Productivity Growth in World Agriculture: Sources and Constraints

Vernon W. Ruttan

Prior to the beginning of the twentieth century, almost all increases in crop and animal production occurred as a result of increases in the area cultivated. By the end of the century, almost all increases were coming from increases in land productivity—in output per acre or per hectare. This was an exceedingly short period in which to make a transition from a natural resource-based to a science-based system of agricultural production. In the presently developed countries, the beginning of this transition began in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In most developing countries, the transition did not begin until well into the second half of the twentieth century. For some of the poorest countries in the world, the transition has not yet begun.

During the second half of the twentieth century, world population more than doubled—from approximately 2.5 billion in 1950 to 6.0 billion in 2000. The demands placed on global agricultural production arising out of population and income growth almost tripled. By 2050, world population is projected to grow to between 9 and 10 billion people. Most of the growth is expected to occur in poor countries, where the income elasticity of demand for food remains high. Even moderately high income growth, combined with projected population growth, could result in close to doubling the demands placed on the world's farmers by 2050 (Johnson, 2000; United Nations, 2001).

The most difficult challenges will occur during the next two or three decades as both population and income in many of the world's poorest countries continue to grow rapidly. But rapid decline in the rate of population growth in such populous countries as India and China lends credence to the United Nations

■ *Vernon W. Ruttan is Regents Professor Emeritus in the Department of Applied Economics and the Department of Economics and Adjunct Professor in the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, all at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.*

projections that by midcentury, the global rate of population growth will slow substantially. The demand for food arising out of income growth is also expected to slow as incomes rise and the income elasticity of demand for food declines. In the interim, very substantial increases in scientific and technical effort will be required, particularly in the world's poorest countries, if growth in food production is to keep pace with growth in demand.

Agriculture in Development Thought

Economic understanding of the process of agricultural development has made substantial advances over the last half-century. In the early post–World War II literature, agriculture, along with other natural resource-based industries, was viewed as a sector from which resources could be extracted to fund development in the industrial sector (Lewis, 1954, p. 139; Rostow, 1956; Ranis and Fei, 1961). Growth in agricultural production was viewed as an essential condition, or even a precondition, for growth in the rest of the economy. But the process by which agricultural growth was generated remained outside the concern of most development economists.

By the early 1960s, a new perspective, more fully informed by both agricultural science and economics, was beginning to emerge. It had become increasingly clear that much of agricultural technology was "location specific." Techniques developed in advanced countries were not generally directly transferable to less developed countries with different climates and resource endowments. Evidence had also accumulated that only limited productivity gains were to be had by the reallocation of resources within traditional peasant agriculture.

In an iconoclastic book, *Transforming Traditional Agriculture,* Theodore W. Schultz (1964) insisted that peasants in traditional agrarian societies are rational allocators of available resources and that they remained poor because most poor countries provided them with only limited technical and economic opportunities to which they could respond—that is, they were "poor but efficient." Schultz (1964, pp. 145–147) wrote:

> The principle sources of high productivity in modern agriculture are reproducible sources. They consist of particular material inputs and of skills and other capabilities required to use such inputs successfully. . . .But these modern inputs are seldom ready made. . . .In general what is available is a body of knowledge, which has made it possible for the advanced countries to produce for their own use factors that are technically superior to those employed elsewhere. This body of knowledge can be used to develop similar, and as a rule superior, new factors appropriate to the biological and other conditions that are specific to the agriculture of poor countries.

This thesis implies three types of relatively high payoff investments for agri-

cultural development: 1) the capacity of agricultural research institutions to generate new location-specific technical knowledge; 2) the capacity of the technology supply industries to develop, produce and market new technical inputs; and 3) the schooling and nonformal (extension) education of rural people to enable them to use the new knowledge and technology effectively. The enthusiasm with which this high-payoff input model was accepted and transformed into doctrine was due at least as much to the success of plant breeders and agronomists in developing fertilizer and management responsive "green revolution" crop varieties for the tropics as to the power of Schultz's ideas.[1]

The Schultz "high-payoff input model" remained incomplete, however, even as a model of technical change in agriculture. It did not attempt to explain how economic conditions induce an efficient path of technical change for the agricultural sector of a particular society. Nor does the high-payoff input model attempt to explain how economic conditions induce the development of new institutions, such as public sector agricultural experiment stations, that become the suppliers of location-specific new knowledge and technology.

Beginning in the early 1970s, Hayami and Ruttan (1971, 1985) and Binswanger and Ruttan (1978) formulated a model of induced technical change in which the development and application of new technology is endogenous to the economic system. Building on the Hicksian model of factor-saving technical change, and their own experience in southeast Asia, they proposed a model in which the direction of technical change in agriculture was induced by changes (or differences) in relative resource endowments and factor prices. In this model, alternative agricultural technologies are developed to facilitate the substitution of relatively abundant (hence, cheap) factors for relatively scarce (hence, expensive) factors. Two kinds of technology generally correspond to this taxonomy. Mechanical technology is "labor saving," designed to substitute power and machinery for labor. Biological and chemical technology is "land saving," designed to substitute labor-intensive production practices and industrial inputs such as fertilizer and plant and animal protection chemicals for land. Both the technical conditions of production and historical experience suggest that changes in land productivity and labor productivity are relatively independent (Griliches, 1968).

The process of induced technical change can be illustrated from the historical experience of Japan and the United States, illustrated in Figure 1. In Panel A of Figure 1, the horizontal axis is the price of fertilizer relative to the price of land, and the vertical axis is the amount of fertilizer per hectare of agricultural land. In Panel B of Figure 1, the horizontal axis is the price of draft power relative to the price of labor, and the vertical axis is the amount of draft power per worker. Reading from

[1] The Schultz "poor but efficient" hypothesis was received skeptically by development economists who had posited a "backward bending" labor supply curve in developing countries' agriculture. See, for example, Lipton (1968). For a particularly vicious review of *Transforming Traditional Agriculture*, see Balogh (1964). Schultz was the recipient of the 1979 Nobel Award in economics, along with W. Arthur Lewis, for his contribution to development economics.

Figure 1

Induced Technical Change in Fertilizer and Draft Power:
The United States and Japan

(quinquennial observations for 1880–1980)

Panel A: Relation between fertilizer input per hectare of arable land and the fertilizer-arable land price ratio: hectares of arable land that can be purchased by one ton of $N + P_2O_5 + K_2O$ contained in commercial fertilizers.

Panel B: Relation between farm draft power per male worker and power-labor price ratio: hectares of work days that can be purchased by one horsepower of tractor or draft animal.

Source: Hayami and Ruttan (1985, pp. 178–204).

right (1880) to left (1980), as the price of fertilizer declined relative to the price of land, fertilizer use per hectare rose in both countries (Panel A). Similarly, as the price of draft power declined relative to the price of labor, the use of power per worker rose in both countries (Panel B).

Throughout the period 1880–1980, Japanese farmers used more fertilizer per hectare than U.S. farmers, and U.S. farmers used more power per worker than did Japanese farmers. These differences in use of fertilizer per unit of land and of draft power per worker between the two countries, and the changes in each country between 1880 and 1980, were not the result of simple factor substitution in response to relative price changes. The large changes in factor ratios were made possible only by the very substantial advances in biological and mechanical technology that facilitated the substitution of fertilizer for land and draft power for labor. These technical changes were induced by the differences and changes in relative factor price ratios (Hayami and Ruttan, 1985, pp. 176–197).[2] Over time,

---

[2] The Hayami and Ruttan (1985) induced innovation interpretation of technical change has been criticized on both theoretical and empirical grounds. See, for example, Olmstead and Rhode (1993) and Koppel (1995). For a response to these criticisms, see Ruttan and Hayami (1995).

particularly since World War II, there has been some convergence in relative factor prices and in relative intensity of factor use in the two countries.

Advances in mechanical technology in agriculture have been intimately associated with the industrial revolution. But the mechanization of agriculture cannot be treated as simply the adaptation of industrial methods of production to agriculture. The spatial dimension of crop production requires that the machines suitable for agricultural mechanization must be mobile—they must move across or through materials that are immobile (Brewster, 1950). The seasonal characteristic of agricultural production requires a series of specialized machines—for land preparation, planting, pest and pathogen control and harvesting—designed for sequential operations, each of which is carried out for only a few days or weeks in each season. One result is that a fully mechanized agriculture is typically very capital intensive. Advances in biological technology in crop production involve one or more of the following three elements: land and water resource development to provide a more favorable environment for plant growth; the addition of organic and inorganic sources of plant nutrition to the soil to stimulate plant growth and the use of biological and chemical means to protect plants from pests and pathogens; and selection and breeding of new biologically efficient crop varieties specifically adapted to respond to those elements in the environment that are subject to management.

