



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

**Spatial Competition and Pricing in the Agricultural Chemical Industry:  
Empirical Evidence from Georgia**

***R. Lee Hall, Jeffrey H. Dorfman, and Lewell F. Gunter\****

*Paper presented at the NCR-134 Conference on Applied Commodity Price  
Analysis, Forecasting, and Market Risk Management  
St. Louis, Missouri, April 21-22, 2003*

Copyright 2003 by R. Lee Hall, Jeffrey H. Dorfman, and Lewell F. Gunter.  
All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial  
purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

\* Hall was a graduate student, Dorfman (jdorfman@agecon.uga.edu) and Gunter (lgunter@agecon.uga.edu) are professors in the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 315 Conner Hall, The University of Georgia, Athens GA 30602-7509.

# **Spatial Competition and Pricing in the Agricultural Chemical Industry: Empirical Evidence from Georgia**

## **Abstract**

*Three models of spatial competition are tested on retail price data for the agricultural chemical industry. The empirical tests find no evidence of any spatial competition using data from sixty-five retailers and twelve different chemicals. Demand and supply-side variables have statistically significant, but economically trivial impacts on retail chemical prices. These results point to a virtually complete control of retail prices by the chemical manufacturers, likely through the rebate program they offer retailers. The oligopoly structure of the chemical manufacturing industry makes such control possible. The results suggest that consolidation of retailers or distributors will not have anti-competitive effects since price competition is essentially absent from this market already.*

**Keywords:** *agricultural chemicals, market power, spatial competition.*

## **Introduction**

The U.S. Department of Commerce (2001) estimated U. S. farm production expenses for the fertilizer and chemical industry totaled \$18.5 billion dollars in 1999. Insecticides, herbicides, pesticides, and fungicides are important subcategories of these major expenses, reaching approximately \$8.8 billion in the U.S. in 1997. Without these expenditures, serious damage to crops would result, causing a drop in both quality and yield. Pesticides have been a growing source of crop protection since the post-World War II era, and have contributed to the high productivity of U.S. agriculture (ERS, 2000). Since widespread farmer adoption of chemicals on crops in the 1940s (MacIntyre, 1987), use has steadily increased, with fluctuations correlated with crop prices.

A study by Knutson & Associates (1990) describes the possible effects of a ban on pesticides. The study finds that U.S. farmers would be less competitive in a global market and major exports, such as corn, wheat, and peanuts, would drop 27%. The study also reveals farmers in warm, humid climates, i.e. the southern United States, would be harmed more because such weather promotes higher pest populations. Another study, conducted by GRC Economics (1989), focuses on a ban of fungicides only. The authors find that U.S. peanut production would decrease 68% if fungicides were not used. The study also estimates that overall consumer food prices would increase 13%. Therefore, both farmers and consumers are affected by these inputs.

There are many factors influencing pesticide prices. A partial list includes: commodity prices, overall health of the agricultural economy, regulations and standards, marketing and advertising, effectiveness of the product, and safety of the product. These factors have a macro effect on price, meaning most of these factors are included in price whether the pesticide is purchased in California or Georgia. The current study focuses on micro level factors affecting the chemical price, including spatial competition and demand shifting components. Thus, macro factors will not be included in our econometric model, as we strive to focus on the spatial component of

retail pricing for agricultural chemicals. In this study, we will test the hypothesis that spatial competition in the agricultural pesticide market has a significant effect on the retail price of these chemicals. Before testing this hypothesis, we will lay out some of the relevant theory and previous work, move on to a discussion of our data, and then present the model and test results.

## **Theory and Previous Literature**

### *Supply Side Issues*

It is estimated that today it costs between \$70 and \$100 million dollars to research and develop a new chemical compound for the global market. This creates an obvious incentive to consolidate and gain scale economies and the incentive is working. In 1996, ten large chemical manufacturing firms dominated the chemical manufacturing industry worldwide; today, these ten firms have been reduced to six: Bayer Crop Science, Syngenta, Monsanto, DuPont, Dow AgroScience, and BASF. The annual sales of these six companies were \$22.70 billion for the year 2000 (Clay, 2001). Clearly, the industry is moving more toward an oligopoly market structure. From the farmer's point of view, most experts agree that the concentration of the firms has been positive with chemical input prices dropping and yields increasing during the period of consolidation (Clay, 2001).

