



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

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.

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Staff Paper P10-8
InSTePP Paper 10-04

October 2010
Revised: July 2011

Staff Paper Series

THE ECONOMIC RETURNS TO U.S. PUBLIC AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

by

Julian M. Alston, Matt A. Andersen, Jennifer S. James, and Philip G. Pardey



College of Food, Agricultural
and Natural Resource Sciences

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE ECONOMIC RETURNS TO U.S. PUBLIC AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

by

Julian M. Alston, Matt A. Andersen, Jennifer S. James, and Philip G. Pardey

The analyses and views reported in this paper are those of the author(s). They are not necessarily endorsed by the Department of Applied Economics or by the University of Minnesota.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Copies of this publication are available at <http://agecon.lib.umn.edu/>. Information on other titles in this series may be obtained from: Waite Library, University of Minnesota, Department of Applied Economics, 232 Classroom Office Building, 1994 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55108, U.S.A.

Copyright (c) 2011 by Julian M. Alston, Matthew A. Andersen, Jennifer S. James, and Philip G. Pardey. All rights reserved. Readers may make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Authorship is alphabetical. Alston is a Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, and Director of the Robert Mondavi Institute Center for Wine Economics at the University of California, Davis, and a member of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics; Andersen is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics at the University of Wyoming; James is a Professor in the Department of Agribusiness at the California Polytechnic State University; and Pardey is a Professor in the Department of Applied Economics and Director of the International Science and Technology Practice and Policy (InSTePP) Center, both at the University of Minnesota. Alston, Andersen and James are also Research Fellows at InSTePP. The authors thank Aaron Smith and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful insights, and Albert Acquaye, Jason Beddow, Connie Chan-Kang, Patricia Zambrano, and Mingxia Zhang for their excellent research assistance on various incarnations of this work going back to the mid-1990s. Thanks are due also to Dennis Unglesbee, Allen Moore, and Ed Kane of USDA CRIS, for their generous assistance with the R&D data. The work for this project was partly supported by the University of California; the University of Minnesota; the USDA's Economic Research Service, Agricultural Research Service, and CSREES National Research Initiative; and the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics.

Formerly issued as: REVISITING THE RETURNS TO U.S. PUBLIC AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH: NEW MEASURES, MODELS, RESULTS, AND INTERPRETATION

ABSTRACT

We use newly constructed state-specific data to explore the implications of common modeling choices for measures of research returns. Our results indicate that state-to-state spillover effects are important, that the R&D lag is longer than many studies have allowed, and that misspecification can give rise to significant biases. Across states, the average of the own-state benefit-cost ratios is 21:1; or 32:1 when the spillover benefits to other states are included. These ratios correspond to real internal rates of return of 9 or 10 percent per annum, much smaller than those typically reported in the literature, partly because we have corrected for a methodological flaw in computing rates of return.

Key Words: Spatial technology spillovers; knowledge stocks; R&D lags; public agricultural R&D; U.S. states

In the United States, public support for investments in agricultural R&D continues to wane in spite of consistently high reported rates of return to agricultural R&D. This apparent paradox could simply reflect government failure, but it might also reflect skepticism about the evidence. Certainly some public policymakers and some economists—ourselves among them—are skeptical about the very high rates of return reported by some studies, and “gilding the lily” might have damaged the case for public support (Alston et al. 2000).

Data limitations require the imposition of restrictive assumptions that have unknown implications for estimation bias, but upward biases may also have resulted from particular modeling choices that were not made necessary by data constraints (Alston and Pardey 2001). This paper reports the main results from a long-running project in which we set out to obtain new and improved estimates of the returns to U.S. public agricultural R&D, to evaluate the role of modeling choices versus fundamental factors in influencing the findings, and thus to provide a clearer understanding of the confidence that could be placed in the estimates.

To explore the consequences of common modeling choices and their implications for measures of research returns we make use of an uncommonly rich and detailed panel of state-level data, which we developed for this purpose. It includes annual state-specific data on agricultural productivity for each of the 48 contiguous U.S. states over the years 1949–2002, and on investments in agricultural research and extension expenditure by the federal and state governments over the years 1890–2002. The indexes of multifactor productivity (MFP) are Fisher Ideal discrete approximations to Divisia indexes that reflect a careful effort to account for variation over time and among states in the composition of the aggregates of inputs and outputs, and thereby minimize the role of index number problems. In our econometric models we pay particular attention to the specification of the research lag structure and models of spatial

spillovers but, to illustrate the role of fundamental factors, we compare the resulting estimates with simple approximations that abstract from the detail of the spatial and temporal aspects.

A more complete description of the data, models, and many of the results discussed here can be found in Alston, Andersen, James and Pardey (AAJP 2010). Beyond presenting a succinct synthesis of the main results in AAJP (2010), we extend that work in two important ways. First, we present new evidence on the time-series properties of the models, which provides additional support regarding the robustness of the results. Second, we present alternative measures of the rate of return to the investments, demonstrating why many of the previous results in the literature should be treated with skepticism.

Modeling Agricultural Research and Productivity

At the center of our empirical work is a model of state-specific productivity growth as a function of investments in agricultural research, built on foundations laid by Griliches (1964 and 1979) and Evenson (1967) among others, as reviewed by Alston, Norton and Pardey (1998) and Alston et al. (2010). Underlying the productivity patterns are changes in aggregate measures of inputs and outputs. In 2002, U.S. agriculture produced 2.6 times the quantity of output produced in 1949. It did this with marginally less aggregate inputs such that MFP grew faster than output. Our estimates indicate that output increased on average by 1.68 percent per year over the period 1949–2002, while inputs used in agriculture declined by 0.11 percent per year, so measured MFP grew by 1.78 percent per year. These averages reflect patterns of input and output growth that varied dramatically among the 48 contiguous states. Some states had both inputs and outputs growing, some had both falling, but the majority had output growing against a declining input quantity, and all had positive rates of MFP growth, which ranged from 0.84 percent per year in Wyoming to 2.48 percent per year in North Carolina over the years 1949–2002.

Investments in agricultural research and extension also evolved dramatically over the period of our analysis, with important changes both in the emphasis among federal, state, and local government and private sources of funding, and in the balance of effort among performing agencies. We use state-specific panel data on investments in publicly performed research since 1890, and in extension since 1915, to develop research and extension knowledge stocks to be used in models of productivity over the years 1949–2002. Over that period total expenditure on public research and extension grew dramatically in total but unevenly. The intensities of investments in research and extension conducted by state government institutions have become quite varied, reflecting differences among states in growth in agricultural production as well as in their investments in the creation and diffusion of knowledge.

Model Structure

We begin with a model in which agricultural productivity in every U.S. state (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) depends on past agricultural research and extension conducted by itself and every other U.S. state (a total of 48 states) and intramural research conducted by the USDA.¹ We can express this model in general terms, mathematically, as

$$(1) \quad MFP_{i,t} = f_i(\mathbf{R}_t, \mathbf{E}_t)$$

where $MFP_{i,t}$ is multifactor productivity in state i in year t , and \mathbf{R}_t is a $49 \times (L_R + 1)$ matrix in which the typical element, $R_{j,t-k}$, is the investment in public agricultural R&D made by state j (for $j = 1, \dots, 48$) or the USDA (for $j = 49$) in year $t-k$; similarly, \mathbf{E}_t is a $48 \times (L_R + 1)$ matrix in which the typical element, $E_{j,t-k}$, is the investment in public agricultural extension made by state j in year

¹ There are various ways to account for R&D activity, but with an eye to the policy implications of the results, our intent here is to evaluate the impacts of agricultural R&D on a “by performer” basis (as distinct from research measured on a “by funder” or other basis). OECD (2002) provides details on the internationally accepted standards for measuring R&D spending and performance that we followed in compiling our R&D data.

$t-k$; L_R denotes the maximum number of years over which a given investment can affect MFP ; and k varies between zero and L_R .

To implement this model we have to define the knowledge stock variables, which requires jointly defining the spillover relationships (which allow for research conducted in one state to affect productivity in another) and the research lag distributions (which summarize the temporal relationship between spending and productivity). Even if the research and extension lag lengths were modest they would imply an impossibly large number of research effects to estimate, so some restrictions must be imposed, as has been long recognized in studies of returns to R&D. Griliches (1979) suggested that

“... it is probably best *to assume* a functional form for the lag distribution on the basis of prior knowledge and general considerations and not to expect the data to answer such fine questions. That is, a “solution” to the multicollinearity problem is a moderation of our demands on the data—our desires have to be kept within the bounds of our means.” (Griliches 1979, p. 106, emphasis in original).

In our particular setting, the potential problems of multicollinearity and identification are many times greater than in the typical study using a single time series since we have allowed for 48 states with interstate spillovers in every direction.

Previous econometric studies of effects of agricultural research on productivity, or rates of return to research, have almost invariably imposed some structure (often implicitly) to reduce the number of lag weights to be estimated, and to impose other prior beliefs on the shape or length of the lag (see Alston et al. 2000 for details). Like most previous studies, and as advocated by Huffman and Evenson (2006b), we impose some restrictions on the lag distribution, to reduce the number of parameters to be estimated. First, as a baseline model we

assume that agricultural research and extension expenditures (at least, at the margin) are fungible and can be combined into a single aggregate R&E variable to which the same lag distribution would apply.² Second, we assume that the same-shaped lag distribution applies to a state's R&E, regardless of who is adopting the results. Thus, productivity in each of the 48 states depends on 49 state-specific knowledge stocks (one own-state research stock, 47 other-state research stocks, and one federal research stock). Third, we assume that same lag shape applies to all the states, within a given model. However, we do estimate the parameters that define the shape and effective length of the lag, and in that sense our approach is less restrictive than others that simply imposed a specific distribution a priori (such as the trapezoidal lag that was introduced by Huffman and Evenson 1993 and applied by many others since). In addition, we explore the implications of relaxing several of the baseline modeling assumptions.