Advances in mechanical technology are a primary source of growth in labor productivity; advances in biological technology are a primary source of growth in land productivity. There are, of course, exceptions to this analytical distinction. For example, in Japan, horse plowing was developed as a technology to cultivate more deeply to enhance yield (Hayami and Ruttan, 1985, p. 75). In the United States, the replacement of horses by tractors released land from animal feed to food production (White, 2000; Olmstead and Rhode, 2001). At the most sophisticated level, technical change often involves complementary advances in both mechanical and biological technology. For most countries, the research resource allocation issue is the relative emphasis that should be given to advancing biological and mechanical technology.

The model of induced technical change has important implications for resource allocation in agricultural research. In labor abundant and land constrained developing countries, like China and India, research resources are most productively directed to advancing yield-enhancing biological technology. In contrast, land abundant Brazil has realized very high returns from research directed to releasing the productivity constraints on its problem soils. Discovery of the yield-enhancing effects of heavy lime application on acidic aluminum containing soils has opened its *Campos Cerrado* (great plains) region to extensive mechanized production of maize and soybeans.

Measuring the Rate and Direction of Productivity Growth

Comparative research on the rate and direction of productivity growth in agriculture has gone through three stages. Initially, efforts were directed to the

measurement of partial productivity ratios and indexes, such as output per worker and per hectare. Intercountry cross-section and time series comparisons of output per unit of land and labor were first assembled by Colin Clark in his pioneering study, the *Conditions of Economic Progress* (1940). In the late 1960s, Clark's intercountry comparisons were revived and updated by Yujiro Hayami and associates (Hayami, 1969; Hayami and Inagi, 1969; Hayami, Miller, Wade and Yamashita, 1971). These early partial productivity studies identified exceedingly wide differences in land and labor productivity, both among countries and major world regions. Recent trends in land and labor productivity indicate that these wide differences have persisted. In Figure 2, labor productivity (output per worker) is measured on the horizontal axis. Land productivity (output per hectare) is measured on the vertical axis. The dashed diagonal lines, with the units appearing across the top and down the right-hand side of the figure, trace the land-labor factor ratios (hectares of agricultural land per worker). The country and regional lines indicate land-labor trajectories for specific countries or regions. The partial productivity growth patterns of Figure 2 are displayed in much greater detail in the work of Hayami and Ruttan (1985, pp. 117–129). The several country and regional growth paths fall broadly into three groups: a) a land constrained path in which output per hectare has risen faster than output per worker; b) a land abundant path in which output per worker has risen more rapidly than output per hectare; and c) an intermediate growth path in which output per worker and per hectare have grown at somewhat comparable rates. During the later stages of development, as the price of labor begins to rise relative to the price of land, the growth path tends to shift in a labor saving direction. Partial productivity ratios such as those plotted in Figure 2 were employed by Hayami and Ruttan (1970, 1971, pp. 163–205) in their initial tests of the induced technical change hypothesis.

A second stage of the research on technical change in agriculture involved the estimation of cross-country production functions and the construction of multifactor productivity estimates. In these studies, factor inputs—typically land, labor, livestock, capital equipment (machinery) and current inputs (fertilizer)—were aggregated using either factor shares or statistical estimates as the weights for factor aggregation in multifactor productivity estimates or as elasticity coefficients in Cobb-Douglas type production functions.[3] Over time, improvements in data availability and estimation methods have contributed to greater reliability in the estimates.

The Hayami and Ruttan (1970) and the Kawagoe, Hayami and Ruttan (1985)

---

[3] Multifactor productivity estimates for agriculture in the United States were first constructed in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Barton and Cooper, 1948; Schultz, 1953; Ruttan, 1956). For a comparative review and analysis of the sources of differences in the several aggregate agricultural production functions that have been estimated for U.S. agriculture, see Trueblood and Ruttan (1995). Note that from the beginning, agricultural economists were using what, in the recent literature, have been termed "augmented" neoclassical production functions rather the Solow-type two-factor production functions. For a review of total factor productivity estimates in developing countries, see Pingali and Heisey (2001).

Figure 2

International Comparison of Land and Labor Productivities by Region: 1961 to 1990

Notes: AgGDP in nominal local currency units was first deflated to base year 1980 using country-specific AgGDP deflators and then converted to U.S. dollars using Purchasing Power Parity exchange rates for agricultural output. The number of countries on which the regional (weighted averages) area is based is as follows: sub-Saharan Africa (17), Asia and the Pacific (11), Latin America and the Caribbean (18), West Asia and North Africa (9), Europe (13) and North America (2). Hectares of agricultural land per economically active member of the agricultural population includes arable plus permanently cropped and permanently pastured land. "Agricultural workers" is here defined as economically active in agricultural production.
Source: Craig, Pardey and Roseboom (1997).

cross-country metaproduction functions (Lau and Youtopoulos, 1989) have been used in growth accounting exercises to partition the sources of differences in agricultural labor and land productivity between developed and developing countries and among individual countries. The results indicated that internal resource endowments (land and livestock), modern technical inputs (machinery and fertilizer) and human capital (general and technical education) each accounted for approximately one-fourth of the differences in labor productivity between developed countries and less developed countries as groups. Scale economies, present in

developed countries but not in less developed countries, accounted for about 15 percent of the difference.[4]

The implications of these results for potential growth of labor productivity in the agricultural production of less developed countries were encouraging. The pressure of population against land resources was not a binding constraint on agricultural production. Scale diseconomies were not an immediate constraint on labor productivity. Labor productivity could be increased by several multiples—to levels approximating the levels in western Europe in the early 1960s—by investment in human capital, in agricultural research and by more intensive use of technical inputs. The historical experience of Japan, and the more recent experience of Korea and Taiwan, did suggest, however, that as demand for labor, associated with rapid urban-industrial development, draws substantial labor from agriculture, small farm size could become a more serious constraint. As the agricultural labor force declines, farm consolidation results in a rise in the land/labor ratio and a rise in labor productivity.

A third stage in agricultural productivity analysis has involved efforts to test for the convergence of growth rates and levels of multifactor productivity between and among developing and less developed countries. Most of these studies have employed the Malmquist or frontier productivity approach. The basic idea of the Malmquist approach is to construct the *best practice,* or *frontier,* production function and to measure the distance of each country in the sample from the frontier by applying a linear programming method known as data envelopment analysis. The combination of inputs is allowed to vary along an efficient frontier, rather than the fixed coefficient production functions employed in the second-stage studies, to partition changes in multifactor productivity into technical change and efficiency change components.[5] Technical change measures the shift in the best practice or

---

[4] In cross-country growth accounting, it has not been possible to account directly for improvement in the quality of inputs. Attempts are made to capture improvements in the quality of labor input by including education and for improvements in the quality of capital and intermediate inputs by including investment in technical education or research and development in the cross-country production functions. Jorgenson and Gollop (1995) have estimated that during 1947–1985, when total factor productivity in U.S. agriculture grew at an annual rate of 1.58 percent, input quality change accounted for about one-third of the total factor productivity growth. Using a somewhat different approach, Shane, Roe and Gopinath (1998) estimated that private research and development embodied in factor input quality, accounting for about 25 percent of total factor productivity between 1949 and 1991.

[5] The advantages of the Malmquist, or frontier, productivity index, in addition to the decomposition of total factor productivity into efficiency change and technical change, are that: a) it is nonparametric and does not require a specification of the functional form of the production technology; and b) it does not require an economic behavior assumption such as cost minimization or revenue maximization (Färe, Grosskopf and Knox Lovell, 1994; Färe et al., 1994). The contemporaneous Malmquist approach employed by Trueblood and Coggins (2001) identifies the "best practice" countries in each period and measures the change in each country's performance relative to the change in the frontier. A country that shows a positive growth in total factor productivity may show negative Malmquist productivity change because it may lag relative to the best practice frontier. The sequential Malmquist approach that has been employed by Suhariyante, Lusigi and Thirtle (2001) does not permit negative technology shifts.

Figure 3

Efficiency Change, Technical Change and Total Factor Productivity Change in Asian Agriculture

Source: Suharlyanto, Lusigi and Thirtle (2001).

frontier production functions; efficiency change measures change in the difference between average practice and the "best practice" productivity frontier.

These studies generally indicate a widening of the agricultural productivity gap between developed and developing countries between the early 1960s and the early 1990s. Within the group of developed countries, except for continuing divergence between northern and southern Europe, productivity levels have converged modestly. Developing countries as a group experienced declining total factor productivity relative to the frontier countries. There is, however, some evidence of convergence toward the still relatively low frontier productivity levels within African agriculture (Thirtle, Hadley and Townsend, 1995; Fulginiti and Perrin, 1997, 1998; Ball et al., 2001; Chavas, 2001; Suhariyanto, Lusigi and Thirtle, 2001; Trueblood and Coggins, 2001).