However, retailers may not have the same point of view as farmers. Leroux, Wortman, and Mathis (2001) state that "consolidation of the pesticide industry has allowed the companies to more thoroughly control prices both through online outlets and through local outlets." Chemical retailers do not deal directly with manufacturers, but are tied to them indirectly through a rebate system in which manufacturers provide money directly to the retailers at the end of the year. Most chemical retailers purchase pesticides at a distribution center which buys directly from the manufacturers. The retailer pays the specified price of the product within fifteen days of the purchase to the distributor. The retailer in turn charges the farmer the wholesale price, plus their mark-up, and minus an adjustment to account for the expected rebate from the manufacturer. The chemical sales representative for each company provides each individual store with anticipated amounts of rebates.<sup>1</sup> Thus, manufacturers play an important role in the retail pricing of pesticides, able to adjust the retail pricing level of their products through manipulation of the rebates.

The agricultural chemical market is a high touch industry, requiring large amounts of customer service and customer interaction. Farmers are accustomed to one-on-one, face-to-face transactions when purchasing chemical inputs. Farmers are dependant on retailers to provide the products needed and advice on using the products in the most beneficial way in their area. In many cases a farmer relies more on trusted individuals' recommendations than on published production information (Barry, et al., 1998). Retailers provide customer service representatives to visit farmers, provide advice, and make sure the chemical application process and rates are correct. In other cases, a representative from the chemical manufacturer will provide advice directly to the farmer or supply the retailer with information to pass on the customer. Moss

---

<sup>1</sup> It is unclear whether every store receives the same level of rebate or even if rebates are based on a single formula. It was deemed extremely unlikely that firms would provide this type of sensitive financial information for the study; therefore rebate details were not sought.

(2001) argues that these factors make chemical buying decisions fundamentally driven by personal relationships, significantly diminishing price competition among retailers.

Most chemical retail stores do not deliver, at least not free of charge. Thus, an f.o.b. pricing scheme is standard and assumed throughout this study.

### *Demand Side Issues*

The United States is the largest purchaser and user of pesticides in the world, with 33% of worldwide pesticides sales within the U.S. borders (McEwan and Deen, 1997). The USDA's Farm Production Expenditures report for the 2001 crop estimates U.S. farm production expenses at \$197 billion dollars with agricultural chemicals making up 4.4% or \$8.6 billion. The average chemical expenditures per farm in 2001 were \$3,996. However, the statistics are much higher for crop farms in the United States, with average expenditures on agricultural chemicals of \$8,170. The Southeast Region, which includes farms in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, has much lower total farm expenses than the national average, but chemical expenditures make up a larger percentage of their expenses at 5%, or \$3,818. In Georgia, the source of this study's data, pesticides made up 4.1% or \$76.34 million in expenses (NASS, 2001).

Farmers' decisions of what chemicals to buy in what quantity are a function of acreage grown, types of crops, and economic conditions (McEwan and Deen, 1997). The makeup of the chemical bundle to be purchased will change from year-to-year and throughout the growing season based on pest cycles, weather conditions, and commodity prices. These three factors help determine if pesticide applications are economically justified. For example, it would be unjustified to apply a pesticide to a crop if the cost of the application would exceed the benefit obtained. This could be this case in if the crop price was extremely low, pests could not be controlled, or drought had already caused excessive crop damage. Throughout the growing season farmers will make numerous purchases of chemicals. The decision of where to purchase inputs is not, and should not be, straightforward. As any savvy consumer understands, it is important to compare prices and shop around.

Studies of the demand for pest control have generally concluded farmers' pest control purchasing decisions are relatively inelastic with respect to product price (Fernandez-Cornjeo and Jans, 1995; McIntosh and Williams, 1992). Norgaard (1976) argued farmers also appear to be "irrational" in their pesticide use, using more than the profit-maximizing amount. This "irrational" behavior is most likely attributed to risk aversion on the part of the farmer. Fox and Weersink (1995) define pesticides as a class of inputs called damage control inputs, recognizing their role in risk reduction as well as profit generation. Specific chemical purchases are also highly substitutable across brands. Thus, small price changes can result in significant changes in the mix of products used as farmers attempt to maximize profits. For example, a farmer may choose between Orthene 75S and Dipel to control an insect problem depending on price of each product. Both products control many of the same pests and the only difference may be in the price. This high cross-price elasticity of demand for specific chemicals should increase competition among retailers (and/or manufacturers and distributors) without contradicting the inelastic overall demand for chemicals since aggregate purchases are unaffected (ERS, 2000).