Consequently, in the baseline model, the relationship between spending on research and extension and the knowledge stock produced within each state can be characterized using a single lag distribution, defined in terms of (a) an overall lag length, (b) a gestation lag, (c) a functional form (we used a gamma distribution), and (d) within the functional form, parameters that determine the shape of the distribution, as follows:³

² This assumption may appear rather strong, but some aggregation assumptions are necessary and are always made in work of this nature. The research and extension variables themselves represent aggregates over different types of activities having different lagged impacts on productivity (ranging from relatively basic research to applied outreach and advisory services, a significant share of which may have no relationship to production agriculture, and across different fields of science that may have more or less relevance to production agriculture). We examine the empirical implications of this assumption later in the paper when testing the robustness of our preferred model.

³ Our analysis is not confined to this baseline model and its particular assumptions. Importantly, unlike previous studies that simply impose assumptions about the research and extension lag, we examine the implications of alternatives, including the arbitrary and untested imposition of a particular, short lag distribution shape for extension combined with a specific trapezoidal lag distribution for research, as used by Huffman and Evenson (1993) and others. The results, discussed in section 5, did not especially favor the option of separate lags for extension, while serving to illustrate the implications of that choice for the estimated rates of return and the difficulty of discriminating among such alternatives using the kinds of data that are available.

$$(2) \quad SK_{i,t} = \sum_{k=0}^{L_R} b_k (R_{i,t-k} + E_{i,t-k}),$$

where L_R is the total lag length, and the b_k parameters are the lag weights that are defined by the alternative lag distributions, and these weights sum to one:

$$(3) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{L_R} b_k = 1.$$

Gamma Lag Distribution Model

The research lag weights (b_k) implied by the gamma distribution are:

$$(4) \quad b_k = \frac{(k-g+1)^{(\delta/1-\delta)} \lambda^{(k-g)}}{\sum_{k=0}^{L_R} [(k-g+1)^{(\delta/1-\delta)} \lambda^{(k-g)}]} \text{ for } L_R \geq k > g; \text{ otherwise } b_k = 0;$$

where g is the gestation lag before research begins to affect productivity, and δ and λ are parameters that define the shape of the distribution ($0 \leq \delta < 1$ and $0 \leq \lambda < 1$). Here, we assume a gestation lag of $g = 0$ years, but several distributions defined by combinations of δ and λ that we use imply weights very close to zero for small values of k , resulting in a longer effective gestation lag. In addition, based on our own previous experience with similar data and models (see, for example, Pardey and Craig 1989) and some limited pretesting as a part of the present study, as well as a predisposition to allow for “generously” long lags, we allow for $L_R = 50$ years. The resulting lag distribution allows for positive contributions to the current stock from up to 50 years of past expenditures on research and extension, but particular values of λ and δ can correspond to a pattern of very low b_k parameters, after a time, that imply a much shorter effective maximum lag. Hence, the research knowledge stocks are defined as

$$(5) \quad SK_{i,t} = \sum_{k=0}^{L_R} b_k (R_{i,t-k} + E_{i,t-k}) = \sum_{k=0}^{L_R} \left((k+1)^{(\delta/1-\delta)} \lambda^{(k)} (R_{i,t-k} + E_{i,t-k}) \right) \Bigg/ \sum_{k=0}^{L_R} \left[(k+1)^{(\delta/1-\delta)} \lambda^{(k)} \right].$$

Spillover Weights Based on Similarity of Commodity Composition

Previous studies have imposed various (largely untested) assumptions to define the interstate spillover impacts of agricultural research and extension investments. As discussed by Alston (2002) and AAJP (2010), many studies simply ignored spatial spillovers, attributing all state-specific impacts to own-state investments, while those studies that have allowed for interstate spillovers have generally defined spillover potential based on physical proximity. Here, as a departure from those previous approaches we use a measure of spillover potential based on the similarity of the commodity composition of output between pairs of states, and we evaluate the implications of this assumption for results, compared with the main alternatives.⁴

We assume a linear state-to-state spillover relationship, such that

$$(6) \quad SS_{i,t} = \sum_{j \neq i}^{49} \omega_{ij} SK_{j,t}$$

where ω_{ij} is a spillover coefficient, a weight that measures the contribution of a unit of the knowledge stock created in state j to the knowledge stock used in state i . To define the spillover coefficients, which measure the state-to-state spillover potential of agricultural research and extension, we borrow and adapt an approach introduced by Jaffe (1986) to measure inter-firm or inter-industry spillover effects. The variant used by Jaffe (1989) is closest to what we use here. Jaffe (1989) used characteristics of the patents obtained by firms to define a measure of technological closeness among them. We use the output characteristics of agriculture in the different states—representing both agroecological factors and other relevant economic

⁴ The notion here is that research spillovers among states producing similar or identical commodity portfolios are likely to be more pronounced than among states producing dissimilar or distinct sets of agricultural outputs. Thus, two predominantly dairy production states are more likely to be doing research of relevance to each other than if one state produced only milk and the other only oranges. To be sure, dairy (and other) production details vary from state to state for a host of reasons, but it is unlikely that the dairy research in New York has no application to dairy production in Minnesota or California, as would be implied by the geographical proximity restriction incorporated in the approach used by Huffman and Evenson (1993 and 2006a), for example.

factors—to define the technological “closeness” of states to one another. The vector of output (value) shares $f_i = (f_{i1}, \dots, f_{iM})$ locates state i in M -dimensional technological space. The corresponding measure of technological spillover potential is defined as:

$$(7) \quad \omega_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M f_{im} f_{jm}}{\left(\sum_{m=1}^M f_{im}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M f_{jm}^2 \right)^{1/2}},$$

where f_{im} is the value of production of output m as a share of the total value of agricultural output in state i such that these shares fall between zero and one and sum to one (i.e., there are a total of M different outputs across the 48 states, and $0 \leq f_{im} \leq 1$ and $\sum_m f_{im} = 1$).⁵ To define corresponding “spillover coefficients” for measuring the state-specific impacts of USDA research stocks (i.e., $\omega_{iF} = \omega_{i49}$, for $i = 1, \dots, 48$), we apply equation (7) to index the similarity of each state’s vector of output shares and the national vector of output shares.⁶ Then, given this specification of the state-to-state spillover relationships, in the regression model instead of 47 individual other-state knowledge stocks and a federal knowledge stock, we include a single research spillover stock tailored for each state, to represent the aggregation of those 48 spillover effects in that state.

⁵ A referee raised several questions about the structure and interpretation of these coefficients related to whether they may vary over time and, as a related point, the direction of causality (if agricultural R&D affects production patterns then the weights are endogenous). The relevant issues are too many to deal with in the space available here, but many of them are discussed in some detail in AAJP (2010). In the present application, we use the average value of ω_{ij} for the sample period, which is simply a measure of the overall similarity of the agricultural output mix between states, as a proxy for the state-to-state spillover potential of agricultural research and extension. We compare the model using this specification with alternative specifications similar to those typically used in the literature.

⁶ Paraphrasing Jaffe (1989, p. 88), in a sense, ω_{ij} measures the degree of overlap of f_i and f_j . The numerator will be large when states i and j have very similar output mixes. The denominator normalizes the measure to be one when f_i and f_j are identical. Hence, ω_{ij} will be zero for pairs of states with no overlap in their output mix and one for pairs of states with an identical output mix; and for the in-between cases, $0 < \omega_{ij} < 1$. It is conceptually similar to a correlation coefficient. Like a correlation coefficient, it is completely symmetric: $\omega_{ij} = \omega_{ji}$; and $\omega_{ii} = 1$.

Econometric Estimation and Results

Assuming a logarithmic functional form and augmenting the model to include state-specific fixed effects and a variable to reflect the effect of weather, the model becomes

$$(8) \quad \ln MFP_{i,t} = \alpha_{0i} + \alpha_{Ri} \ln SK_{i,t} + \alpha_{Si} \ln SS_{i,t} + \gamma_i \ln PRC_{i,t} + e_{i,t}.$$

The variables are defined as follows: (a) $MFP_{i,t}$ is a Fisher ideal index (i.e., a discrete approximation to a Divisia index) of multifactor agricultural productivity in state i in year t ; (b) $SK_{i,t}$ is the own-state stock of knowledge in state i in year t from own-state spending on publicly performed agricultural research and extension over the previous 50 years, in real terms; (c) $SS_{i,t}$ is the state-specific spillover stock of knowledge in state i in year t from spending on agricultural research and extension conducted by federal and other-state public institutions over the previous 50 years, in real terms, constructed using the same lag distribution parameters as for $SK_{i,t}$; (d) $PRC_{i,t}$ is a state-specific pasture and rangeland condition index, measured in September for each year, and published by the Economics, Statistics, and Market Information System (ESMIS) branch of the USDA; and (e) $e_{i,t}$ is a residual, with an i.i.d. structure. Simple summary statistics are presented in table 1.