The partitioning of total factor productivity into technical efficiency and technical change in Asian agriculture is illustrated in Figure 3. During the period 1965/66–1995/96, the gap between average practice, as measured by technical *efficiency change*, and best practice, as measured by *technical change*, widened. As a result, average *total factor productivity change* (TFP) advanced more slowly than the rate of technical change in the countries on the efficiency frontier. Another way of making the same point is that technical efficiency has lagged relative to technical change associated with the rapid adoption of green revolution seed-fertilizer technology in the frontier countries (Rosegrant and Hazel, 2000, pp. 123–160). The results are not inconsistent with a technical trajectory implied by the induced technical change hypothesis. Technical change in Asia has been strongly biased in a land saving direction, in response to the relatively severe constraints on land resources. This bias is reflected in both a land saving shift in the production function and the substitution of technical inputs, particularly fertilizer and pest and

pathogen control chemicals, for land (Murgai, Ali and Byerlee, 2001; Murgai, 2001). Similar trends have taken place in some of the more land constrained labor intensive agricultural systems in Africa and Latin America.

Transition to Sustainability

Growth in total factor productivity in agriculture, arising out of technical change and improvements in efficiency, has made an exceedingly important contribution to economic growth. Within rural areas, growth of land and labor productivity has led to substantial poverty reduction. Productivity growth has also released substantial resources to the rest of the economy and contributed to reductions in the price of food in both rural and urban areas (Shane, Roe and Gopinath, 1998; Irz et al., 2001). The decline in the price of food, which in many parts of the world is the single most important factor determining the buying power of wages, has been particularly important in reducing the cost of industrial development in a number of important emerging economies. These price declines have also meant that, in countries or regions that have not experienced such gains in agricultural productivity, farmers have lost competitive advantage in world markets and consumers have failed to share fully in the gains from economic growth. But what about the future? In the next two sections, I will first address the environmental and resource constraints and then the scientific and the technical constraints that will confront the world's farmers as they attempt to respond to demands that will be placed on them.[6]

Resource and Environmental Constraints

The leading resource and environmental constraints faced by the world's farmers include soil loss and degradation; water logging and salinity; the coevolution of pests, pathogens and hosts; and the impact of climate change. Part of my concern is with the feedback of the environmental impacts of agricultural intensification on agricultural production itself (Tilman et al., 2001).

Soil. Soil degradation and erosion have been widely regarded as major threats to sustainable growth in agricultural production in both developed and developing countries. It has been suggested, for example, that by 2050, it may be necessary to feed "twice as many people with half as much topsoil" (Harris, 1990, p. 115). However, attempts to assess the implications of soil erosion and degradation confront serious difficulties. Water and wind erosion estimates are measures of the amount of soil moved from one place to another rather than the soil actually lost. Relatively few studies provide the information necessary to estimate yield loss from erosion and degradation. Studies in the United States by the Natural Resources Conservation Service have been interpreted to indicate that if 1992 erosion rates

---

[6] The issues discussed in this section are addressed in greater detail in Ruttan (1999).

continued for 100 years, the yield loss at the end of the period would amount to only 2 to 3 percent (Crosson, 1995a). An exceedingly careful review of the long-term relationship among soil erosion, degradation and crop productivity in China and Indonesia concludes that there has been little loss of organic matter or mineral nutrients and that use of fertilizer has been able to compensate for loss of nitrogen (Lindent, 2000). A careful review of the international literature suggests that yield losses at the global level might be roughly double the rates estimated for the United States (Crosson, 1995b).

At the global level, soil loss and degradation are not likely to represent a serious constraint on agricultural production over the next half-century. But soil loss and degradation could become a serious constraint at the local or regional level in some fragile resource areas. For example, yield constraints due to soil erosion and degradation seem especially severe in the arid and semiarid regions of sub-Saharan Africa. A slowing of agricultural productivity growth in robust resource areas could also lead to intensification or expansion of crop and animal production that would put pressure on soil in fragile resource areas—like tropical rain forests, arid and semiarid regions and high mountain areas. In some such areas, the possibility of sustainable growth in production can be enhanced by irrigation, terracing, careful soil management and changes in commodity mix and farming systems (Lal, 1995; Smil, 2000; Niemeijer and Mazzucato, 2000).

Water. During the last half-century, water has become a resource of high and increasing value in many countries. In the arid and semiarid areas of the world, water scarcity is becoming an increasingly serious constraint on growth of agricultural production (Seckler, Molden and Barker, 1999; Raskin et al., 1998; Gleick, 2000). During the last half-century, irrigated area in developing countries more than doubled, from less than 100 million hectares to more than 200 million hectares. About half of developing country grain production is grown on irrigated land. The International Water Management Institute had projected that by 2025, most regions or countries in a broad sweep from north China across east Asia to north Africa and northern sub-Saharan Africa will experience either absolute or severe water scarcity.[7]

Irrigation systems can be a double-edged answer to water scarcity, since they may have substantial spillover effects or externalities that affect agricultural production directly. Common problems of surface water irrigation systems include water logging and salinity resulting from excessive water use and poorly designed drainage systems (Murgai, Ali and Byerlee, 2001). In the Aral Sea basin in central Asia, the effects of excessive water withdrawal for cotton and rice production,

---

[7] Countries characterized by "absolute water scarcity" do not have sufficient water resources to maintain 1990 levels of per capita food production from irrigated agriculture, even at high levels of irrigation efficiency, and also meet reasonable water demands for domestic, environmental and industrial purposes. Countries characterized by "severe water scarcity" are in regions in which the potential water resources are sufficient to meet reasonable water needs by 2025, but only if they make very substantial improvements in water use efficiency and water development (Seckler, Molden and Barker, 1999).

combined with inadequate drainage facilities, has resulted in such extensive water logging and salinity, as well as contraction of the Aral Sea, that the economic viability of the entire region is threatened (Glazovsky, 1995). Another common externality results from the extraction of water from underground aquifers in excess of the rate at which the aquifers are naturally recharged, resulting in a falling groundwater level and rising pumping costs. In some countries, like Pakistan and India, these spillover effects have in some cases been sufficient to offset the contribution of expansion of irrigated area to agricultural production.

However, the lack of water resources is unlikely to become a severe constraint on global agricultural production in the next half-century. The scientific and technical efforts devoted to improvement in water productivity have been much more limited than efforts to enhance land productivity (Molden, Amarasinghe and Hussain, 2001), so significant productivity improvements in water use are surely possible. Institutional innovations will be required to create incentives to enhance water productivity (Saleth and Dinar, 2000). But in 50 to 60 of the world's most arid countries, plus major regions in several other countries, competition from household, industrial and environmental demands will reallocate water away from agricultural irrigation. In many of these countries, increases in water productivity and changes in farming systems will permit continued increases in agricultural production. In other countries, the reduction in irrigated area will cause a significant constraint on agricultural production. Since these countries are among the world's poorest, some will have great difficulty in meeting food security needs from either domestic production or food imports.

Pests. Pest control has become an increasingly serious constraint on agricultural production in spite of dramatic advances in pest control technology. In the United States, pesticides have been the most rapidly growing input in agricultural production over the last half-century. Major pests include pathogens, insects and weeds. For much of the post–World War II era, pest control has meant application of chemicals. Pesticidal activity of Dichlorodiphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) was discovered in the late 1930s. It was used in World War II to protect American troops against typhus and malaria. Early tests found DDT to be effective against almost all insect species and relatively harmless to humans, animals and plants. It was relatively inexpensive and effective at low application levels. Chemical companies rapidly introduced a series of other synthetic organic pesticides in the 1950s (Ruttan, 1982; Palladino, 1996). The initial effectiveness of DDT and other synthetic organic chemicals for crop and animal pest control after World War II led to the neglect of other pest control strategies.

By the early 1960s, an increasing body of evidence suggested that the benefits of the synthetic organic chemical pesticides introduced in the 1940s and 1950s were obtained at substantial cost. One set of costs included the direct and indirect effects on wildlife populations and on human health (Carson, 1962; Pingali and Roger, 1995). A second set of costs involved the destruction of beneficial insects and the emergence of pesticide resistance in target populations. A fundamental problem in efforts to develop methods of control for pests and pathogens is that the control

results in evolutionary selection pressure for the emergence of organisms that are resistant to the control technology (Palumbi, 2001). When DDT was introduced in California to control the cottony cushions scale, its predator, the vedelia beetle, turned out to be more susceptible to DDT than the scale. In 1947, just one year after the introduction of DDT, citrus growers were confronted with a resurgence of the scale population. In Peru, the cotton bollworm quickly built up resistance to DDT and to the even more effective—and more toxic to humans—organo-phospate insecticides that were adopted to replace DDT (Palladino, 1996, pp. 36–41).

The solution to the pesticide crisis offered by the entomological community was Integrated Pest Management (IPM). IPM involved the integrated use of an array of pest control strategies: making hosts more resistant to pests, finding biological controls for pests, cultivation practices and also chemical control, if needed. At the time Integrated Pest Management began to be promoted in the 1960s, it represented little more than a rhetorical device. But by the 1970s, a number of important Integrated Pest Management programs had been designed and implemented. However, exaggerated expectations that dramatic reductions in chemical pesticide use could be achieved without significant decline in crop yields as a result of Integrated Pest Management have yet only been partially realized (Gianessi, 1991; Lewis et al., 1977).