As in any industry, retailers have to meet the needs of the customers. One way the agricultural chemical retailers do this is through establishing a line of credit for farmers. This helps farmers with liquidity issues and convenience, saving time and allowing employees to purchase (pickup) chemicals without trusting those employees with a company checkbook. Once the chemical purchase has been made the farmer normally faces three payment options: pay at the time of purchase, pay monthly, or pay at the end of the season. The third option will generally involve paying accrued interest charges in addition to the chemical purchase price. However, in the world of chemical sales, like most industries, not everyone is equal. Farmers who purchase large quantities of product normally receive a bulk discount (and may receive more favorable payment terms). Such rewards for large customers suggest that the presence of large-scale commercial farmers may influence the degree of price competition observed among retailers.

### *Spatial Competition*

The most natural criterion for the separation of consumers and individual consumer markets is a spatial one. Households, farms, and businesses exist, purchase and consume in a spatial environment. Products are manufactured at one location and then distributed to various and numerous markets. When one includes factors such as transportation costs and general frictions of distance such as loss of information and inconvenience, markets are more clearly understood in a spatial environment.

Hotelling (1929) first focused on the location of the firm, suggesting that consumers do not always buy from the least expensive supplier because firms are differentiated by their locations or product characteristics. Hotelling describes the disutility of travel to make a purchase as different from simply a disparity of transportation costs. Thus, consumers at different locations pay different prices for the same good. Capozza and Van Order (1978) state two essential distinguishing features of spatial competition: transportation costs and downward sloping average costs curves over some range of quantity sold. In the modern world, transportation costs include shipping costs for remote purchases and must vary across possible purchase sites to make location matter. Average costs curves are assumed to be negatively sloped within some quantity range (due to economies of scale or fixed costs) since otherwise there would be no advantage to concentrating production.

Often discussed in the literature are two basic, yet opposing, forces that influence a firm's location decision to either cluster with competing firms or to disperse from them. The first force leads firms to locate near competitors in an attempt to capture, or steal, more customers. Pinske and Slade (1998) termed this effect the *market share effect*. Working against the *market share effect* is the *market power effect*. The *market power effect* relies on the theory that reduced spatial competition leads to overall decreased competition and increased sales. Basically, firms locate further away from competition in order to capture consumers within a specific area. Thus, the theory of the *market power effect* is for firms to locate further from rivals. Borenstein and Netz (1999), in a review of empirical literature, found that the *market share effect* dominates over *market power effect*. That is, firms tend to cluster.

The three main conjectural variations considered in the analysis of spatial economic theory (Greenhut, Norman, and Hung, 1987) are Löschian competition, Hotelling-Smithies competition, and Greenhut-Ohta competition. The Hotelling-Smithies assumption is equivalent to the Bertrand assumption in the traditional, non-spatial analysis of an oligopoly; that is, rivals will not alter price regardless of actions made by the firm. Hotelling-Smithies competition can result in market prices that are higher or lower than in perfect competition.

According to Greenhut and Ohta (1975) and Ohta (1976) firms treat their market area and price as highly variable. The Greenhut-Ohta model assumes each firm selects a pricing policy to maximize profits subject to a given price constraint at the edge of its market. Greenhut-Ohta competition theory leads to lower prices and is very similar to Hotelling-Smithies competition in its predicted pricing behavior. The Hotelling-Smithies and Greenhut-Ohta assumptions about firms' conjectural variations lead to the following theoretical predictions:

- As transport costs and/or fixed costs approach zero, nonspatial perfect competition results, and the firm's price approaches marginal costs.
- Increases in fixed costs, marginal costs, and transport cost all lead to the classical-theory result of an increase in price.
- As more firms enter the industry or market, the increased competition lowers price.
- Price falls in the long run as population increases.

Löschian competition occurs when firms believe that rivals will pursue price strategies to maintain a fixed market area, implying price changes will be matched exactly. Löschian competition leads to a contradiction of the expected outcome of nonspatial competitive theory. Löschian behavior leads to high short-run profits, which are diluted by entry in the long-run (Fik, 1988). The theoretical predictions for Löschian competition are as follows:

- As transport costs and/or fixed costs approach zero, price will approach the nonspatial monopoly price.
- As fixed costs and transport costs rise, price falls, whereas an increase in marginal costs leads to ambiguous results.
- As firms enter and thus competition increases, prices increase.
- Price increases as population density, or consumers, increases.