[Table 1. *Simple Summary Statistics, Data for the Productivity Model*]

Notably, the specification in equation (8) does not include any variables to represent the stocks of knowledge from private agricultural research conducted in the United States or internationally, public agricultural research conducted in other countries, or nonagricultural research. The reason for excluding these variables is that appropriate data in suitably long time series simply are not available. The omission of these variables could lead to biases in the estimated effects of the included knowledge stocks if the omitted stocks are correlated with the included stocks. However, private research effects are largely embodied in inputs and, to the

extent that the benefits are captured through royalties or the equivalent, they might not have much impact on measured productivity compared with an equivalent public research achievement provided to farmers and others for free. In addition, our adjustments for changes in input and output quality will have dealt with some of these impacts. This view is supported to some extent by some recent work by Huffman and Evenson (2006b).⁷ Even so, we are conscious of the potentially biasing effects of omitting private agricultural R&D (as well as omitting U.S. nonagricultural research and international research), and we explore this issue in later sections.

The models were estimated using various estimation procedures in STATA 10.0 with version 4 of the InSTePP Production Accounts as described by Pardey, Andersen, Craig, and Alston (2009).⁸ We used a type of grid-search procedure, in which we assigned values for the parameters of the gamma lag distribution (λ and δ), then constructed the knowledge stock variables using these parameters along with the expenditures on research and extension, and the spillover coefficients (ω_{ij}), and then estimated the model using these constructed stocks.⁹ By repeating this procedure using different values for λ and δ , we were able to search for the values of these parameters that, jointly with the estimated values for the other parameters, would best fit the data. Combining the following eight possible values for both λ and δ (0.60, 0.65, 0.70, 0.75,

⁷ Most studies of the effects of public agricultural research on productivity have not incorporated an explicit measure of private research. In a significant and rare exception, Huffman and Evenson (2006b) attempted to account for private research effects in an analysis using U.S. state-level data (see, also, Huffman and Evenson 1993, 2006a). In the absence of suitably long time series of private research expenditures, they used state-specific production weights applied to four classes of commodity-specific patent data, to define state-specific annual flows of private research outputs, which they aggregated into state-specific stocks by applying trapezoidal timing weights over a 19-year period and summing. The resulting measure of “private agricultural research capital” did not make a statistically significant contribution to either of the productivity models that Huffman and Evenson (2006b) reported.

⁸ Version 4 of the InSTePP Production Accounts represents a revised and updated version of the data used by Acquaye, Alston, and Pardey (2003) and originally developed and used by Craig and Pardey (1996). Pardey, Andersen, Craig, and Alston (2009) provide further details on the construction of these data, which are presented and discussed in AAJP (2010).

⁹ This approach of estimating productivity models with pre-constructed research knowledge stocks is standard in much of the relevant previous work. Our important departure in this context from most of the previous work is to search across the range of possibilities for the lag distribution used to construct that stock, and test amongst them, rather than simply impose one.

0.80, 0.85, 0.90, 0.95), a fixed maximum lag (50 years in most cases), and no gestation lag, yields a total of 64 possible combinations. A very wide range of shapes and effective lag lengths are encompassed by the range of parameter values tried. We initially thought we might conduct a further search over a finer grid, but upon review of our econometric results with the 64 lag distributions, we concluded that it would not be informative to do so because the top-ranked models were nearly indistinguishable.

The base model treats state-specific research and extension symmetrically, such that the same lag weights and spillover coefficients apply to both research and extension. This model was estimated using ordinary least squares with state-specific intercepts, which is a “fixed effects” (FE) panel data estimator, for each of the 64 lag distributions.¹⁰ Table 2 summarizes the main results for the highest-ranked eight models, arranged in rank order according to goodness-of-fit (SSE) criteria, highest to lowest from left to right. The best-fitting model was obtained with values for $\lambda = 0.70$ and $\delta = 0.90$ implying a peak lag weight at year 24, as seen in Figure 1.¹¹ Among the models in this table, the shape of the lag distribution was fairly similar across the top-ranked models compared with other models that did not fit as well. The peak lag varied somewhat but the implied values for the elasticities of *MFP* with respect to the various knowledge stocks were very similar across the eight models—about 0.32 for own-state research and about 0.24 for spillins.

[Table 2. *Summary of Results for the Base Model, Top-Ranked Models*]

[Figure 1. *Gamma and Trapezoidal lag distributions*]

¹⁰ We established that a fixed-effects estimator was preferred to a random-effects estimator using Hausman’s (1978) specification test for fixed or random effects. The results are presented along with additional diagnostic tests in AAJP (2010, Table 10-4).

¹¹ Figure 1 also shows the trapezoidal lag structure used by Huffman and Evenson (1993) and many others, plus a parameterization of our gamma distribution that closely approximates this specific trapezoidal form.

Model Diagnostics

The analysis generally resulted in highly significant coefficient estimates; however, we also sought to verify the consistency of the estimates after controlling for some additional econometric issues. Specifically, we were concerned with autocorrelation of the residuals and unit roots in the state-specific *MFP* series, which can result in spurious parameter estimates. To address this concern, we re-estimated the models in first-difference form (i.e., with all of the variables specified in logarithmic differences and absent an intercept term). In most cases first-differencing resulted in similarly shaped preferred lag distributions, as well as similar estimates of elasticities for a given lag distribution shape, compared with the base models.

Heteroskedasticity and contemporaneous correlation were not of primary concern given the large sample size, the asymptotic properties of the estimators, and the statistical significance of the coefficient estimates. However, we also estimated the full grid of lag distributions using a Feasible Generalized Least Squares (FGLS) procedure that corrected for heteroskedasticity within states, contemporaneous correlation among states, and first-order autocorrelation of the residuals. The estimated elasticities from the FGLS estimation procedures were very similar to those from the FE regressions presented in table 1. For example, in the base model with the preferred lag distribution the elasticity of *MFP* with respect to the own-state knowledge stock was 0.311 using a FGLS regression procedure and 0.322 using a FE regression procedure, while the corresponding elasticities with respect to spillover knowledge stocks were 0.241 and 0.235 respectively. Given the pattern of similarities of the estimates in the FGLS models to those in the base FE models, we were fairly certain that any autocorrelation of the residuals and issues of

unit roots related to the state-specific MFP series were not substantially affecting the consistency of the FE estimates.¹²

Time-Series Properties of the Data

We also performed a formal statistical analysis of the time-series properties of the variables and a check of the consistency of the parameter estimates. A visual inspection of the data reveals that the series appear to be highly nonstationary. However, if the variables in the analysis are nonstationary, but share the same order of integration (e.g., $I(1)$ behavior), then they might approach the same stochastic trend. In this case a linear combination of the variables could form a long-run equilibrium relationship that is stationary, and a linear regression of MFP on the research stock variables would result in consistent parameter estimates. Indeed, if the series were $I(1)$ and cointegrated then the estimates would be superconsistent. Stock (1987) showed that such estimates converge to their probability limits faster than least squares estimates in stationary time series models.

To establish whether our models produce consistent parameter estimates we proceeded by first examining the data for the presence of a unit root, and then establishing if a cointegrating relationship exists between the variables. As a starting point we applied augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests on a state-by-state basis for the three variables of interest, $\ln MFP_{it}$, $\ln SK_{it}$, and $\ln SS_{it}$. Most of the state-specific data indicated the presence of a unit root, with the $\ln MFP_{it}$ series indicating a unit root in 41 of the 48 states, $\ln SK_{it}$ in 36, and $\ln SS_{it}$ in all 48.¹³

Given the evidence of unit roots in these data, it is possible that a long-run equilibrium relationship exists between the series; therefore, a test of a cointegrating relationship between the

¹² Additional comparisons of alternative estimators and models, as well as detailed diagnostic testing of the econometric models are provided in AAJP (2010, Chapter 10).

¹³ In each ADF test we set $\alpha = 5$ percent and included an intercept, trend, and three lags of the dependent variable.

variables is warranted. Westerlund (2007) developed a test of cointegration in panel data that produces four test statistics, G_α , G_τ , P_α , and P_τ .¹⁴ Consider the following error-correction model with one lag of the dependent variable and one covariate:

$$(9) \quad \Delta y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_{i1} \Delta y_{it-1} + \delta_{i0} \Delta x_{it} + \delta_{i1} \Delta x_{it-1} + \beta_i (y_{it-1} - \delta_i x_{it-1}) + u_{it}.$$

The parameter, β_i provides an estimate of the speed of adjustment towards the long-run equilibrium, and if $\beta_i = 0$ then there is no error correction, and thus no cointegrating relationship between the variables. The G_α and G_τ test statistics begin with a weighted average of the state-specific β_i parameters and their t -ratios, and test the null hypothesis that $\beta_i = 0$ for all i versus the alternative that $\beta_i < 0$ for at least one i . The P_α and P_τ test statistics pool the sample over all the states, and test the null hypothesis that $\beta_i = 0$ for all i versus the alternative that $\beta_i = \beta < 0$ for all i . If the observations are correlated across cross-sectional units (states), robust critical values can be obtained through a bootstrapping procedure. Table 3 reproduces the panel data tests of cointegration developed by Westerlund (2007, Table 7) including the group-mean, G_α and G_τ , as well as the pooled, P_α and P_τ , test statistics. Panel (a) of table 3 shows the test results between $\ln MFP_{it}$ and $\ln SK_{it}$, and Panel (b) between $\ln MFP_{it}$ and $\ln SS_{it}$.

[Table 3: *Results from Panel Data Tests of Cointegration*]

The null hypothesis of these tests is no cointegration between the variables. The results of the Westerlund tests generally indicate that a cointegrating relationship exists between MFP and the research stock variables. The only results indicating rejection of a cointegrating relation are the bootstrapped versions of G_α and P_α , but these results are not as robust as the τ au versions

¹⁴ See also Persyn and Westerlund (2008) for additional details about this test and its implementation in STATA.

of the tests, which indicate a cointegrating relationship does exist.¹⁵ Furthermore, the 48-state average value of the estimated speed-of-adjustment parameters (i.e., the $\hat{\beta}_i$ parameters) is equal to -0.71 in the Panel a results, and -0.83 in the Panel b results.¹⁶ The test results in table 3 provide convincing evidence that the models specified in logarithms produce superconsistent parameter estimates. Finally, the formal statistical test results are supported by the empirical observation that our models specified either in logarithmic or growth rate form produce similar results in terms of the estimated elasticities.

Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios—Base-Model Results

We used the estimated productivity model to compute the *marginal* benefit associated with various hypothetical (counterfactual) changes in research investments. Specifically, we computed the state-specific and national benefits from a small (one thousand dollar) change in 1950 in expenditures (a) on research by a particular state, (b) on extension by a particular state, or (c) on USDA intramural research by the federal government. In computing the national benefits, we took into account that both federal and state-specific research investments have effects on all the states.¹⁷

The gross annual research benefits (*GARB*) to state i in year t were computed using the following approximation:

$$(10) \quad GARB_{i,t} = \Delta \ln MFP_{i,t} V_{i,t}$$

¹⁵ Based on Monte-Carlo simulations assuming cross-sectional dependence, Westerlund (2007, p. 730) reported that “At one end of the scale, we have the G_t and P_t tests, which actually appear to be quite robust to the cross-sectional correlation.”

¹⁶ These results pertain to the models that do not correct for contemporaneous correlation among the states.

¹⁷ This explicit simulation approach is less prone to error or misinterpretation than using an analytically derived approximation to a rate of return, as some studies have done.

where $V_{i,t}$ is the real (in year 2000 dollars) value of agricultural production in state i in year t , and $\Delta \ln MFP_{i,t}$ is the proportional change in estimated agricultural productivity in state i in year t , associated with the simulated one thousand dollar increase in spending in 1950.¹⁸ Since the variables are in logarithms, the simulated proportional change in MFP is simply equal to $\Delta \ln MFP = \ln MFP^1 - \ln MFP^0$, where the superscript 0 denotes the predicted $\ln MFP$ given the actual research expenditure and the 1 denotes the predicted $\ln MFP$ with the increased (counterfactual) expenditure. Then, the present value in the year 2002 of benefits accruing to state i (PVB_i) was computed using a (correspondingly real) discount rate of $r = 3$ percent per year.

$$(11) \quad PVB_i = \sum_{t=1950}^{2002} GARB_{i,t} (1+r)^{2002-t} = \sum_{t=1950}^{2002} \Delta \ln MFP_{i,t} V_{i,t} (1+r)^{2002-t}$$

The benefit-cost ratio for that one thousand dollar investment is given by dividing the present value of benefits by the present value of the costs— $PVC = \$1,000 (1+r)^{53}$ ($= \$4,650$ for $r = 3$ percent). Hence, marginal benefit-cost ratios (or benefits per dollar of additional expenditure) were computed as $B_i^h / C_i^h = PVB_i^h / \$4,650$, where the superscript h denotes which of (a) one of the 48 state-specific research expenditures, (b) one of the 48 state-specific extension expenditures, or (c) federal research expenditures, was increased by \$1,000 in 1950 to generate the stream of benefits being evaluated.

¹⁸ This approximation is likely to be reasonably valid as a measure of the total benefits for a small research-induced change in production, as a result of a comparatively small change in the research investment. However, to the extent that these marginal changes in research spending induce price changes, the benefits will be distributed between producers and consumers, depending on the elasticities of supply and demand, and this might imply differences in the spatial distribution of benefits, compared with our analysis that implicitly presumes that all of the benefits are enjoyed within the innovating state (i.e., accruing to producers or assuming an absence of interstate and international trade). This “distortion” will itself be unevenly distributed. Some states produce commodities for which the United States as a whole, let alone an individual state, does not appreciably influence the world price; but California, for instance, significantly influences world prices for a substantial share of its production, and a sizable share of its production is consumed in other states. This means there are greater spillouts of California’s research benefits than for most other states, driven by price changes, which we have not accounted for here.

We computed marginal benefit-cost ratios for increases in investments in research conducted by any of the 48 State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAESs) or by the USDA itself.¹⁹ Table 4 summarizes the benefit-cost ratios in terms of the regional averages (representing the simple average of the entries for the states within each region), the minimum, maximum, and simple average across the 48 states, and state-specific entries for some selected states (California, Minnesota, and Wyoming) for the base model (the top-ranked model described in column 1 of table 1). In table 4, for each state and for each region, the entries in columns 1 and 2 are measures of the benefits, per dollar of expenditure, accruing to that state (column 1, the own-state benefits) and the nation as a whole (column 2, both the own-state benefits and the spillover benefits to the other 47 states) from an increase in state-specific research spending; column 3 shows the benefits accruing to each state, or region, or the country as a whole from an increase in USDA intramural research expenditures.²⁰ All of these figures are in common terms, expressing real, marginal benefits per dollar invested (associated with a small change in expenditure in 1950).

[Table 4. *Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios, Base Model Results*]

Within a row in table 4, comparing columns 1 and 2 we can compare the own-state payoff to that state from investing in research and extension versus the payoff to the nation as a

¹⁹ Here SAES research is used as a short-hand for the funds (from all sources) spent on research undertaken by the SAESs and selected other cooperating institutions in the same state. Thus, for each state we included research spending by the SAESs (including the 1890 colleges) and the state-specific veterinary medicine schools. We excluded research spending by the state-specific forestry schools (for symmetry with the coverage of our agricultural productivity series) and, likewise, also omitted forestry-related research spending from our intramural USDA series. The cooperating state institutions report their expenditures to USDA, CRIS on a voluntary basis, and so the readily obtainable data are neither complete nor reported in a consistent fashion (from year to year and among states). We did a considerable amount of work to clean up erroneous and sometimes large reporting problems with the CRIS data for these state-specific cooperating institutions. The extension series is an estimate of total funding (from all sources) for state cooperative extension work obtained from a variety of published and unpublished sources. See Alston et al. (2010, pp. 229-236) for more details.

²⁰ Because the base model treats state-specific research and extension symmetrically, the own-state benefit-cost ratio for SAES research in any state is the same as the own-state benefit-cost ratio for extension; the same is true for the national benefit-cost ratios for state government expenditures on research and extension.

whole; the difference between these two is the spillover benefit per dollar. This comparison indicates the magnitude of the distortion in incentives for a state to conduct the quantity and mixture of agricultural research that will generate the greatest national payoff, if it attaches no value to interstate spillouts of its research results. In California, for instance, the marginal own-state payoff is \$33.3 per dollar and the marginal national payoff is \$43.4 per dollar; for Minnesota, the corresponding figures are \$40.6 and \$55.4 per dollar; for Wyoming, \$12.7 and \$23.6 per dollar.²¹

The own-state and national benefit-cost ratios vary considerably among states. The own-state benefit-cost ratio for state research and extension ranges from 2.4:1 to 57.8:1, around an average of 21.0:1. Similarly, the national benefit cost-ratios range from 9.9:1 to 69.2:1, around an average of 32.1:1. The spillover benefits are relatively constant across the states and thus variation in the own-state benefits drives most of the inter-state differences in national benefits from SAES research and extension. Hence, spillovers typically represent a smaller share of the total benefits in those states where own-state benefits are comparatively large. Spillover benefits to other states are worth \$6–\$16 per dollar spent on research; and in some states—especially states having smaller agricultural sectors—the spillover benefits account for the majority of the national benefits. USDA intramural research yielded a national benefit-cost ratio of 17.5:1, generally lower than the national benefit-cost ratio for research and extension conducted by states.

²¹ Rounding to the nearest whole dollar arguably conveys the appropriate degree of precision of these estimates, but we report them here and elsewhere in the text to one decimal place to facilitate cross referencing with the relevant table.

Effects of Alternative Specification Choices

We tried a range of variations in the model specification, including: (a) different functional forms for the model (linear rather than logarithmic, and estimated in first-differences or growth rates rather than in levels), (b) differential treatment of the lag structure for extension compared with research (including a four-year geometric lag for extension rather than the 50-year gamma lag as used for research, with or without allowing interstate spillovers of extension effects), (c) a different lag distribution shape (a 35-year trapezoidal lag model, as used by Huffman and Evenson 1993 rather than a 50-year gamma lag model), (d) different specifications of the spillover relationship (including models with no spillovers or spillovers based on proximity according to USDA regions rather than our model based on the similarity of commodity composition), and (e) alternative restrictions on the maximum lag length for research. Combining all of these variations implied a large number of alternative specifications to be estimated and compared. Based on an evaluation of the statistical performance of the models and other implications, we generally favor the base model, in logarithms, over all the alternatives. The specification choice that had the most profound implications for the estimates was the choice of a linear versus logarithmic functional form, and our statistical tests clearly favored the logarithmic specification, which has been the standard choice in published work.

In table 5 we present the results from a selection of alternative models, summarized in terms of the own-state and national benefits from research and extension conducted by individual states, and the national benefit from USDA intramural research. In each case, as appropriate, we present the results using the best-fitting gamma distribution for the particular model specification. Across all the models summarized in table 5, some consistent patterns emerge in the estimates. First, the different models imply a range of estimates for the social benefit-cost

ratio for USDA intramural research, but in every model the ratio is well greater than 1.0. Second, in every case the national benefit-cost ratios for SAES research are well greater than 1.0 in every state, and the average values across the 48 states are quite large. Third, the national benefit-cost ratios for SAES research are large relative to the own-state benefit-cost ratios. In all but two of the models (the linear model in levels or in first-difference form), the marginal own-state benefit cost ratio was greater than 1.0 in every state, and the average value across the 48 states was much greater than 1.0 in every model. The different models do imply very different ranges of estimates of benefit-cost ratios for SAES research among the states, but the overall range is much smaller when we leave out the clearly mis-specified models that were included for illustrative purposes.