My own judgment is that the problem of pest and pathogen control will represent a more serious constraint on sustainable growth in agricultural production at a global level than either land or water constraints.[8] In part, this is because the development of pest and pathogen resistant crop varieties and chemical methods of control both tend to induce the evolution of more resistant pests or pathogen. In addition, international travel and trade are spreading the newly resistant pests and pathogens to new environments. As a result, pest control technologies must constantly be replaced and updated. The coevolution of pathogens, insect pests and weeds in response to control efforts will continue to represent a major factor in directing the allocation of agricultural research resources to assuring that agricultural output can be maintained at present levels or continue to grow.[9]

---

[8] Estimates of losses in crop and animal production due to pests vary greatly by commodity, location and year. However, estimates by reputable investigators run upwards of 33 percent of global food crop production. Losses represent a higher percentage of output in less developed countries than in developed countries. Among major commodities, the highest losses are experienced by rice (Yudelman, Ratta and Nygaard, 1998).

[9] I have not in this paper discussed the potential impacts of health constraints on agricultural production. The increase in use of insecticides and herbicides associated with agricultural intensification have had important negative health effects on agricultural workers. The health effects, which include the incidence of new diseases, such as AIDS, and of the resurgence of older diseases, such as malaria and tuberculosis, are greatest in rural communities in developing countries. It is not too difficult to visualize situations in particular villages in which the coincidence of several of these health factors could result in serious constraints on agricultural production (Pingali and Roger, 1995; Bell, Clark and Ruttan, 1994; Haddad and Gillespie, 2001).

Climate. Measurements taken in Hawaii in the late 1950s indicated that carbon dioxide (CO_2) was increasing in the atmosphere. Beginning in the late 1960s, computer model simulations indicated possible changes in temperature and precipitation that could occur due to human-induced emission of CO_2 and other "greenhouse gases" into the atmosphere. By the early 1980s, a fairly broad consensus had emerged in the climate change research community that energy production and consumption from fossil fuels could, by 2050, result in a doubling of the atmospheric concentration of CO_2, a rise in global average temperature by 2.5 to 4.5°C (2.7 to 8.0°F) and a complex pattern of worldwide climate change (Ruttan, 2001, pp. 515–520).

Since the mid-1980s, a succession of studies has attempted to assess how an increase in the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases could affect agricultural production through three channels: a) higher CO_2 concentrations in the atmosphere may have a positive "fertilizer effect" on some crop plants (and weeds); b) higher temperatures could result in a rise in the sea level, resulting in inundation of coastal areas and intrusion of saltwater into groundwater aquifers; and c) changes in temperature, rainfall and sunlight may also alter agricultural production, although the effects will vary greatly across regions. Early assessments of the impact of climate change on global agricultural suggested a negative annual impact in the 2 to 4 percent range by the third decade of this century (Parry, 1990). More recent projections are more optimistic (Mendelsohn, Nordhaus and Shaw, 1994; Rosenzweig and Hillel, 1998). The early models have been criticized for a "dumb farmer" assumption—they did not incorporate how farmers would respond to climate change with different crops and growing methods. Efforts to incorporate how public and private suppliers of knowledge and technology might adjust to climate change are just beginning (Evenson, 1998). But even the more sophisticated models have been unable to incorporate the synergistic interactions among climate change, soil loss and degradation, ground and surface water storage and the incidence of pests and pathogens. These interactive effects could combine into a significantly larger burden on growth in agricultural production than the effects of each constraint considered separately. One thing that is certain is that a country or region that has not acquired substantial agricultural research capacity will have great difficulty in responding to anticipated climate change impacts.

Scientific and Technical Constraints

The achievement of sustained growth in agricultural production over the next half-century represents at least as difficult a challenge to science and technology development as the transition to a science-based system of agricultural production during the twentieth century. In assessing the role of advances in science and technology to release the several constraints on growth of agricultural production and productivity, the induced technical change hypothesis is useful. To the extent that technical change in agriculture is endogenous, scientific and technical resources will be directed to sustaining or enhancing the productivity of those factors that are relatively scarce and expensive. Farmers in those countries who have not

yet acquired the capacity to invent or adapt technology specific to their resource endowments will continue to find it difficult to respond to the growth of domestic or international demand.

In the 1950s and 1960s, it was not difficult to anticipate the likely sources of increase in agricultural production over the next several decades (Ruttan, 1956; Schultz, 1964; Millikan and Hapgood, 1967). Advances in crop production would come from expansion in area irrigated, from more intensive application of improved fertilizer and crop protection chemicals and from the development of crop varieties that would be more responsive to technical inputs and management. Advances in animal production would come from genetic improvements and advances in animal nutrition. At a more fundamental level, increases in crop yields would come from genetic advances that would change plant architecture to make possible higher plant populations per hectare and would increase the ratio of grain to straw in individual plants. Increases in production of animals and animal products would come about by genetic and management changes that would decrease the proportion of feed devoted to animal maintenance and increase the proportion used to produce usable animal products.

I find it much more difficult to tell a convincing story about the likely sources of increase in crop and animal production over the next half-century than I did a half-century ago. The ratio of grain to straw is already high in many crops, and severe physiological constraints arise in trying to increase it further. There are also physiological limits to increasing the efficiency with which animal feed produces animal products. These constraints will impinge most severely in areas that have already achieved the highest levels of output per hectare or per animal unit—in western Europe, north America and east Asia. Indeed, the constraints are already evident. The yield increases from incremental fertilizer application are falling. The reductions in labor input from the use of larger and more powerful mechanical equipment are declining as well. As average grain yields have risen from the 1 to 2 metric tons per hectare range to the 6 to 8 metric tons per hectare range in the most favored areas, the share of research budgets devoted to maintenance research—the research needed to maintain existing crop and animal productivity levels—has risen relative to total research budgets (Plucknet and Smith, 1986). Cost per scientist year has been rising faster than the general price level (Pardey, Craig and Hallaway, 1989; Huffman and Evenson, 1993). I find it difficult to escape a conclusion that both public and private sector agricultural research, in those countries that have achieved the highest levels of agricultural productivity, has begun to experience diminishing returns.

Perhaps advances in molecular biology and genetic engineering will relieve the scientific and technical constraints on the growth of agricultural production. In the past, advances in fundamental knowledge have often initiated new cycles of research productivity (Evenson and Kislev, 1975). Transgenetically modified crops, particularly maize, soybeans and cotton, have diffused rapidly since they were first introduced in the mid-1990s. Four countries—United States, Argentina, Canada and China—accounted for 99 percent of the 109 million acres of transgenic crop

area in 2000 (James, 2000). The applications that are presently available in the field are primarily in the area of plant protection and animal health. Among the more dramatic examples is the development of cotton varieties that incorporate resistance to the cotton bollworm. The effect has been to reduce the application of chemical control from 8 to 10 to 1 to 2 spray applications per season (Falck-Zepeda et al., 2000). These advances are enabling producers to push crop and animal yields closer to their genetically determined biological potential. But they have not yet raised biological yield ceilings above the levels that that have been achieved by researchers employing the older methods based on Mendelian genetics (Ruttan, 1999).

Advances in agricultural applications of genetic engineering in developed countries will almost certainly be slowed by developed country concerns about the possible environmental and health impacts of transgenetically modified plants and foods.

One effect of these concerns has been to shift the attention of biotechnology research effort away from agricultural applications in favor of industrial and pharmaceutical applications (Committee on Environmental Impact Associated with Commercialization of Transgenic Plants, 2002, pp. 221–229). This shift will delay the development of productivity-enhancing biotechnology applications and agricultural development in less developed economies.

I find it somewhat surprising that it is difficult for me to share the current optimism about the dramatic gains to be realized from the application of molecular genetics and genetic engineering. One of my first professional papers was devoted to refuting the pessimistic projections of agricultural productivity and production that were common in the early 1950s (Ruttan, 1956). Other students of this subject have presented more optimistic perspectives (Waggoner, 1997; Alston et al. 2000, p. 77; Runge et al., 2001). But I am skeptical that the new genetics technologies, although undoubtedly powerful, will or can overcome the long-term prospect of diminishing returns to research on agricultural productivity.

Agricultural Research Systems

I have given major attention to this point, to the role of agricultural research as a source of technical change and productivity growth. In this section, I sketch the evolution and structure of national and international agricultural research systems.[10] The institutional arrangements for the support of agricultural research began in the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1843, Sir John Bennett Laws established, and later endowed, an agricultural experiment station on his ancestral estate at Rothamsted (England). The introduction by Justus von Liebig of the laboratory method of training in organic chemistry at Giessen led directly to the establishment of the first publicly supported agricultural experiment station at Mockern, Saxony, in 1852. The German model of public sector agricultural research became the model for agricultural research in the United States. A number of American students who studied with Liebig were responsible for establishing the

---

[10] For a more detailed discussion of the evolution and structure of national and international agricultural research, see Ruttan (1982) and Huffman and Evenson (1993).