Very few studies have been done on spatial competition in the agribusiness sector. Fik (1988) studied spatial competition in food markets or supermarkets. He theorized that price competition in the retail food markets is highly dependent on the location and/or the distance to rival firms. His results concluded a solid link between price, space and the intensity of price reaction as a decreasing function of distance. Durham, Sexton, and Ho Song (1996) examined the role of spatial pricing in the allocation of tomatoes from farms to processing facilities across the state of California. The aim of the study was to determine if the tomato farmers were shipping the product to the most profitable processing facilities. The results indicated farmers were hauling the tomatoes an extra 10 miles per trip to the processing plant. This misallocation was estimated to cost an extra \$7.41 million dollars in transportation costs; however, this represented only a 1.9% loss from potential industry-wide profit.

## Empirical Testing

### *Model Definition*

To test these theories of spatial competition in the retail-level U.S. agricultural chemical industry, a retailer mail survey was conducted in Georgia and the data were used to estimate an econometric model of chemical pricing for twelve different, commonly used agricultural chemicals.

In 1999, agricultural chemicals and fertilizer made up 8.6% of all farm production expenses in Georgia (The Georgia County Guide, 2001). This translates into approximately \$408 million farmers are spending annually on these inputs in Georgia alone. In the counties this study surveyed, the percentage is much greater than the average Georgia County. The 66 counties included in the survey spent approximately \$366 million on fertilizer and agricultural chemicals, or 90% of the statewide fertilizer and agricultural chemical expenses (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2001). Georgia data should be representative of national trends as chemical input costs are at least as high as the national average and certainly are a large enough component of production costs to ensure that farmers pay attention to their purchasing decisions in this arena.

Given previous work in the literature on agricultural chemical demand and empirical research on spatial competition, the model for this study was specified as follows:

$$(1) \quad \ln(P_{ij}) = \beta_i + \ln(DC_j)\beta_{13} + \ln(NC15_j)\beta_{14} + \ln(SF_k)\beta_{15} + \ln(NF200_k)\beta_{16} + \ln(NF_k)\beta_{17} + e_{ij}.$$

In equation (1),  $P$  is the retail price of a chemical,  $DC$  is the distance to the closest competitor,  $NC15$  is the number of competitors within a 15 mile radius,  $SF$  is the gross sales of relevant crops (defined below),  $NF200$  is the number of “commercial” farms with sales over \$200,000 in the county,  $NF$  is the total number of farms in the county,  $\beta$  represents regression model parameters to be estimated, and  $e$  is the stochastic error term. Variables, chemicals, retailers, and counties are designated by subscripts with  $i$  denoting the chemical,  $j$  designating the store, and  $k$  indexing the county. Note that there is allowance for chemical specific intercepts. The two variables measuring the nearness and number of competitors ( $DC$  and  $NC15$ ) should allow insight into the importance of market power and/or market share effects. They allow investigation of the presence or absence of spatial competition and, if it exists, the format of it from among the three possible spatial models. The other explanatory, county-level variables in the model ( $SF$ ,  $NF200$ , and  $NF$ ) can be thought of as measuring the strength of local demand, the total local market size, and, for  $NF200$  to at least some extent, the market power of the buyers. The signs and significance of the coefficients for these three variables also can be used to distinguish between the three possible models of spatial competition.

### *Data*

As mentioned, the chemical price data were collected through a survey. The Georgia Department of Agriculture’s list of restricted use pesticide dealers was the starting point for the sample frame with the goal of reaching all retailers who sell chemicals to farmers. The 66



Georgia counties chosen as the study area were designed to capture the major row crop producing area of the state. The counties included in the study area vary widely in size, population of farms, and gross agricultural sales. Of the sixty-six counties involved, fifty-eight of the counties had at least one restricted use dealer that sold chemicals for use on crops. The eight counties that did not have a restricted use pesticide dealer either were highly populated or were in areas where row crop production was low.

