier-to-prepare prepared foods as ingredients for their dishes to reduce costs. Therefore, the difference in demand for prepared foods between Limited Service Restaurants in China and the U.S. has led to differences in the products and sales channels of Wens and Tyson Food.

## **4 Suggestion**

### **4.1 Product Localization**

Localize and improve products according to the culture and consumption habits of the U.S. market. For example, processed meat products or prepared foods such as smoked beef and barbecued pork can be developed to suit local tastes in order to better integrate into the local market. According to the data mentioned above, the average meat consumption of US consumers is higher than that of China, which indicates that there is a greater demand for meat products in the US market. This is because the large demand for meat in the fast food market in the US will give Chinese companies a stable meat sales channel and ultimately improve profitability.

### **4.2 Supply Chain Optimization**

The main business should be transformed from integrating farmers' resources to meat products processor because the labor cost of agriculture in the United States is too high. Hiring cooperating farmers will bring huge cost to the Chinese company, which will reduce the profitability of the company. And in order to reduce the labor cost of factory operations, automated production lines should be developed because the large demand for meat in the fast food market in the U.S. will give the Chinese firms a stable sales channel for meat and finally increase profitability. Meanwhile, in a study by Beal et al[4]., they found that the environmental burden of the U.S. chicken industry comes mainly from feed production and on-site energy consumption through life cycle assessment (LCA). This suggests that by improving feed sourcing and energy use, Chinese firms can reduce costs and improve environmental sustainability.

### **4.3 Partner Selection**

This can be done by partnering with a Chinese food chain brand or an existing local meat processor or distributor, utilizing existing market channels and experience to quickly penetrate the market. According to Tyson Food's annual report, its partner network and market penetration strategy is reflected in its close collaboration with independent farmers and producers, extensive international presence, and co-marketing and product development through a number of well-known brands. The company achieves market penetration through multi-channel sales, including retail, food service, industrial and export markets, as well as through brand strengthening

through advertising and promotional campaigns. Wens could adopt a similar strategy to achieve market penetration.

#### **4.4 Branding and Marketing Strategies**

Strengthen brand building and enhance brand awareness and influence through effective marketing strategies. Utilize social media and advertising to promote product features and advantages to attract consumers. Marketing cases can also be cited, such as a brand promoting its products on social media by cooperating with famous chefs or food bloggers, thus rapidly increasing brand influence.

#### **4.5 Compliance and Standards**

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) have a number of strict regulations and standards for the production and importation of food products. Companies need to ensure that their products comply with all relevant standards to avoid legal risks. First and foremost Wens should have a thorough understanding of all relevant FDA and USDA regulations and ensure that all products comply with these requirements. Establish and maintain a comprehensive quality management system to ensure compliance at every step of the process, from raw material procurement to product shipment.

### **5 Conclusions**

This paper delves into the differences between the livestock industry chains of China and the United States, using the Chinese company Wens Foodstuff Group Co., Ltd. (referred to as Wens) and the American company Tyson Foods, Inc. (referred to as Tyson Food) as case studies. It conducts a detailed comparative analysis from both financial and business perspectives. The study reveals that although China's livestock industry has a certain level of competitiveness globally, there is still a gap in per capita production and self-sufficiency rates compared to the United States. By comparing the financial data of the two companies, including profitability, operational capacity, solvency, and growth potential, the paper points out that Wens excels in accounts receivable turnover ratio, while Tyson Food demonstrates more robust inventory management and debt repayment capabilities.

In addition, the paper analyzes the impact of consumer preferences, labor costs, and fast-food market demand in both countries on the business models and product sales of the two companies. It suggests that to enhance China's livestock industry's international competitiveness, it is necessary to strengthen supply chain security, technological equipment, industry resilience, and competitiveness. For the "going global" strategy of Chinese livestock enterprises, the paper recommends localizing products according to American market culture and consumer habits, optimizing supply chains, choosing the right partners, strengthening brand building and marketing strategies, and strictly adhering to the regulations. These strategies will

help Chinese livestock enterprises to better adapt to the international market and improve their global competitiveness.

## References

1. Shi, Z., Li, J., & Hu, X. (2023). From Large to Powerful: International Comparison, Challenges and Strategic Choices for China's Livestock Industry. *Agriculture*, 13(7), 1298 – 1298. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13071298>
2. Deng, Y., Li, F., & Lu, Q. (2024). Spatial disparities and internal subsystems' coupling coordination analysis of green development in Chinese animal husbandry. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 31(12), 18916–18931. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-024-32394-y>
3. Chen L. (2013). Establishment of Three Levels Food Safety Risk Surveillance and Early Warning Information Platform in Kunshan City and Its Effect Evaluation. *Food and Nutrition in China*.
4. Beal, C. M., Robinson, D. M., Smith, J. P., Doren, V., Tabler, G. T., Rochell, S. J., ... Xin Gen Lei. (2023). Economic and environmental assessment of U.S. broiler production: opportunities to improve sustainability. *Poultry Science*, 102(10), 102887 – 102887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2023.102887>
5. Jianwei, Y. (2016). Comparative Analysis on Export Competitiveness of Chinese Meat Duck Products. 38(7). <https://doi.org/10.16372/j.issn.1004-6364.2016.07.008>
6. Putman, B., Thoma, G., Burek, J., & Matlock, M. (2017). A retrospective analysis of the United States poultry industry: 1965 compared with 2010. *Agricultural Systems*, 157, 107 – 117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.07.008>

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