Figure 4
Sources and Flows of Funding for Agricultural Research: 1998

Federal $1,517 million	States $1,143 million	Private Sector $5,074 million

$783 million

$733 million

$1,143 million

$510 million

$4,560 million

USDA $787 million	SAES* & cooperating institutions $2,386 million	Industry $4,560 million

$4 million

Note: SAES is the State Agricultural Experiment Station.
Source: Adapted from Fuglie, Ballenger, Day, Klotz, Ollinger, Reilly, Vasavada and Lee (1996).

research program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations at the new land grant public universities in the late 1800s (Ruttan, 1982). The basic structure of the U.S. agricultural research system has become increasingly complex, with the federal government, individual states and the private sector each playing an important role. The sources and flows of funding for 1998 are shown in Figure 4.

Substantial progress was made in the first several decades of the twentieth century in initiating public sector agricultural research capacity in Latin America and in the colonial economies of Asia and Africa. Research efforts were focused primarily on tropical export crops such as sugar, rubber, cotton, banana, coffee and tea. The disruption of international trade during the Great Depression of the 1930s and during World War II, followed by the breakup of colonial empires, aborted or severely weakened many of these efforts.

By the early 1960s, the U.S. development assistance agency and the assistance agencies of the former colonial powers were beginning to channel substantial resources into strengthening agricultural education and research institutions with a stronger focus on domestic food crops in developing countries. The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations collaborated in the establishment of four international agricultural research institutes: the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in the Philippines; the International Center for the Improvement of Maize and Wheat (CIMMYT) in Mexico; the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) in Nigeria; and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Columbia. In 1971, the two foundations, joined by the World Bank, the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and a number of bilateral donor agencies, formed a Consultative

Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). By the early 1990s, the CGIAR systems had expanded to 18 centers or institutes.

From the 1950s through the 1980s, the resources available to the new national and international research institutions from national and international sources expanded rapidly. Both the national and international systems achieved dramatic success in the development of higher yielding "green revolution" wheat, rice and maize varieties (Alston et al., 2000; Ruttan, 2001, pp. 203–223). Several developing countries—India, China, Brazil, Argentina and South Africa—achieved world class agricultural research capacity. During the 1990s, however, growth of public sector support for both national and international agricultural research slowed substantially. Support for private sector agricultural research, which remains concentrated primarily in developed countries, has continued to grow rapidly.[11]

An active and vibrant global agricultural research system will be needed to sustain growth in agricultural productivity into the twenty-first century. But the system itself is still incomplete. When it is completed, it will include strong public national research institutions, linked to higher education, that can work effectively with the international system and other national systems. This network will be complemented by a scientifically sophisticated technology supply industry, composed of both national and multinational firms. The research systems in most developing countries have yet to establish sufficient capacity to make effective use of the existing advances in knowledge and technology. The private sector agricultural technology supply industry, although growing rapidly, still remains poorly represented in most developing countries.

Perspective

What are the implications of the resource and environmental constraints, the scientific and technical constraints, and the institutional constraints on agricultural productivity growth over the next half-century? In those countries and regions in which land and labor productivity are already at or approaching scientific and technical frontiers, it will be difficult to achieve growth in agricultural productivity comparable to the rates achieved over the last half-century (Pingali, Moya and Velasco, 1990; Reilly and Fuglie, 1998; Pingali and Heisey, 2001). But in most of these countries at the technological frontier, the demand for food will rise only slowly. As a result, these countries, except perhaps those that are most land constrained, will have little difficulty in achieving rates of growth in agricultural

[11] In 1995, it was estimated that global agricultural research expenditures amounted to $33 billion (in 1993 dollars). Of this amount, public sector expenditures amounted to $12.2 billion in developed countries and $11.5 billion in developing countries. Private sector expenditures for agricultural research amounted to $10.8 billion in developed and $0.7 billion in developing countries. Support for the CGIAR system declined from $334 million in 1990 to $305 million (1993 prices) in 2000 (Pardey and Beintema, 2001).

production that will keep up with the slowly rising demand for food. Several of the countries near the technological frontier, particularly in east Asia, will find it economically advantageous to continue to import substantial quantities of animal feed and food grains (Rosegrant and Hazel, 2000).

For those countries in which land and labor productivity levels are furthest from frontier levels, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa, opportunities exist to enhance agricultural productivity substantially. Countries that are land constrained, such as India, can be expected to follow a productivity growth path that places primary emphasis on biological technology. In contrast, Brazil, which is still involved in expanding its agricultural land frontier while confronting crop yield constraints in its older agricultural regions, can be expected to follow a more balanced productivity growth path. Most of the poor countries or regions that find it advantageous to follow a biological technology path will have to invest substantially more than in the past to acquire a capacity for agricultural research and technology transfer. These investments will include general and technical education, rural physical infrastructure and building appropriate research and technology transfer institutions. Moreover, gains in labor productivity will depend on the rate of growth in demand for labor in the nonfarm sectors of the economy, which in turn create the incentives for substituting of mechanical technology for labor in agricultural production. If relatively land abundant countries, in sub-Saharan Africa, for example, fail to develop a strong intersector labor market in which workers can move from rural agricultural jobs to urban manufacturing and service jobs, they will end up following an east Asian land saving biological technology path.

I find it more difficult to anticipate the productivity paths that will be followed by several other regions. The countries of the former USSR have in the past followed a trajectory somewhat similar to North America (as shown in Figure 2). If they recover from recent stagnation, these countries may resume their historical trajectory.[12] The trajectories that will be followed by west Asia, north Africa and other arid regions are highly uncertain. Very substantial gains in water productivity will be required to realize gains in land productivity in these areas, and very substantial growth in nonagricultural demand for labor will be required to realize the substantial gains in labor productivity that would enable them to continue along the intermediate technology trajectory that has characterized the countries of southern Europe. The major oil-producing countries will continue to expand their imports of food and feed grains. If the world should move toward more open trading arrangements, a number of tropical or semitropical developing countries would find it advantageous to expand their exports of commodities in which their climate and other resources give them a comparative advantage and import larger quantities of food and feed grains.

---

[12] Between 1962 and 1990, crop yields in the former Soviet Union experienced modest gains relative to the world's leaders. Since the early 1990s, however, yield growth rates became negative, and by 1997, the yield gap between the countries of the former Soviet Union and the world leaders exceeded the levels of 1962 (Trueblood and Arnade, 2001).

While many of the constraints on agricultural productivity discussed in this paper are unlikely to represent a threat to global food security over the next half-century, they will, either individually or collectively, become a threat to growth of agricultural production at the regional and local level in a number of the world's poorest countries. A primary defense against the uncertainty about resource and environmental constraints is agricultural research capacity. The erosion of capacity of the international research system will have to be reversed; capacity in the presently developed countries will have to be at least maintained; and capacity in the developing countries will have to be substantially strengthened. Smaller countries will need, at the very least, to strengthen their capacity to borrow, adapt and diffuse technology from countries in comparable agroclimatic regions. It also means that more secure bridges must be built between the research systems of what have been termed the "island empires" of the agricultural, environmental and health sciences (Mayer and Mayer, 1974).

If the world fails to meet its food demands in the next half-century, the failure will be at least as much in the area of institutional innovation as in the area of technical change. This conclusion is not an optimistic one. The design of institutions capable of achieving compatibility between individual, organizational and social objectives remains an art rather than a science. At our present stage of knowledge, institutional design is analogous to driving down a four-lane highway looking out the rear-view mirror. We are better at making course corrections when we start to run off the highway than at using foresight to navigate the transition to sustainable growth in agricultural output and productivity.

References

Alston, Julian M. et al. 2000. *A Meta-Analysis of Rates of Return to Agricultural R&D: Ex Pede Herculem.* Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Arnade, Carlos. 1998. "Using a Programming Approach to Measure International Agricultural Efficiency and Productivity." *Journal of Agricultural Economics.* 49:1, pp. 67–84.

Ball, V. Eldon et al. 2001. "Levels of Farm Sector Productivity: An International Comparison." *Journal of Productivity Analysis.* January, 15:1, pp. 5–29.

Balogh, Thomas. 1964. "Review of *Transforming Traditional Agriculture.*" *Economic Journal.* 74: 296, pp. 996–99.

Barton, Glenn T. and Martin R. Cooper. 1948. "Relation of Agricultural Production to Inputs." *Review of Economics and Statistics.* 30:1, pp. 117–26.

Bell, David E., William C. Clark and Vernon W. Ruttan. 1994. "Global Research Systems for Sustainable Development: Agriculture, Health and Environment," in *Agriculture, Environment, and Health: Sustainable Development in the 21st Century.* Vernon W. Ruttan, ed. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 358–79.

Binswanger, Hans P. and Vernon W. Ruttan, eds. 1978. *Induced Innovation: Technology, Institutions and Development.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Brewster, John M. 1950. "The Machine Process in Agriculture and Industry." *Journal of Farm Economics.* February, 32, pp. 69–81.

Carson, Rachel. 1962. *Silent Spring.* New York: Fawcett.