The retailers were each contacted via telephone and asked two questions. The first question was: does your firm sell pesticides for use on farms? If the firm answered 'yes' then the firm was asked for their fax number. If the answer was 'no' then they were eliminated from the list of potential survey participants. Since the firms did not sell chemicals that were used by farms, it was assumed the firm either sold pesticides for home pest control or other pesticides not related to farming. Thus, the survey was sent to the entire population of retailers in the study area.

The survey faxed to each retailer asked the firm to provide the retail price paid by the average farmer for twelve highly used agricultural chemicals. Of the 204 surveys faxed out, 65 were returned, for a response rate of 32%. Not all the responders provided prices for all the chemicals; however, overall there were 552 prices responses from the 65 responding retailers. These responses comprise the price data for this study.

The names of the twelve chemicals and summary details of the responses can be found in table 1. As the table reveals, Temik® was the most widely observed chemical with 64 observations and Prowl® with 63 observations was the second most widely observed chemical. This may be because of the flexibility of these two chemicals to be applied to numerous crops. The least observed chemical was Chlorothalonil. Chlorothalonil is a generic substitute for Bravo® 720. The low number of observations may be a sign that ISK Biosciences, the maker of Bravo® the main manufacturer of Chlorothalonil, is successfully marketing its product as superior to the generic Chlorothalonil brands.

The remaining variables were constructed from secondary data. The two spatial competition measures (*DC* and *NC15*) were constructed using Microsoft Map Quest and the firm addresses in the original RUP list from the Georgia Department of Agriculture. The fifteen mile radius for the *NC15* variable was chosen as an approximation of how far a farmer was willing to travel to purchase these chemicals; any stores farther away were deemed too far to expect a farmer to travel, particularly given that this is direct distance, not road mileage. While this is an arbitrary definition of potential market area for a firm, it seems a reasonable one given the demands on farm labor time and the transportation cost associated with these (bulky) chemicals. The average distance between competitors is 5.83 miles, the longest distance between competitors is 18.7, and the shortest distance is 0.3 miles.

The number of total and commercial farms in each county (*NF* and *NF200*) was obtained from USDA's 1997 Census of Agriculture.<sup>2</sup> The value of (relevant) farm production in each county (*SF*) was computed by summing county-level value data for row and forage crops, fruits and nuts, vegetables, ornamental horticulture, and forestry production (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2002). Categories included are those crops most reliant on the surveyed chemicals.

---

<sup>2</sup> Table 6: Farms, Land in Farms, and Value of Land and Buildings, and Land Use: 1997 and 1992.

**Table 1: Chemical Price Response Summary**

<i>Chemical</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Counties Included</i>	<i>Max (\$)</i>	<i>Min (\$)</i>	<i>Mean (\$)</i>	<i>STD(\$)</i>
Temik®	64	36	3.49	2.95	3.09	0.11
Round-Up®(2.5)	57	32	55	33.35	45.64	4.08
Round-Up®(bulk)	48	29	46.90	37.40	40.11	2.12
Glyfos® X-TRA (2.5)	44	30	42	19	27.95	5.98
Glyfos® X-TRA(bulk)	32	24	35.25	18.5	23.39	4.31
Prowl® 3.3 EC	63	36	34	13	18.84	2.72
Orthene®75S	40	29	17	7.5	10.39	1.51
Orhtene®90S	53	34	12	7.5	9.29	0.76
Bravo® 720	42	29	55	35	39.50	3.72
Chlorothalonil	29	23	32	55	37.75	4.35
Trilin®	27	19	21	10.65	15.96	2.23
Trifluralin HF	52	32	22.5	8.95	15.29	2.06

*Estimation Approach and Diagnostics*

The model was estimated using generalized least squares (GLS) to account for chemical-specific heteroscedasticity. That is, the model error variance was allowed to vary by chemical, but was held constant for all observations on each chemical. Diagnostic testing for firm-specific and regional heteroscedasticity found no evidence of such effects. The condition number for the model data matrix is 387, so multicollinearity is not a particular problem with this data set.