[Table 5. *Effects of Specification Choice on Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios*

The implication of these results is that specification choices do influence the results, but not in ways that change the primary messages: (a) the marginal social benefits from agricultural research and extension are generally very large relative to the costs, though the benefit-cost ratios vary among states systematically depending on the characteristics of the states, and (b) the spillover benefits are an important component of the total benefits, such that the national benefits are much greater than the own-state benefits from SAES research and extension, with the implication that individual states can be expected to underinvest in these activities from a national perspective. If accurate, these high own-state and even higher national benefit-cost ratios represent evidence of past underinvestment by both the state and federal governments in public agricultural research.

Credibility of Results

Our measures of benefit-cost ratios are large, and it is natural to be skeptical. One way to address that skepticism is to set aside the complex models and simply compute the value of the growth in agricultural productivity and compare it with the cost of agricultural research. In this section we present simple measures of this nature, which abstract from the issues of spatial spillovers and R&D lags that were central to our econometric analysis.

The Value of Productivity Growth

Over the period 1949–2002, our index of MFP more than doubled, from 100 in 1949 to about 257 in 2002, and if aggregate input had been held constant at the 1949 quantities, output would have increased by a factor of 2.6:1. Of the actual output in 2002, only 39 percent (i.e., $100/257 = 0.39$) could be accounted for by conventional inputs using 1949 technology, holding productivity constant. The remaining 61 percent is accounted for by economies of scale along with improvements in infrastructure, inputs, and other technological changes. Hence, of the total production value, worth \$173.3 billion in 2002, only 39 percent or \$67.3 billion could be accounted for by conventional inputs using 1949 technology, and the remaining \$106.0 billion is attributable to the factors that gave rise to improved productivity. Among these factors is new technology, developed and adopted as a result of agricultural research and extension.

The actual value of agricultural output (AV_t) can be divided into two parts: (a) one representing what the value of output would have been, given the actual input quantities, if productivity had not grown since 1949—i.e., hypothetical value, $HV_t = AV_t * (100 / MFP_t)$; and (b) the other, a residual representing the value of additional output that is attributable to productivity growth—i.e., residual value, $RV_t = AV_t - HV_t = AV_t * (MFP_t - 100) / MFP_t$. As productivity increases over time, the share of the value of production that is attributable to

productivity growth increases. Among the 48 states, the share of the total value of agricultural output in 2002 attributable to growth in productivity since 1949 averaged 58 percent but ranged from as low as 36 percent (Wyoming) to as high as 79 percent (Mississippi).

To summarize the stream of values of agricultural output attributable to productivity improvements, the yearly residual values, RV_t (defined above) were expressed in constant (2000) dollars. The deflated values were compounded at a real interest rate of 3 percent per annum and evaluated in the year 2002. The resulting stream of values of agricultural output attributable to productivity improvements is equivalent to a one-time payment of more than \$7.4 trillion in 2002, an enormous benefit from improved agricultural productivity in the United States during the post-WWII period.

Approximate Benefit-Cost Ratios

We compared the value of productivity gains since 1949 compounded forward over 54 years to 2002, against the expenditures on agricultural research and extension during 1929–1982, compounded forward to 2002. Both costs and benefits were converted into real terms using the GDP price deflator and accumulated forward to 2002 using a real discount rate of 3 percent per annum.

The simple ratios of approximate benefits in 2002 to approximate costs in 2002 are biased estimates of the true benefit-cost ratios for several reasons. First, the existence of long R&D lags mean that we have left out some of the relevant costs (research expenditures prior to 1929 will have contributed to productivity growth between 1949 and 2002) and some of the relevant benefits (research expenditures between 1949 and 1982 will generate benefits for many years after 2002). Depending on the pattern of benefits and costs over time and the effects of discounting, these two sources of bias could be offsetting. However, given the generally rising

pattern of research expenditures and the annual flows of benefits from productivity gains, we would expect the effect of the understatement of benefits to outweigh the effect of the understatement of costs, biasing the benefit-cost ratios down on balance. Second, a significant share, perhaps as much as half of the total benefits may be attributable to private and rest-of-world research. Third, spillover effects mean that some of a state's productivity growth will be attributable to expenditures by other states and the federal government; conversely, some of the national benefits from a state's research expenditures will accrue as productivity gains in other states. In estimates at the regional level, the distortions associated with omitting state-to-state spillovers will be much smaller, and in estimates at the national level they will be absent.

In table 6 we compare estimates of approximate *average* benefit-cost ratios with the preferred estimates of *marginal* social benefit-cost ratios derived from the econometric estimation. Columns 1 and 2 show the estimates of marginal private and social benefit-cost ratios from the econometric model (as in table 4), while columns 3 and 4 show the approximate measures, comparing benefits over 1949–2002 with costs over 1929–1982, and allowing for either 100 percent or only 50 percent of the total benefits to be attributed to the public agricultural research and extension expenditures included in the measure of cost. The approximate measure of the national benefit-cost ratio could be as high as 25.6 (the upper bound with 100 percent attribution, in column 3) or as low as 12.8 (our lower bound with 50 percent attribution, in column 4). In column 3, the corresponding upper-bound estimates of regional benefit-cost ratios range from 18.1 to 63.6; the state-specific benefit-cost ratios range from 5.4 to 77.7, and the simple average of these 48 estimates is 30.4. In column 4, the corresponding lower-bound estimates of regional benefit-cost ratios range from 9.0 to 31.8; the state-specific benefit-cost ratios range from 2.7 to 38.8 and the simple average of these 48 estimates is 15.2.

The estimates of marginal social benefit-cost ratios in column 2 are remarkably similar to the estimates of approximate average benefit-cost ratios with 100 percent attribution in column 3, while the estimates of state-specific (private) marginal benefit-cost ratios in column 1 are more comparable to the approximate average benefit-cost ratios with 50 percent attribution in column 4.

[Table 6: *Benefit-Cost Ratios – Approximations versus Econometric Estimates*]

Recalibrating Rates of Return to Agricultural R&D

We prefer to use benefit-cost ratios but the preponderance of precedent literature reports internal rates of returns. Having conducted a meta-analysis of 292 studies that reported estimates of returns to agricultural R&D, Alston et al. (2000, p. 55, Table 12) reported an overall mean internal rate of return for their sample of 1,852 estimates of 81.3 percent per annum, with a mode of 40 percent, and a median of 44.3 percent. After dropping some outliers and incomplete observations, they conducted regression analysis using a sample of 1,128 estimates with a mean of 64.6 percent, a mode of 28 percent, and a median of 42.0 percent. The main mass of the distribution of internal rates of return reported in the literature is between 20 and 80 percent per annum.²² Other reviews of the literature may not have covered the same studies or done so in the same ways, but nevertheless reached similar general conclusions—for instance, Evenson (2002), and Fuglie and Heisey (2007). In a recent report, distilling the evidence, CAST (2011, p. 6) reiterated the typical finding but reported a point estimate as follows:

“Numerous in-depth studies at the University of Chicago, Yale University, Iowa State University, the University of Minnesota, and elsewhere have carefully

²² When characterizing the evidence from the literature, economists often use a range like this, but more often it is a narrower one with a smaller mean (such as the 20–60 percent range reported by, Fuglie and Heisey 2007). As discussed by Alston et al. (2000) such selective reporting of the literature may be misleading, giving a false impression of both the average and the size of the range around it.

calculated the rate of return to investing in public agricultural research. Focusing on the contribution of productivity-oriented agricultural research undertaken by the main U.S. public agricultural research institutions—SAESs, VMCs, ARS, and ERS—to agricultural productivity in the 48 contiguous states, including spillover effects to other states in the same geoclimatic region, during 1970–2004, the marginal real rate of return is approximately 50% (Huffman 2010; Huffman and Evenson 2006a,b).²³

It is easy to show that a 50 percent rate of return is implausible for a long-term investment yielding benefits that compound over 35 years (as in Huffman 2010 and Huffman and Evenson 2006a, 2006b) let alone over 50 years, which we have found is more appropriate for U.S. public agricultural R&D. Table 7 includes some sample calculations of the terminal values of investments of one dollar over various time periods using alternative real rates of return to illustrate this point. One dollar invested at 50 percent per annum would be worth more than \$3,000 at the end of 20 years, nearly \$1.5 million at the end of 35 years, and a whopping \$637 million at the end of 50 years. To provide some perspective, if the roughly \$4 billion invested in public agricultural R&D in 2005 earned a return of 50 percent per annum compounding over 35 years, by 2040 the accumulated benefits would be worth \$5,824,000 billion (2000 prices)—more than 100 times projected U.S. GDP in 2040 and more than 10 times projected global GDP in 2040.²³ Clearly, as these figures illustrate, a 50 percent rate of return compounding over a long period of time is implausible. Perhaps this fact may help account for why the very large estimates have been discounted and ignored by some policymakers. Even a 10 percent real rate of return yields a large terminal value when compounded over 35 or 50 years.

²³ Fogel (2007) forecasted that U.S. GDP would reach \$41,944 billion in 2040 and global GDP would reach \$307,857 billion (2000 PPP prices).