Chavas, Jean-Paul. 2001. "An International Analysis of Agricultural Productivity," in *Agricultural Investment and Productivity in Developing Countries.* Lydia Zepeda, ed. Rome, Italy: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, pp. 21–37.

Clark, Collin. 1940. *The Conditions of Economic Progress, First Edition.* London: Macmillan, Third Edition, 1957.

Committee on Environmental Impacts Associated with Commercialization of Transgenic Plants. 2002. *Environmental Effects of Transgenic Plants: The Scope and Adequacy of Regulation.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Conway, Gordon R. 1998. *The Doubly Green Revolution: Food for All in the Twenty-First Century.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Craig, Barbara J., Philip G. Pardey and Johannes Roseboom. 1997. "International Productivity Patterns: Accounting for Input Quality, Infrastructure and Research." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics.* November, 79:4, pp. 1064–076.

Crosson, Pierre. 1995a. "Soil Erosion Estimates and Costs." *Science.* 269:5223, pp. 461–63.

Crosson, Pierre. 1995b. "Soil Erosion and its On-Farm Productivity Consequences: What Do We Know?" Washington, D.C., Resources for the Future Discussion Paper 95-29.

Evenson, Robert E. 1998. "Technology, Climate Change, Productivity and Land Use in Brazilian Agriculture." Yale University Economic Growth Center Staff Paper.

Evenson, Robert E. and Yoav Kislev. 1975. *Agricultural Research and Productivity.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Falck-Zepeda, José B. et al. 2000. "Surplus Distribution from the Introduction of a Biotechnology Innovation." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics.* May, 82, pp. 360–69.

Färe, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf and C. A. Knox Lovell. 1994. *Production Frontiers.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Färe, Rolf et al. 1994. "Productivity Growth, Technical Progress, and Efficiency Changes in Industrialized Countries." *American Economic Review.* 84:1, pp. 66–83.

Fuglie, Keith et al. 1996. "Agricultural Research and Development: Public and Private Investment Under Alternative Markets and Institutions." Washington, D.C., USDA Economic Research Service Report AE 35.

Fulginiti, Lilyan E. and Richard K. Perrin. 1997. "LDC Agriculture: Nonparametric Malmquist Productivity Indexes." *Journal of Development Economics.* 53:2, pp. 373–90.

Fulginiti, Lilyan E. and Richard K. Perrin. 1998. "Agricultural Productivity in Developing Countries." *Agricultural Economics.* 19:1-2, pp. 45–51.

Gianessi, L. P. 1991. "Reducing Pesticide Use with No Cost in Yields? A Critique of a Recent Cornell Report." Washington, D.C., Resources for the Future Discussion Paper 0E91-16.

Glazovsky, N. F. 1995. "The Aral Sea Basin," in *Regions at Risk: Comparisons of Threatened Environments.* J. X. Kasperson, R. E. Kasperson and B. L. Turner, eds. New York: United Nations University Press, pp. 92–140.

Gleick, Peter H. 2000. "The Changing Water Paradigm: A Look at Twenty-first Century Water Resource Development." *Water International.* 25:1, pp. 127–38.

Griliches, Zvi. 1968. "Agriculture: Productivity and Technology," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 1.* David L. Sills, ed. New York: Macmillan Press, pp. 241–45.

Haddad, Lawrence and Stuart Gillespie. 2001. "Effective Food and Nutrition Responses to HIV/AIDS: What We Know and What We Need to Know." Washington, D.C., International Food Policy Research Institute/FCN Discussion Paper, March 13.

Harris, J. M. 1990. *World Agriculture and the Environment.* Garland: New York.

Hayami, Yujiro. 1969. "Industrialization and Agricultural Productivity: An International and Comparative Study." *Developing Economies.* 7, pp. 3–21.

Hayami, Yujiro and Kinuyo Inagi. 1969. "International Comparisons of Agricultural Productivity." *Farm Economist.* 11, pp. 407–19.

Hayami, Yujiro and Vernon W. Ruttan. 1970. "Agricultural Productivity: Differences Among Countries." *American Economic Review.* December, 60:5, pp. 895–911.

Hayami, Yujiro and Vernon W. Ruttan. 1971. *Agricultural Development: An International Perspective, First Edition.* Second Edition, 1985. Baltimore, M.D.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hayami, Yujiro et al. 1971. *An International Comparison of Agricultural Production and Productivities.* St. Paul, Minn.: University of Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 277.

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

Irz, Xavier et al. 2001. "Agricultural Productivity Growth and Poverty Alleviation." *Development Policy Review.* 19: 4, pp. 449–66.

James, Clive. 2000. *Global Review of Commercialized Transgenic Crops: 2000.* Ithaca, N.Y.: International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications.

Johnson, D. Gale. 2000. "Population Food and Knowledge." *American Economic Review.* 90:1, pp. 1–14.

Jorgenson, Dale W. and Frank M. Gollop. 1995. "Productivity Growth in U.S. Agriculture: A Postwar Perspective," in *Productivity, Volume 1: Postwar U.S. Economic Growth.* Dale W. Jorgenson, ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 389–400.

Kawagoe, T., Yujiro Hayami and Vernon W. Ruttan. 1985. "The Intercountry Agricultural Production Function and Productivity Differences Among Countries." *Journal of Development Economics.* September/October, 19, pp. 113–32.

Koppel, Bruce M., ed. 1995. *Induced Innovation Theory and International Agricultural Development: A Reassessment.* Baltimore, M.D.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lal, Rattan. 1995. "Erosion-Crop Productivity Relationships for Soils in Africa." *Soil Science Society of America Journal.* 59:3, pp. 661–67.

Lau, Lawrence and Pan Yotopoulos. 1989. "The Meta-Production Function Approach to Technological Change in World Agriculture." *Journal of Development Economics.* October, 31:2, pp. 241–69.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1954. "Economic Development With Unlimited Supply of Labor." *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies.* 22, pp. 139–91.

Lewis, W. J. et al. 1997. "A Total System Approach to Sustainable Pest Management." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 94:23, pp. 12243–2249.

Lindent, Peter H. 2000. *Shifting Ground: The Changing Agricultural Soils of China and Indonesia.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lipton, Michael. 1968. "The Theory of the Optimizing Peasant." *Journal of Development Studies.* 4:3, pp. 327–51.

Mayer, André and Jean Mayer. 1974. "Agriculture, the Island Empire." *Daedalus.* Summer, 103, pp. 83–95.

Mendelsohn, Robert, William D. Nordhaus and D. Shaw. 1994. "The Impact of Global Warming on Agriculture: A Ricardian Analysis." *American Economic Review.* 84:4, pp. 753–71.

Millikan, Max F. and David Hapgood. 1967. *No Easy Harvest: The Dilemma of Agriculture in Underdeveloped Countries.* Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown.

Molden, David, Upali Amarasinghe and Intizar Hussain. 2001. "Water for Development: Background Paper in Water for Rural Development Prepared for the World Bank." Colombo, Sri Lanka, International Water Management Institute Working Paper 32.

Murgai, Rinku. 2001. "The Green Revolution and the Productivity Paradox: Evidence from the Indian Punjab." *Agricultural Economics.* September, 25:2-3, pp. 199–209.

Murgai, Rinku, Mubarik Ali and Derek Byerlee. 2001. "Productivity Growth and Sustainability in Post-Green Revolution Agriculture: The Case of the Indian and Pakistan Punjabs." *World Bank Research Observer.* Fall, 16:2, pp. 199–218.

Niemeijer, David and Valintina Mazzucato. 2000. "Soil Degradation in the West African Sahel: How Serious Is It?" *Environment.* March, 41:2, pp. 20–31.

Olmstead, Alan L. and Paul Rhode. 1993. "Induced Innovation in American Agriculture: A

Reconsideration." *Journal of Political Economy.* February, 101:1, pp. 100–18.

Olmstead, Alan L. and Paul Rhode. 2001. "Reshaping the Landscape: The Impact and Diffusion of the Tractor in American Agriculture, 1910–1960." *Journal of Economic History.* September, 61:3, pp. 663–68.

Palladino, Paulo. 1996. *Entomology, Ecology and Agriculture: The Making of Scientific Careers in North America, 1885–1995.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Parry, Martin L. 1990. *Climate Change and World Agriculture.* London, U.K.: Earthscan Publications.

Palumbi, Stephen R. 1986. "Humans as the World's Greatest Evolutionary Force." *Science.* 293:5536, pp. 1786–790.

Pardey, Philip G. and Nienke M. Beintema. 2001. *Slow Magic: Agricultural R&D a Century After Mendel.* Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Pardey, Philip J., Barbara J. Craig and Michelle J. Hallaway. 1989. "U.S. Agricultural Research Deflators: 1890–1985." *Research Policy.* October, 18, pp. 289–96.

Pingali, Prabhu L. and Paul W. Heisey. 2001. "Cereal Crop Productivity in Developing Countries: Past Trends and Future Prospects," in Julian M. Alston, Philip G. Pardey and M. J. Taylor, eds. *Agricultural Science Policy, Changing Global Agendas.* Baltimore, M.D.: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 56–82.