Spatial autocorrelation is a potential problem for the regression model given that the data is spatial in nature and space is an integral part of the hypotheses we wish to test. Therefore, Moran's I test was performed to test for the presence of spatial autocorrelation (Moran, 1950; Anselin and Kelejian, 1997). Moran's I test uses the residuals from an initial OLS regression on the model being tested estimation to test for spatial autocorrelation, and is defined as:

$$(2) \quad I = [ (\sum_i \sum_j w_{ij} e_i e_j) / (\sum_i \sum_j w_{ij}) ] / [(n-k)s^2/n] ,$$

where  $w_{ij}$  is a binary variable equal to one if observations  $i$  and  $j$  are “neighbors,”  $e_i$  is the  $i^{th}$  residual from the OLS regression,  $n$  is the number of observations in the data set,  $k$  is the number of estimated regressors,  $s^2$  is the standard OLS estimator of the error variance, and the summations are all from  $i$  (or  $j$ ) = 1, 2, ...,  $n$ . When spatial autocorrelation is present, Moran’s I test statistic is greater than one.

Two chemicals were tested for spatial autocorrelation: Temik® and RoundUp® UltraMax (2.5 gallon); these are the most popular chemicals and the data set contained the most observations for these two. The results of the Moran’s I test, displayed in table 2, reveal no statistical evidence in favor of spatial autocorrelation; both the test statistics are negative and the z-scores of the two test statistics are considerably below the one-tail critical value of 1.645 for a 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the GLS model is assumed free of spatial autocorrelation.

**Table 2: Results of the Moran’s I Test**

	<i>Temik®</i>	<i>RoundUp® UltraMax</i>
Moran’s I	-0.0929	-.054897
z-score	-1.2498	-0.52512

#### *Results: Statistical versus Economic Significance*

The results of the regression model estimation are shown in table 3. The key result is that both of the coefficients on the two spatial competition-related variables (*DC* and *NC15*) are statistically and economically insignificant. Thus, there does not appear to be any important aspect of spatial competition to the retail agricultural chemical market. We therefore cannot draw any conclusions about which of the three forms of spatial competition are supported by these data, since none are supported.

The coefficients on the demand-side variables are all statistically significant, but are pretty minor in terms of economic impact. Recalling that all the coefficients are elasticities (due to the ln-ln form), for example, the price elasticity with respect to the number of farms (*NF*) is 0.0822. With a t-value of over 5, this coefficient is very precisely estimated, but the economic impact is trivial. The number of farms would have to decrease by 12% to cause chemical prices to decrease by 1%. The price elasticity with respect to the number of commercial farms (*NF200*) is approximately the same magnitude, but of opposite sign with a point estimate of -0.0798. Since a possible scenario is for the total number of farms to shrink while commercial farms increase (through consolidation), one could anticipate some decrease in agricultural chemical prices over time. This makes sense if retailers need to price more competitively to attract the business of larger farms which are more likely to shop carefully given the larger expense of buying chemicals in higher quantities.

**Table 3. Estimation Results**

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	P-value
<i>DC</i>	0.0031	0.0026	0.2268
<i>NC15</i>	-0.0009	0.0023	0.7036
<i>NF</i>	0.0822	0.0160	<.0001
<i>NF200</i>	-0.0798	0.0172	<.0001
<i>SF</i>	-0.0289	0.0073	0.0001
<u>Chemical-specific intercepts</u>			
Temik	1.1641	0.0403	<.0001
RoundUp (2.5)	3.8512	0.0418	<.0001
RoundUp (bulk)	3.7243	0.0411	<.0001
Glyfos X-tra(2.5)	3.3448	0.0523	<.0001
Glyfos X-tra(bulk)	3.1741	0.0496	<.0001
Prowl	2.9622	0.0427	<.0001
Trilin	2.7998	0.0483	<.0001
Trifluralin	2.7807	0.0474	<.0001
Orthene 75S	2.3690	0.0446	<.0001
Orhtene 90S	2.2589	0.0415	<.0001
Bravo 720	3.7113	0.0420	<.0001
Chlorothalonil	3.6592	0.0435	<.0001

 $R^2 = 0.9786$ 

Condition number = 387.3

The estimated price elasticity with respect to gross farm sales (*SF*) is also statistically significant but economically insignificant. An increase in sales, assumedly linked to an increase in the total quantity of chemicals purchased, leads to a slightly lower price. This is consistent with Hotelling-Smithies and Greenhut-Ohta competition, but not with the Löschian theory. However, such evidence cannot be considered particularly strong given the small magnitude of the elasticity (point estimate of -0.0289) and the insignificance of the two spatial competition variables.