[Table 7: *Terminal Values Implied by Internal Rates of Return*]

We computed conventional internal rates of return (IRR) using the same base-model simulated streams of benefits and costs that we used to compute the benefit-cost ratios reported in table 4. The IRR is by definition the discount rate that makes the present value of the benefits equal to the present value of the costs. Summary results are reported in table 8, in columns (1) and (2), while more-detailed results for all the states are presented in table 9. Relative to the mainstream of the literature, our preferred logarithmic model yielded estimates at the lower end of the range for both social and private annual rates of return to state and federal agricultural R&D—around 20 percent. Specifically, our estimates of own-state rates of return ranged from 7.4 to 27.6 percent, with an average of 18.9 percent per annum across the states and the estimates of national rates of return ranged from 15.3 to 29.1 percent, with an average of 22.7 percent per annum across the states.

[Table 8: *Conventional and Modified Internal Rates of Return*]

[Table 9: *Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios and Internal Rates of Return*]

Our estimates of conventional internal rates of return in columns 2 and 3 of table 8 are much smaller than those reported typically—for instance the 50 percent annual rate of return as reported by CAST (2011). Even so, we think our own measures are unrealistically high—for a conceptual reason as well as because of their unrealistic implications as indicated in table 7. Specifically, the conventional internal rate of return implicitly assumes that the flows of benefits can be reinvested at the same rate as the investment being evaluated. It is suited for a situation where those entities that would pay the cost would also reap the return, whereas in the present context the government pays the cost but the benefits accrue to producers and consumers of farm products. In our application, if a public research investment is to earn a rate of return of 50

percent per annum, the conventional calculation will be correct only if the farmers and consumers to whom the streams of benefits accrue can (and do) invest their net benefits at the same 50 percent rate of return. Kierulff (2008) provides a recent discussion of conventional measures of internal rates of return, their shortcomings, and why a ‘modified’ version is preferred for financial analyses applied to investments that yield streams of revenue.²⁴

Consider an investment of I_t dollars in time t that will yield a flow of benefits, B_{t+n} over the following N years. The conventional internal rate of return, i , solves the equation:

$$(12) \quad \sum_{n=0}^N B_{t+n} (1+i)^{N-n} - I_t (1+i)^N = 0.$$

Alternatively, suppose the stream of benefits would be reinvested by the beneficiaries (say, farmers or food consumers) at some external rate of return, r , which could be different from the rate for the project being evaluated. Then we would want to solve for the modified internal rate of return, m which solves the problem:

$$(13) \quad \sum_{n=0}^N B_{t+n} (1+r)^{N-n} - I_t (1+m)^N = 0.$$

Intuitively, m is the rate at which one could afford to borrow the amount to be invested, I_t , given that it would generate the flow of benefits, B_{t+n} , which would be reinvested at the external rate, r . It can be seen that the conventional internal rate of return calculation is a special case of (13) which assumes $r = i (= m)$, which is implausible for public projects yielding flows of benefits that imply very large conventional internal rates of return.

We computed the modified internal rates of return corresponding to the conventional internal rates of return in table 8, assuming that benefits could be reinvested at a real rate of 3 percent per annum (the same rate we used to compute the benefit-cost ratios). Summary results

²⁴ Biondi (2006) suggests that the modified internal rate of return concept was first proposed by Duvillard in the late 19th century, and “reinvented” in the late 1950s by the likes of Solomon (1956), Hirshleifer (1958) and Baldwin (1959).

are reported in table 8, in columns 3 and 4, while more-detailed results for all the states are presented in table 9. Our estimates of the own-state modified internal rates of return ranged from 4.8 to 11.4 percent, with an average of 8.8 percent per annum across the states, while the estimates of national rates of return (including interstate spillovers) ranged from 7.7 to 11.7 percent, with an average of 9.9 percent per annum across the states. We also computed the conventional internal rate of return for USDA intramural research, which was 18.7 percent per annum and the corresponding modified internal rate of return was 8.7 percent. All of these modified rates of return are plausible yet consistent with very high benefit-cost ratios.

Conclusion

Measures of the payoff to public agricultural R&D are potentially useful for policy, and this usefulness will be greater if the measures are transparent, well understood, and credible. The overwhelming message from the extant literature on the returns to agricultural R&D is that it has paid handsome dividends and has been underfunded, yet the underfunding pattern persists. In the work reported in this paper we set out to develop new evidence on the returns to agricultural research and extension and present it in a new light. While our estimates apply to both research and extension, since they enter our model symmetrically, much of the previous literature has emphasized returns to agricultural research *per se*, and that is the benchmark for comparison.

The work reported here entails several contributions. The analysis is based on entirely new measures of both agricultural productivity and state and federal government investments in agricultural research and extension that were developed specifically for this purpose. The models used here are also new and different from those used previously in some ways that have implications for findings. In particular we tested for lag length in a flexible gamma lag distribution model and, compared with typically used models, our preferred model suggests a

much longer lag length, which in turn has implications for measured rates of return. In addition, we used a new approach to model spatial spillovers, based on the similarity of commodity composition rather than spatial proximity, and evaluated the implications. Rather than simply impose a set of modeling assumptions we evaluated the implications of our own modeling choices versus alternatives typically reported for findings with respect to returns to research. We found that some elements of specification choices had quite significant impacts on findings, but that the main finding was consistent across models: a very high social payoff to the investment with very significant state-to-state spillover effects compounding incentive problems and justifying a significant federal role.

Nevertheless, the combination of specification choices in our preferred model resulted in a much lower conventionally measured internal rate of return to research than has been reported typically in previous studies. These comparatively low rates of return reflect our comparatively long lags and our greater attention to reducing other sources of misattribution bias that have contributed to very high rates of return found in some studies (as discussed by Alston and Pardey, 2001, for instance), and the comparison lends credibility to our results. Moreover, we show that the conventional internal rate of return measures are implausible. Our modified internal rates of return are much lower than the very high rates that are still part of the mainstream in the literature and being presented to policymakers. These new findings regarding the prevalent use of a flawed metric provide some empirical justification for the skepticism sometimes expressed about very high estimated rates of return to research, which may have contributed in turn to skepticism about the value of the investment.

To address that skepticism, we developed simple, approximate measures of benefit-cost ratios. These measures are based on comparing the value of productivity growth with the cost of

investments in agricultural research, without specifically modeling the statistical relationship between productivity and spending over space and time, and thereby avoid the problem of specification bias. They generate similar measures to those coming from the econometric analysis, illustrating the point that the econometric estimates reflect the same fundamental forces at work. Specifically, agricultural productivity growth is worth many times more than the annual spending on agricultural R&D (including extension). Even if only a fraction is attributed to R&D, and even if the lags are very long, the implied benefit-cost ratio will be very large.

Our specific empirical results are interesting, but in this work we have sought to emphasize the insights we can draw from the overall pattern and robustness of the evidence. Throughout we have emphasized two elements: the spatial and temporal attribution problems associated with modeling R&D lags and spatial spillovers. Our results show that R&D lags are very long, much longer than most previous studies have allowed, which has potential implications for problems for policy prescriptions, as well as econometric biases. Likewise, spatial spillovers are empirically important, contributing to important differences between state-specific and national benefits from SAES research. Studies that do not account appropriately for spillovers may suffer from econometric biases and could yield inappropriate policy prescriptions.

The finding of substantial interstate technology spillovers suggests that states would underinvest in agricultural R&D from a national perspective, even if they did not underinvest from a narrower state-specific perspective. Federal support for SAES research can be justified on these grounds. As well as providing a justification for federal support of SAES research, spatial technology spillovers provide a justification for intramural research by the USDA. Our results indicate that even with substantial support from the federal government, most states substantially underinvest in agricultural R&D, in the sense that both the in-state and national

returns well exceed the costs of additional investments in agricultural R&D; they also indicate that these institutional failures continue to impose very large opportunity costs on individual states and the nation as a whole.

References

Acquaye, A.K., J.M. Alston, and P.G. Pardey. "Post-War Productivity Patterns in U.S. Agriculture: Influences of Aggregation Procedures in a State-Level Analysis." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 85(1)(February 2003): 59-80.

Alston, J.M. "Spillovers." *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 46(3)(September 2002): 315-346.

Alston, J.M., M.A. Andersen, J.S. James, and P.G. Pardey. *Persistence Pays: U.S. Agricultural Productivity Growth and the Benefits from Public R&D Spending*. New York: Springer, 2010.

Alston, J.M., C. Chan-Kang, M.C. Marra, P.G. Pardey, and TJ Wyatt. *A Meta-Analysis of Rates of Return to Agricultural R&D: Ex Pede Herculem?* Research Report No. 113, Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute, 2000.

Alston, J.M., G.W. Norton and P.G. Pardey. *Science under Scarcity: Principles and Practice for Agricultural Research Evaluation and Priority Setting*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995 (paperback edition, CAB International 1998).

Alston, J.M. and P.G. Pardey. "Attribution and Other Problems in Assessing the Returns to Agricultural Research." *Agricultural Economics* 25(2-3)(September 2001): 141-152.

Baldwin, R.H. "How to Assess Investment Proposals." *Harvard Business Review* 37 (1959):98-104.

Biondi, Y. "The Double Emergence of the Modified Internal Rate of Return: The Neglected Financial Work of Duvillard (1755–1832) in a Comparative Perspective." *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 13(3)(2006): 311-335.

Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST). *Investing in a Better Future through Public Agricultural Research*. CAST Commentary QTA2011-1. Ames, Iowa: CAST, 2011.

Craig, B.J. and P.G. Pardey "Productivity Measurement in the Presence of Quality Change." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 78(5)(December 1996):1349-1354.

Evenson, R.E. "The Contribution of Agricultural Research to Production." *Journal of Farm Economics* 49(December 1967): 1415-1425.