Pingali, Prabhu L. and Pierre A. Roger, eds. 1995. *Impact of Pesticides on Farmer Health and the Rice Environment.* Boston, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Pingali, Prabhu L., F. Moya and L. E. Velasco. 1990. "The Post-Green Revolution Blues in Asian Rice Production: The Diminished Gap Between Experiment Station and Farmer Yields." Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines, International Rice Research Institute Social Science Division Paper No. 90-01.

Plucknett, Donald L. and Nigel J. H. Smith. 1986. "Sustaining Agricultural Yields." *Bioscience.* 36:1, pp. 40–45.

Qi, Shunrong, Lan Xu and Jay Coggins. 2001. "Integrated Environmental-Economic Accounting." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics.* Forthcoming.

Ranis, Gustav and John C. H. Fei. 1961. "A Theory of Economic Development." *American Economic Review.* September, 51:4, pp. 533–65.

Raskin, Paul et al. 1998. *Comprehensive Assessment of the Freshwater Resources of the World.* Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm Environment Institute.

Reilly, John M. and Keith O. Fuglie. 1998. "Future Yield Growth in Field Crops: What Evidence Exists?" *Soil and Tillage Research.* July, 47: 3-4, pp. 283–98.

Rosegrant, Mark W. and Peter B. Hazel. 2000. *Transforming the Rural Asian Economy: The Unfinished Revolution.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Rosenzweig, Cynthia and D. Hillel. 1998. *Climate Change and the Global Harvest.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rostow, Walt W. 1956. "The Take-off Into Self-Sustained Growth." *Economic Journal.* March, 66, pp. 25–48.

Runge, C. Ford et al. 2001. *Ending Hunger in Our Lifetime: Food Security and Globalization.* Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Ruttan, Vernon W. 1956. "The Contribution of Technological Progress to Farm Output: 1950–1975." *Review of Economics and Statistics.* February, 38, pp. 61–69.

Ruttan, Vernon W. 1982. *Agricultural Research Policy.* Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Ruttan, Vernon W. 1999. "The Transition to Agricultural Sustainability." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* May, 96, pp. 5960–967.

Ruttan, Vernon W. 2001. *Technology, Growth and Development: An Induced Innovation Perspective.* Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Ruttan, Vernon W. and Yujiro Hayami. 1995. "Induced Innovation Theory and Agricultural Development: A Personal Account," in *Induced Innovation Theory and International Agricultural Development: A Reassessment.* Bruce M. Koppel, ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 22–36.

Saleth, R. Maria and Ariel Dinar. 2000. "Institutional Changes in Global Water Sector: Trends, Patterns and Implications." *Water Policy.* 2:3, pp. 175–99.

Seckler, David, D. Molden and Randolph Barker. 1999. "Water Scarcity in the Twenty-First Century." *International Journal of Water Resources Management.* 15:1-2, pp. 29–42.

Schultz, Theodore W. 1953. *The Economic Organization of Agriculture.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Schultz, Theodore W. 1964. *Transforming Traditional Agriculture.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Shane, Mathew, Terry Roe and Munisamy Gopinath. 1998. "U.S. Agricultural Growth and Productivity: An Economy Wide Perspective." Washington, D.C., United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Agricultural Economic Report 758.

Smil, Vaclav. 2000. *Feeding the World: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Suhariyanto, K., A Lusigi and Colin Thirtle. 2001. "Productivity Growth and Convergence in Asian and African Agriculture," in *Asia and Africa in Comparative Economic Perspective.* P. Lawrence and Colin Thirtle, eds. London: Palgrave, pp. 258–74.

Thirtle, Colin G., David Hadley and Robert Townsend. 1995. "A Multilateral Malmquist Productivity Index Approach to Explaining Agricultural Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Development Policy Review.* 13:4, pp. 323–48.

Tilman, David et al. 2001. "Forecasting Agriculturally Driven Global Environmental Change." *Science.* April 13, 292, pp. 281–84.

Trueblood, Michael A. and Carlos Arnade. 2001. "Crop Yield Convergence: How Russia's Yield Performance has Compared to Global Yield Leaders." *Comparative Economic Studies.* 43:2, pp. 59–81.

Trueblood, Michael A. and Jay Coggins. 2001. "Intercountry Agricultural Efficiency and Productivity: A Malmquist Index Approach." Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, June.

Trueblood, Michael A. and Vernon W. Ruttan. 1995. "A Comparison of Multifactor Productivity Calculation of the U.S. Agricultural Sector." *Journal of Productivity Analysis.* December, 6:9, pp. 321–32.

United Nations. 2001. "World Population Prospects: The 2000 Revision." United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, ESA/P/WP 165. Available at ⟨http://www.un.org/esa/population/wpp2000.htm⟩.

Waggoner, Paul E. 1997. "How Much Land Can Ten Billion People Spare for Nature?" in *Technology Trajectories and the Human Environment.* Jesse H. Ausubel and H. D. Langford, eds. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, pp. 57–73.

White, William J. III. 2000. "An Unsung Hero: The Farm Tractor's Contribution to Twentieth-Century United States Economic Growth." Ohio State University, Ph.D. Thesis.

Yudelman, Montague, Anna Ratta and David Nygaard. 1998. "Pest Management and Food Production." Washington, D.C., International Food Policy Research Institute, Food, Agriculture and the Environment Discussion Paper 25.

This article has been cited by:

1. Jason Potts, Tim Kastelle. 2017. Economics of innovation in Australian agricultural economics and policy. *Economic Analysis and Policy* **54**, 96-104. [CrossRef]

2. Kumud Malika Tripathi, Anshu Bhati, Anupriya Singh, Amit Kumar Sonker, Sabyasachi Sarkar, Sumit Kumar Sonkar. 2017. Sustainable Changes in the Contents of Metallic Micronutrients in First Generation Gram Seeds Imposed by Carbon Nano-onions: Life Cycle Seed to Seed Study. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering* . [CrossRef]

3. Axel Ebers, Trung Thanh Nguyen, Ulrike Grote. 2017. Production efficiency of rice farms in Thailand and Cambodia: a comparative analysis of Ubon Ratchathani and Stung Treng provinces. *Paddy and Water Environment* **15**:1, 79-92. [CrossRef]

4. Fan Zhang, Jinyan Zhan, Qian Zhang, Haiming Yan, Zhongxiao Sun. 2016. Allocating agricultural production factors: A scenario-based modeling of wheat production in Shandong Province, China. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C* **96**, 55-63. [CrossRef]

5. Mercedes Campi. 2016. The effect of intellectual property rights on agricultural productivity. *Agricultural Economics* . [CrossRef]

6. César Salazar, John Rand. 2016. Production risk and adoption of irrigation technology: evidence from small-scale farmers in Chile. *Latin American Economic Review* **25**:1. . [CrossRef]

7. Jakob B. Madsen, Md. Rabiul Islam. 2016. Exploring the widening food gap: an international perspective. *Agricultural Economics* **47**:6, 645-659. [CrossRef]

8. Víctor H. Moreira, Boris E. Bravo-Ureta. 2016. Total factor productivity change in dairy farming: Empirical evidence from southern Chile. *Journal of Dairy Science* **99**:10, 8356-8364. [CrossRef]

9. Gudbrand Lien, Subal C. Kumbhakar, J. Brian Hardaker. 2016. Accounting for risk in productivity analysis: an application to Norwegian dairy farming. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* . [CrossRef]

10. Moti Jaleta, Menale Kassie, Kindie Tesfaye, Tilaye Teklewold, Pradyot Ranjan Jena, Paswel Marenya, Olaf Erenstein. 2016. Resource saving and productivity enhancing impacts of crop management innovation packages in Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics* **47**:5, 513-522. [CrossRef]

11. Susanne Scheierling, David O. Treguer, James F. Booker. 2016. Water Productivity in Agriculture: Looking for Water in the Agricultural Productivity and Efficiency Literature. *Water Economics and Policy* **02**:03, 1650007. [CrossRef]

12. Thapanut Sarinont, Takaaki Amano, Pankaj Attri, Kazunori Koga, Nobuya Hayashi, Masaharu Shiratani. 2016. Effects of plasma irradiation using various feeding gases on growth of Raphanus sativus L. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* **605**, 129-140. [CrossRef]

13. Gustav Engström. 2016. Structural and climatic change. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **37**, 62-74. [CrossRef]

14. Jan Ženka, Ondřej Slach, Luděk Krtička, Petr Žufan. 2016. Determinants of microregional agricultural labour productivity – Evidence from Czechia. *Applied Geography* **71**, 83-94. [CrossRef]

15. S. Niggol SeoModeling Microbehavioral Decisions: Economic Perspectives 25-67. [CrossRef]

16. S. Niggol SeoModeling a Complex Structure in Microbehavioral Methods in Tandem With Changes in Global Ecosystems 191-233. [CrossRef]