## Conclusions

The main finding of this study is the lack of spatial competition among agricultural chemical retailers, even though the average distance between retailers was less than six miles. This

surprising finding suggests that the oligopoly structure of the chemical manufacturers and distributors, combined with the manufacturers rebate programs, has given them tight control over retail prices. One policy implication of this finding is that there is little point in worrying about further consolidation within the chemical manufacturing industry as retail prices seem unlikely to rise if we moved from the current six down to, for example, four. So far, consolidation at the manufacturing stage has lowered prices by allowing high front end costs to be spread over larger sales volumes.

We also find that prices are controlled firmly enough by manufacturers and distributors that demand-side shifters do not have much impact on retail prices either. While we measured statistically significant effects of the demand-side variables included in the regression model, the economic magnitude of these effects is trivial.

## **Appendix: List of Surveyed Chemicals**

### *Temik®*

Temik® is a restricted use pesticide for the control of insects, mites and nematodes. Aventis CS is the manufacturer of this product, which has a generic, or common, name of Aldicarb. Temik® is used on peanuts, cotton, soybeans, and tobacco<sup>3</sup> at planting to control a variety of pests in the surveyed region.

### *Round-Up® UltraMax*

Round-Up® UltraMax is a popular herbicide that is used on a variety of crops in the survey area. The generic name is Glyphosphate, and has many competitors. The introduction of genetically modified crops, such as Round-Up ready cotton has greatly increased the demand of this product. Round-Up® Ultramax is a product of the Monsanto, and is sold in three different ways: 2.5-gallon containers, 30 gallon drums, and in bulk. The survey included price questions for the 2.5-gallon containers and in bulk.

### *Glyfos® X-TRA*

Glyfos® X-TRA is a popular generic herbicide, Glyphosphate, that is direct competition with Round-Up® Ultramax. It is used on the same crops and sold in the same forms: 2.5-gallon containers, 30-gallon drums, and bulk. Price was collected on 2.5-gallon containers and in bulk.

### *Prowl® 3.3 EC*

Prowl® 3.3 EC is a herbicide used on cotton, fruit & nut crops, peanuts, soybeans, and a variety of vegetable crops. The generic name is pendimethalin, and it is manufactured by the BASF Company. Prowl® 3.3 EC is sold in 2.5-gallon containers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Temik® is not labeled for tobacco use in Georgia. However, it is widely used on the crop according to many retailers.

### *Trilin®*

Trilin® is a selective herbicide for the pre-emergence of annual grasses and broadleaf weeds. Trilin® is used on a variety of crops including vegetables, soybeans, cotton, and peanuts. Trilin® is a product of the Griffin Corporation and is sold in 2.5-gallon containers.

### *Trifluralin HF*

Trifluralin HF is a product of the UAP company and is basically the same product as Trilin®. Again, the chemical is used on the same crops as Trilin® and is sold in 2.5-gallon containers.

### *Orthene® 75 S*

Orthene® 75 S is a water-soluble insecticide powder manufactured by the Valent Corporation. Orthene 75 S is composed of 75% of the active ingredient, Acephate. Orthene 75 S is used on many crops in the survey region including vegetables, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts.

### *Orthene® 90 S*

Orthene® 90 S is a stronger version of Orthene® 75 S, and is made up of 90% Acephate. Both Orthene® 75 S and 90 S are sold by the pound in a variety of packing. The surveyed packing was a 10-lb water-soluble bag.

### *Bravo® 720*

Bravo® 720 is an agricultural fungicide used mainly on vegetable and peanut crops in the surveyed region. The generic name is Chlorothalonil. Bravo® 720 is a product of ISK Biosciences Corporation and is sold in 2.5-gallon containers.

### *Chlorothalonil*

Chlorothalonil is a generic name for Bravo 720 and is manufactured by a variety of chemical companies. It is also sold in 2.5-gallon containers and is used on the same crops as Bravo® 720.

## **References**

- Anselin, L. and Kelejian, H.H., "Testing for Spatial Error Autocorrelation in the Presence of Endogenous Regressions." January 1997. Available online at: <http://www.rri.wvu.edu/wpapers/pdffiles/ivmoran.pdf>.
- Borenstein, S., and Netz, J.S., "Why Do All the Flights Leave at 8 am?: Competition and Departure-Time Differentiation in Airline Markets," *International Journal of Industrial Organization* Vol.17 No. 5 (July 1999): 611-640.