Evenson, R.E. "Economic Impacts of Agricultural Research and Extension." Chapter 11 in B.L. Gardner and G.C. Rausser, eds. *Handbook of Agricultural Economics, Volume 1A: Agricultural Production*. New York: Elsevier, 2002.

Fogel, R.W. "Capitalism and Democracy in 2040: Forecasts and Speculations." Working Paper No. 3184. Washington D.C.: National Bureau of Economic Research, June 2007.

Fuglie, K.O. and P.W. Heisey. *Economic Returns to Public Agricultural Research*. USDA, ERS Economic Brief No. 10. Washington D.C.: USDA, September 2007.

Griliches, Z. "Research Expenditures, Education, and the Aggregate Agricultural Production Function." *American Economic Review* 54(6)(1964): 961-974

Griliches, Z. "Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and Development to Productivity Growth." *Bell Journal of Economics* 10(Spring 1979): 92-116.

Hausman, J.A. "Specification Tests in Econometrics." *Econometrica* 46 (1978):1251-1271.

Hirshleifer, J. "On the Theory of Optimal Investment Decision." *Journal of Political Economy* 66(4)(1958): 329-352.

Huffman, W.E. "Measuring Public Agricultural Research Capital and its Contribution to State Agricultural Productivity." Department of Economics Working Paper, Ames: Iowa State University, 2010.

Huffman, W.E. and R.E. Evenson. *Science for Agriculture: A Long-Term Perspective*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1993.

Huffman, W.E. and R.E. Evenson. *Science for Agriculture: A Long-Term Perspective* (second edition). Ames, Iowa: Blackwell Publishing, 2006a.

Huffman, W.E. and R.E. Evenson. "Do Formula or Competitive Grant Funds Have Greater Impacts on State Agricultural Productivity." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 88(4)(November 2006b): 783–798.

Jaffe, A.B. "Technological Opportunity and Spillovers of R&D: Evidence from Firm's Patents, Profits, and Market Value." *American Economic Review* 76(5)(December 1986): 984-1001.

Jaffe, A.B. "Characterizing the 'Technological Position' of Firms, with Application to Quantifying Technological Opportunity and Research Spillovers." *Research Policy* 18(2)(April 1989): 87-97.

Kierulff, H. "MIRR: A Better Measure." *Business Horizons* 51(4) (2008): 321-329.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development). *Frascati Manual: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 2002.

Pardey, P.G., M.A. Andersen, B.J. Craig, and J.M. Alston. "Primary Data Documentation U.S. Agricultural Input, Output, and Productivity Series, 1949–2002 (Version 4)." InSTePP Data Documentation. International Science and Technology Practice and Policy Center, University of Minnesota, 2009.

Pardey, P.G. and B. Craig. "Causal Relationships between Public Sector Agricultural Research Expenditures and Output." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 71(February 1989): 9-19.

Persyn, D., and J. Westerlund. "Error-Correction-Based Cointegration Tests for Panel Data." *Stata Journal* 8 (2)(2008): 232-241.

Solomon, E. "The Arithmetic of Capital-Budgeting Decisions." *The Journal of Business* 29(2)(1956): 124-129.

Stock, J. "Asymptotic Properties of Least Squares Estimators of Cointegrating Vectors." *Econometrica* 55(5) (1987): 1035-1056.

Westerlund, J. "Testing for Error Correction in Panel Data." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 69 (2007): 709-748.

Table 1. Simple Summary Statistics, Data for the Productivity Model

Symbol	Variable Name	Definition	Value Description	Value
$MFP_{i,t}$	Multifactor Agricultural Productivity	Fisher ideal index agricultural output in state i and year t	Minimum across all years and states	74.74
			Maximum across all years and states	481.83
			Average across years	
			All states	181.30
			California	176.14
			Minnesota	173.40
			Wyoming	142.24
$SK_{i,t}$	Own-state stock of knowledge	Constructed using 50 years of own-state government spending on agricultural research and extension (in real 2000 dollars) and specification of gamma lag distribution	Preferred lag distribution ($\lambda = 0.70, \delta = 0.90$)	
			Minimum across all years and states	\$5.0 million
			Maximum across all years and states	\$104.8 million
			Average across all years and states	\$33.1 million
$SS_{i,t}$	State-specific spilling stock of knowledge	Constructed using federal and other-state government spending on agricultural research and extension (in real 2000 dollars), specification of lag distribution, and ω_{ij} 's used as weights	Preferred lag distribution ($\lambda = 0.70, \delta = 0.90$)	
			Minimum across all years and states	\$548.2 million
			Maximum across all years and states	\$1,436.0 million
			Average across all years and states	\$1,050.9 million
$PRC_{i,t}$	Pasture and rangeland condition index	Measured in September for each year (published by the Economics, Statistics, and Market Information System (ESMIS) branch of the USDA)	Minimum across all years and states	8
			Maximum across all years and states	107
			Average across years	
			All states	74.33
			California	73.27
			Minnesota	73.39
			Wyoming	78.02

Sources: Developed by the authors.


Table 2. Summary of Results for the Base Model, Top-Ranked Models

Model Details	Model Results							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Model Rank by SSE								
Lag Distribution Characteristics								
λ	0.70	0.65	0.80	0.75	0.85	0.90	0.60	0.80
δ	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.90	0.80
Peak Lag Year	24	20	24	19	24	27	17	17
Elasticities with Respect to								
Own-State SAES	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.14
Own-State Extension	0.18	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.19	0.13	0.15
All Own-State Combined	0.32	0.28	0.33	0.29	0.33	0.35	0.25	0.29
SAES Spillins	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.12	0.10
Intramural Spillins	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.11	0.10
Extension Spillins	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.13	0.12
All Spillins Combined	0.24	0.31	0.22	0.30	0.22	0.19	0.36	0.31

Sources: Developed by the authors.

Notes: SSE (sum of squared errors) indicates the goodness of fit of the model. The elasticities refer to elasticities of *MFP* with respect to the own and spillover research knowledge stocks.

Figure 1. Gamma and trapezoidal lag distributions



Sources: Developed by the authors.

Table 3. Results from Panel Data Tests of Cointegration

Statistic	Value	Z-value	P-value	Robust P-value
Panel a: Tests between $\ln MFP_{it}$ and $\ln SK_{it}$ (average AIC selected lag length is 2.04 years)				
G_τ	-3.93	-16.64	0.00	0.00
G_α	-12.32	-6.55	0.00	0.00
P_τ	-21.60	-11.24	0.00	0.00
P_α	-11.11	-10.20	0.00	0.00
Panel b: Tests between $\ln MFP_{it}$ and $\ln SS_{it}$ (average AIC selected lag length is 2.25 years)				
G_τ	-4.32	-19.67	0.00	0.00
G_α	-10.26	-3.91	0.00	0.26
P_τ	-22.45	-12.08	0.00	0.00
P_α	-8.85	-6.78	0.00	0.16

Sources: Developed by the authors.

Notes: All calculations were done using STATA and the ‘xtwest’ command. The null hypothesis is no cointegration. In each test we included an intercept term and set the lag length according to the average Akaike information criterion (AIC). The robust P-values correct for cross-sectional dependence among the states using a bootstrapping procedure. One hundred replications were used for the bootstrapping procedure and the lag length was set to one.

Table 4. Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios for Research and Extension

State or Region	Benefit-Cost Ratios		
	State R&E		USDA
	Own-State	National	Intramural
<i>Ratio</i>			
Total			17.5
48 States			
Average	21.0	32.1	0.4
Minimum	2.4	9.9	0.0
Maximum	57.8	69.2	1.6
Selected States			
California	33.3	43.4	1.4
Minnesota	40.6	55.4	0.8
Wyoming	12.7	23.6	0.1
Regions			
Pacific	21.8	32.9	0.6
Mountain	20.0	31.6	0.1
N Plains	42.4	54.5	0.5
S Plains	20.2	31.0	0.5
Central	33.7	46.8	0.8
Southeast	15.1	26.7	0.3
Northeast	9.4	18.4	0.1

Sources: Developed by the authors based on model described in column 1 of table 1.

Table 5. Effects of Specification Choices on Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios

Model	Own-State Benefit-Cost Ratio for SAES Research			National Benefit-Cost Ratio for			
				SAES Research		USDA Research	
	Min.	Max.	Average	Min.	Max.	Average	Total
<i>Ratio</i>							
Functional Form							
Logarithmic	2.4	57.8	21.0	9.9	69.2	32.1	17.5
Growth (first-difference logarithmic)	1.4	29.4	10.7	15.9	52.1	32.2	33.7
Linear	0.2	43.9	10.0	14.2	74.4	39.7	47.0
First-difference linear	0.2	51.3	11.2	16.7	84.5	46.3	55.4
Extension Treatment							
50 gamma lags with spillovers	2.4	57.8	21.0	9.9	69.2	32.1	17.5
50 gamma lags without spillovers	2.3	55.9	20.3	14.1	73.6	37.7	27.3
4 geometric lags with spillovers	1.3	27.8	9.3	16.2	50.5	31.4	34.7
4 geometric lags without spillovers	1.3	28.5	9.5	23.9	64.5	42.7	52.0
Lag Distribution for Research (R) and Extension (E)							
50-year gamma, R&E	2.4	57.8	21.0	9.9	69.2	32.1	17.5
35-year trapezoid, R&E	3.4	53.5	19.8	18.0	75.4	41.2	33.6
50-year gamma, R; 4-year geometric, E	1.3	27.8	9.3	16.2	50.5	31.4	34.7
35-year trapezoid, R; 4-year geometric, E	2.2	34.0	11.8	20.2	61.0	38.2	41.3

Table 5. Effects of Specification Choices on Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios (continued)

Model	Own-State Benefit-Cost Ratio for SAES Research			National Benefit-Cost Ratio for			
				SAES Research		USDA Research	
	Min.	Max.	Average	Min.	Max.	Average	Total
<i>Ratio</i>							
Spillovers							
Based on output mix	2.4	57.8	21.0	9.9	69.2	32.1	17.5
Based on USDA Regions	2.3	48.5	17.6	6.6	62.4	24.8	60.5
No spillovers	4.5	90.0	33.7	4.5	90.0	33.7	n/a
Research Lag Length							
50-year gamma, R&E	2.4	57.8	21.0	9.9	69.2	32.1	17.5
35-year gamma, R&E	2.4	56.7	20.4	11.7	71.0	20.4	21.9
20-year gamma, R&E	2.5	39.5	14.8	17.2	63.0	36.3	33.7
50-year gamma, R; 4-year geometric, E	1.3	27.8	9.3	16.2	50.5	31.4	34.7
35-year gamma, R; 4-year geometric, E	1.1	27.0	8.8	15.3	48.9	30.1	33.4
20-year gamma, R; 4-year geometric, E	1.7	29.4	10.4	17.6	55.0	33.7	36.6

Sources: Developed by the authors.