17. Jan Ženka, Petr Žufan, Luděk Krtička, Ondřej Slach. 2015. Labour productivity of agricultural business companies and cooperatives in the Czech Republic: A micro-regional level analysis. *Moravian Geographical Reports* **23**:4. . [CrossRef]

18. Abdullahi Iliyasu, Zainal Abidin Mohamed, Mazuki Hashim. 2014. Productivity growth, technical change and efficiency change of the Malaysian cage fish farming: an application of Malmquist Productivity Index approach. *Aquaculture International* . [CrossRef]

19. Raffaele Spinelli, Carolina Lombardini, Luigi Pari, Liana Sadauskiene. 2014. An alternative to field burning of pruning residues in mountain vineyards. *Ecological Engineering* **70**, 212-216. [CrossRef]

20. Carlos Dionisio Pérez-Blanco, Carlos Mario Gómez. 2014. Drought management plans and water availability in agriculture: A risk assessment model for a Southern European basin. *Weather and Climate Extremes* **4**, 11-18. [CrossRef]

21. Jeremy Hall, Stelvia V. Matos, Michael J.C. Martin. 2014. Innovation pathways at the Base of the Pyramid: Establishing technological legitimacy through social attributes. *Technovation* **34**:5-6, 284-294. [CrossRef]

22. Julian M. Alston, Philip G. Pardey. 2014. Agriculture in the Global Economy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **28**:1, 121-146. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

23. Luc NijsFarmland II: Capita Selecta 233-244. [CrossRef]

24. Tesfamicheal Wossen, Thomas Berger, Teferi Mequaninte, Bamlaku Alamirew. 2013. Social network effects on the adoption of sustainable natural resource management practices in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* **20**:6, 477-483. [CrossRef]

25. S. Niggol Seo. 2013. An essay on the impact of climate change on US agriculture: weather fluctuations, climatic shifts, and adaptation strategies. *Climatic Change* **121**:2, 115-124. [CrossRef]

26. ANDREW OJEDE, AMIN MUGERA, DAIGYO SEO. 2013. MACROECONOMIC POLICY REFORMS AND PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH IN AFRICAN AGRICULTURE. *Contemporary Economic Policy* **31**:4, 814-830. [CrossRef]

27. John Adam Sparger, George W. Norton, Paul W. Heisey, Jeffrey Alwang. 2013. Is the share of agricultural maintenance research rising in the United States?. *Food Policy* **38**, 126-135. [CrossRef]

28. Mekonnen B. Wakeyo, Cornelis Gardebroek. 2013. Does water harvesting induce fertilizer use among smallholders? Evidence from Ethiopia. *Agricultural Systems* **114**, 54-63. [CrossRef]

29. Isha Sharma, Renu Bhardwaj, Pratap Kumar Pati. 2012. Mitigation of adverse effects of chlorpyrifos by 24-epibrassinolide and analysis of stress markers in a rice variety Pusa Basmati-1. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* **85**, 72-81. [CrossRef]

30. Markus Eberhardt, Francis Teal. 2012. No Mangoes in the Tundra: Spatial Heterogeneity in Agricultural Productivity Analysis*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* no-no. [CrossRef]

31. A. Amarender Reddy, Ma Cynthia S. Bantilan. 2012. Competitiveness and technical efficiency: Determinants in the groundnut oil sector of India. *Food Policy* **37**:3, 255-263. [CrossRef]

32. Jean-Jacques Dethier, Alexandra Effenberger. 2012. Agriculture and development: A brief review of the literature. *Economic Systems* **36**:2, 175-205. [CrossRef]

33. Carlos Mario Gómez Gómez, Carlos Dionisio Pérez Blanco. 2012. Do drought management plans reduce drought risk? A risk assessment model for a Mediterranean river basin. *Ecological Economics* **76**, 42-48. [CrossRef]

34. Jeremy Hall, Stelvia Matos, Lorn Sheehan, Bruno Silvestre. 2012. Entrepreneurship and Innovation at the Base of the Pyramid: A Recipe for Inclusive Growth or Social Exclusion?. *Journal of Management Studies* no-no. [CrossRef]

35. Julian A. Lampietti, Sean Michaels, Nicholas Magnan, Alex F. McCalla, Maurice Saade, Nadim Khouri. 2011. A strategic framework for improving food security in Arab countries. *Food Security* **3**:S1, 7-22. [CrossRef]

36. Viet-Ngu Hoang. 2011. Measuring and decomposing changes in agricultural productivity, nitrogen use efficiency and cumulative exergy efficiency: Application to OECD agriculture. *Ecological Modelling* **222**:1, 164-175. [CrossRef]

37. Waleerat Suphannachart, Peter Warr. 2011. Research and productivity in Thai agriculture. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* **55**:1, 35-52. [CrossRef]

38. Thomas W. Hertel. 2011. The Global Supply and Demand for Agricultural Land in 2050: A Perfect Storm in the Making?1. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **93**:2, 259-275. [CrossRef]

39. Melanie O'Gorman, Manish Pandey. 2010. Cross-Country Disparity in Agricultural Productivity: Quantifying the Role of Modern Seed Adoption. *Journal of Development Studies* **46**:10, 1767-1785. [CrossRef]

40. JASON W. MOORE. 2010. The End of the Road? Agricultural Revolutions in the Capitalist World-Ecology, 1450-2010. *Journal of Agrarian Change* **10**:3, 389-413. [CrossRef]

41. Kathleen Neumann, Peter H. Verburg, Elke Stehfest, Christoph Müller. 2010. The yield gap of global grain production: A spatial analysis. *Agricultural Systems* **103**:5, 316-326. [CrossRef]

42. Charles Kenny. 2010. Is Anywhere Stuck in a Malthusian Trap?. *Kyklos* **63**:2, 192-205. [CrossRef]

43. Carleton Schade, David Pimentel. 2010. Population crash: prospects for famine in the twenty-first century. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **12**:2, 245-262. [CrossRef]

44. Víctor H. Moreira, Boris E. Bravo-Ureta. 2010. Technical efficiency and metatechnology ratios for dairy farms in three southern cone countries: a stochastic meta-frontier model. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **33**:1, 33-45. [CrossRef]

45. Philip G. Pardey, Julian M. Alston, Vernon W. RuttanThe Economics of Innovation and Technical Change in Agriculture 939-984. [CrossRef]

46. Rodolfo Cermeño, Sirenia Vázquez. 2009. Technological Backwardness in Agriculture: Is it Due to Lack of R&D, Human Capital, and Openness to International Trade?. *Review of Development Economics* **13**:4, 673-686. [CrossRef]

47. David B. Lobell, Kenneth G. Cassman, Christopher B. Field. 2009. Crop Yield Gaps: Their Importance, Magnitudes, and Causes. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **34**:1, 179-204. [CrossRef]

48. Mon-Chi Lio, Jin-Li Hu. 2009. Governance and Agricultural Production Efficiency: A Cross-Country Aggregate Frontier Analysis. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **60**:1, 40-61. [CrossRef]

49. J. Pongratz, C. Reick, T. Raddatz, M. Claussen. 2008. A reconstruction of global agricultural areas and land cover for the last millennium. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **22**:3, n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

50. Jörg Mayer, Pilar Fajarnes. 2008. Tripling Africa's Primary Exports: What, How, Where?. *The Journal of Development Studies* **44**:1, 80-102. [CrossRef]

51. Boubaker Dhehibi, Lassaad Lachaal. 2006. Empirical Evidence of Productivity Growth in Tunisian Agriculture: 1961?2000. *African Development Review* **18**:2, 248-257. [CrossRef]

52. Matthew J. Kotchen. 2006. The Economics of Sustainable Development, edited by Sisay Asefa. *Journal of Regional Science* **46**:3, 583-586. [CrossRef]

53. S MANAGI. 2006. Are there increasing returns to pollution abatement? Empirical analytics of the Environmental Kuznets Curve in pesticides#. *Ecological Economics* **58**:3, 617-636. [CrossRef]

54. International Monetary Fund. 2006. Burundi: Selected Issues and Statistical Appendix. *IMF Staff Country Reports* **06**:307, i. [CrossRef]

55. Andrew Balmford, Rhys. E. Green, Jorn P. W. Scharlemann. 2005. Sparing land for nature: exploring the potential impact of changes in agricultural yield on the area needed for crop production. *Global Change Biology* **11**:10, 1594-1605. [CrossRef]

56. Tim J. Coelli, D. S. Prasada Rao. 2005. Total factor productivity growth in agriculture: a Malmquist index analysis of 93 countries, 1980-2000. *Agricultural Economics* **32**:s1, 115-134. [CrossRef]

57. R. W. Kates, T. M. Parris. 2003. Long-term trends and a sustainability transition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**:14, 8062-8067. [CrossRef]

58. Rodolfo Cermeño, G. S. Maddala, Michael A. Trueblood. 2003. Modeling Technology as a Dynamic Error Components Process: The Case of the Inter-country Agricultural Production Function. *Econometric Reviews* **22**:3, 289-306. [CrossRef]