- Barry, P.J., Sotomayor, N., and L.A. Moss. "Professional Farm Manager's View on Leasing Contracts and Land Control: An Illinois Perspective." *Journal of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers*. Vol. 62 (1998-1999): 15-19.
- Capozza, D.R., and Van Order, R., "A Generalized Model of Spatial Competition." *The American Economic Review*. Vol. 68 No. 5 (December 1978): 896-908.
- Center for Agribusiness & Economic Development, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of Georgia. *The Georgia County Guide*. 2001
- Center for Agribusiness & Economic Development, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of Georgia. *The Georgia Farmgate Value Report 2001*. 2002
- Clay, Heather. "Agro Chemical Giants- Keeping track of the names." *Hivelights*. Vol. 14 No. 4 (November 2001).
- Durham, C.A., Sexton, R.J., and Ho Song, J. "Spatial Competition, Uniform Pricing, and Transportation Efficiency in the California Processing Tomato Industry." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Vol. 78 Issue 1 (February 1996): 115-125.
- Fernandez-Cornejo, J., and Jans, S. "Quality-Adjusted Price and Quantity Indices for Pesticides." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Vol. 77 Issue 3 (August 1995): 645-659.
- Fik, T.J., "Spatial Competition and Price Reporting in Retail Food Markets," *Economic Geography*, Vol. 64 Issue 1 (January 1988): 29-44.
- Fox, G. and Weersink, A., "Damage Control and Increasing Returns." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Vol. 77 Issue 1 (February 1995): 33-39.
- GRC Economics. "The Value of Fungicides to the Availability of a Healthy and Affordable Food Supply." Washington, D.C. (1989).
- Greenhut M.L., Norman, G., and Hung, C., *The Economics of Imperfect Competition: A Spatial Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Greenhut, M.L., and Otha, H., "Monopoly Output Under Alternative Spatial Pricing Techniques." *American Economic Review* Vol. 62 Issue 4 (July 1975): 705-713.
- Hotelling, Harold. "Stability in Competition." *Economic Journal*, Vol. 39 Issue 153 (March 1929):41-57.
- Knutson, R.D., Taylor, J.B., & E.G. Smith. Economic Impacts of Reduced Chemical Use. Knutson & Associates, College Station, Texas. 1990.

- Leroux, N., Wortman, M.S., and Mathias, E., “Dominant Factors Impacting the Development of Business-to-Business (B2B) E-Commerce in Agriculture.” Paper presented at the 2001 IAMA Symposium in Sydney, Australia, June 27-28, 2001.
- MacIntyre, A.A., “Why Pesticides Received Extensive Use in America: A Political Economy of Agricultural Pest Management to 1970.” *Natural Resource Journal* Vol. 27 Summer Issue (1987).
- McEwan, B., and Deen, K., “A Review of Agriculture Pesticides Pricing and Availability in Canada. University of Guelph. 1997.
- McIntosh, C.S., and Williams, A.A., “Multiproduct Product Choices and Pesticide Regulation in Georgia.” *Southern Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Vol. 24 Issue 1 (July, 1992): 135-144.
- Moran, P.A.P., “Partial and Multiple Rank Correlation.” *Biometrika* Vol. 37 Issue 1/2 (June, 1950): 26-32.
- Moss, L.A. “Who Wins and Loses and How Will E-Markets Affect Rural America?” Paper presented at the USDA Outlook Forum, Washington, DC, February, 2001.
- Norgaard, R.B., “The Economics of Improving Pesticide Use.” *Annual Review of Entomology*. Vol. 21 (1976): 45-60.
- Ohta, H., “On the Efficiency of Production Under Conditions of Imperfect Competition.” *Southern Economic Journal* Vol. 43 Issue 2 (October 1976): 1124-35.
- Pinske, J. and Slade, M.S., “Contracting in Space,” *Journal of Econometrics*. Vol. 85 Issue 1 (July 1998): 125-154.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, *Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators*. (October, 2000): Chapter 4.3.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. National Agriculture Statistics Service. *1997 Census of Agriculture—County Data*. Table 6 – Farms, Land in Farms, Value of Land and Buildings, and land Use: 1997 and 1992.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. National Agriculture Statistics Service. *Farm Computer Usage and Ownership Report*. July 2001.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. National Agriculture Statistics Service. *Farm Production Expenditures 2001 Summary*. July 2002.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. “Farm Income and Farm Production Expenses” May 2001, Table CA45, Regional Economic Information System, Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.