Table 6. Benefit-Cost Ratios—Approximations versus Econometric Estimates

State or Region	Econometric Model, Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratio		Approximate Average Benefit-Cost Ratio Costs 1929–1982, Benefits 1949–2002	
	State R&E (Own-State) (1)	State R&E (National) (2)	100% Attribution	50% Attribution
			(3)	(4)
<i>Ratio</i>				
48 States				
Average	21.0	32.1	30.4	15.2
Minimum	2.4	9.9	5.4	2.7
Maximum	57.8	69.2	77.7	38.8
Selected States				
California	33.3	43.4	48.5	24.2
Minnesota	40.6	55.4	55.6	27.8
Wyoming	12.7	23.6	17.0	8.5
Regions				
Pacific	21.8	32.9	41.1	20.5
Mountain	20.0	31.6	30.5	15.3
N Plains	42.4	54.5	63.6	31.8
S Plains	20.2	31.0	27.3	13.6
Central	33.7	46.8	40.6	20.3
Southeast	15.1	26.7	28.6	14.3
Northeast	9.4	18.4	18.1	9.0
United States (includes USDA Intramural):			25.6	12.8
USDA Intramural		17.5		

Sources: Developed by the authors.

Table 7. Terminal Values Implied by Various Rates of Return

Number of Years from Initial Investment	Rate of Return, Percent per Annum		
	10	20	50
<i>Terminal Value, Dollars of Benefit per Dollar of Initial Investment</i>			
20	7	38	3,325
35	28	591	1,456,110
40	45	1,470	11,057,332
50	117	9,100	637,621,500

Sources: Developed by the authors.

Table 8. Conventional and Modified Internal Rates of Return

Conventional Internal Rate of Return (IRR)		Modified Internal Rate of Return (MIRR)	
State R&E (Own-State)	State R&E (National)	State R&E (Own-State)	State R&E (National)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Percent Per Year</i>			
48 States			
Average	18.9	22.7	8.8
Minimum	7.4	15.3	4.8
Maximum	27.6	29.1	11.4
 Selected States			
California	24.1	26.1	10.2
Minnesota	24.7	27.3	10.6
Wyoming	16.8	20.9	8.2
 Regions			
Pacific	20.2	23.5	9.1
Mountain	19.0	22.7	8.9
N Plains	24.9	27.0	10.7
S Plains	19.5	22.7	9.0
Central	23.1	25.9	10.1
Southeast	17.6	22.0	8.3
Northeast	14.0	19.0	7.2

Sources: Developed by the authors. The figures in columns 3 and 4 are ‘modified’ internal rates-of-return (MIRRs) assuming a 3 percent reinvestment rate.

Table 9. Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios and Internal Rates of Return

State or Region	Benefit-Cost Ratio			Internal Rate of Return		MIRR	
	State R&E (Own-State) (1)	State R&E (National) (2)	USDA Intramural (3)	State R&E (Own-State) (4)	State R&E (National) (5)	State R&E (Own-State) (6)	State R&E (National) (7)
	<i>Ratio</i>			<i>Percent Per Year</i>			
Pacific	21.8	32.9	0.6	20.2	23.5	9.1	10.1
California	33.3	43.4	1.4	24.1	26.1	10.2	10.7
Oregon	11.3	24.1	0.2	16.3	21.3	7.9	9.5
Washington	20.9	31.2	0.3	20.3	23.1	9.2	10.0
Mountain	20.0	31.6	0.1	19.0	22.7	8.9	10.0
Arizona	26.6	36.9	0.2	22.1	24.5	9.7	10.4
Colorado	31.1	43.8	0.3	22.5	25.2	10.0	10.8
Idaho	34.0	44.8	0.2	23.3	25.5	10.2	10.8
Montana	22.0	32.2	0.2	20.4	23.1	9.3	10.1
Nevada	7.3	19.2	0.0	13.0	19.1	7.0	9.0
New Mexico	15.6	28.2	0.1	18.1	22.2	8.6	9.8
Utah	11.0	24.5	0.1	16.0	21.3	7.9	9.5
Wyoming	12.7	23.6	0.1	16.8	20.9	8.2	9.5
N Plains	42.4	54.5	0.5	24.9	27.0	10.7	11.2
Kansas	33.6	45.3	0.7	23.3	25.6	10.2	10.8
Nebraska	51.3	64.9	0.8	26.3	28.4	11.1	11.6
North Dakota	37.3	46.0	0.3	23.8	25.5	10.4	10.9
South Dakota	47.4	61.7	0.4	26.3	28.4	10.9	11.5
S Plains	20.2	31.0	0.5	19.5	22.7	9.0	10.0
Arkansas	26.8	35.7	0.4	21.4	23.6	9.7	10.3
Louisiana	12.2	23.0	0.2	16.8	21.0	8.1	9.4
Mississippi	15.1	25.3	0.3	18.3	21.7	8.5	9.6
Oklahoma	19.0	31.4	0.3	19.1	22.8	9.0	10.1
Texas	28.2	39.4	1.1	21.9	24.5	9.8	10.5
Central	33.7	46.8	0.8	23.1	25.9	10.1	10.8
Illinois	43.0	53.8	1.3	25.1	27.0	10.7	11.2
Indiana	27.1	39.4	0.7	21.7	24.6	9.7	10.5
Iowa	57.8	69.2	1.6	27.6	29.1	11.4	11.7
Michigan	17.1	31.5	0.3	19.1	23.4	8.8	10.1
Minnesota	40.6	55.4	0.8	24.7	27.3	10.6	11.3
Missouri	34.7	49.9	0.6	24.3	27.1	10.3	11.0

Table 9. Marginal Benefit-Cost Ratios and Internal Rates of Return (continued)

State or Region	Benefit-Cost Ratio			Internal Rate of Return		MIRR	
	State R&E (Own-State) (1)	State R&E (National) (2)	USDA Intramural (3)	State R&E (Own-State) (4)	State R&E (National) (5)	State R&E (Own-State) (6)	State R&E (National) (7)
<i>Ratio</i>				<i>Percent Per Year</i>			
Ohio	22.4	37.0	0.5	20.2	24.0	9.3	10.4
Wisconsin	26.7	38.3	0.6	22.1	24.8	9.7	10.5
Southeast	15.1	26.7	0.3	17.6	22.0	8.3	9.7
Alabama	13.4	24.8	0.3	17.1	21.3	8.3	9.6
Florida	21.6	28.2	0.4	20.5	22.4	9.3	9.8
Georgia	20.5	31.0	0.4	20.3	23.2	9.2	10.0
Kentucky	18.5	30.5	0.3	19.2	22.8	8.9	10.0
North Carolina	19.9	27.5	0.5	20.6	22.8	9.1	9.8
South Carolina	11.2	23.1	0.1	16.1	20.9	7.9	9.4
Tennessee	15.7	31.3	0.2	18.4	23.3	8.6	10.1
Virginia	11.8	26.3	0.2	16.7	22.0	8.0	9.7
West Virginia	3.8	17.6	0.0	9.7	18.9	5.7	8.8
Northeast	9.4	18.4	0.1	14.0	19.0	7.2	8.8
Connecticut	5.4	14.2	0.0	11.8	17.6	6.4	8.4
Delaware	15.8	21.5	0.0	17.9	20.0	8.6	9.3
Maine	13.5	20.1	0.1	17.5	20.1	8.3	9.1
Maryland	14.1	26.1	0.1	17.5	21.7	8.4	9.7
Massachusetts	4.7	13.3	0.0	10.8	17.0	6.1	8.2
New Hampshire	4.4	14.0	0.0	10.6	17.5	6.0	8.4
New Jersey	4.7	13.7	0.1	11.3	17.5	6.1	8.3
New York	8.3	18.1	0.3	14.2	19.1	7.3	8.9
Pennsylvania	18.0	30.3	0.3	19.1	22.8	8.9	10.0
Rhode Island	2.4	9.9	0.0	7.4	15.3	4.8	7.7
Vermont	12.4	21.5	0.0	16.2	20.0	8.1	9.3
U.S. Average^a	21.0	32.1	0.4	18.9	22.7	8.8	9.9

Sources: Compiled by the authors.

Notes: The figures in columns 6 and 7 are ‘modified’ internal rates-of-return (MIRRs) assuming a 3 percent per annum reinvestment rate.

a. Average of 48 contiguous U.S. states.